

Round A	English	Evaluation Sheet for Blue Inc.	Match No.		Red Co.	Blue Inc.

Round	<input checked="" type="radio"/> A <input type="radio"/> B
Language	<input type="radio"/> J <input checked="" type="radio"/> E

Red Co.	<input type="radio"/>
Blue Inc	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

University	Team

Judge	<input type="radio"/> ①	<input type="radio"/> ②	<input type="radio"/> ③	<input type="radio"/> ④	<input type="radio"/> ⑤	<input type="radio"/> ⑥	<input type="radio"/> ⑦	<input type="radio"/> ⑧	<input type="radio"/> ⑨
	<input type="radio"/> ①	<input type="radio"/> ②	<input type="radio"/> ③	<input type="radio"/> ④	<input type="radio"/> ⑤	<input type="radio"/> ⑥	<input type="radio"/> ⑦	<input type="radio"/> ⑧	<input type="radio"/> ⑨

Tokyo Keio Sophia Kyush Hitotsu Aus

University	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Team	<input type="radio"/> ①	<input type="radio"/> ②	<input type="radio"/> ③			

Judge's Name ( )

Match No	<input type="radio"/> ①	<input type="radio"/> ②	<input type="radio"/> ③	<input type="radio"/> ④	<input type="radio"/> ⑤	<input type="radio"/> ⑥	<input type="radio"/> ⑦	<input type="radio"/> ⑧	<input type="radio"/> ⑨
----------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------

No.	Category	Aspects for Evaluation	Score (3 is average)					Score				
1	Persuasiveness of the Brief	On each issue, is the brief well founded with respect to facts, legal provisions and other authorities? Is it logical and persuasive?	1 ①	1.5 ①.5	2 ②	2.5 ②.5	3 ③	3.5 ③.5	4 ④	4.5 ④.5	5 ⑤	
			Poor		Fair		Avg.		Exc.		Outst.	
2	Expression and Organization of the Brief	Does the brief use adequate and precise expression? Is it easy to read and comprehend? Is it well organized?	1 ①	1.5 ①.5	2 ②	2.5 ②.5	3 ③	3.5 ③.5	4 ④	4.5 ④.5	5 ⑤	
			Poor		Fair		Avg.		Exc.		Outst.	
3	Issue 1	Were necessary facts and the legal basis for the claim and/or defense presented clearly and at an appropriate time? Overall, was the team's argument persuasive?	1 ①	1.5 ①.5	2 ②	2.5 ②.5	3 ③	3.5 ③.5	4 ④	4.5 ④.5	5 ⑤	
			Poor		Fair		Avg.		Exc.		Outst.	
4	Issue 2	Were necessary facts and the legal basis for the claim and/or defense presented clearly and at an appropriate time? Overall, was the team's argument persuasive?	1 ①	1.5 ①.5	2 ②	2.5 ②.5	3 ③	3.5 ③.5	4 ④	4.5 ④.5	5 ⑤	
			Poor		Fair		Avg.		Exc.		Outst.	
5	Response to Arbitrators	Did the team respond to the arbitrators adequately and promptly?	1 ①	1.5 ①.5	2 ②	2.5 ②.5	3 ③	3.5 ③.5	4 ④	4.5 ④.5	5 ⑤	
			Poor		Fair		Avg.		Exc.		Outst.	
6	Response to Counterparty's Argument	Did the team understand the given facts accurately and sufficiently? Did they research and present appropriate information on the factual background?	1 ①	1.5 ①.5	2 ②	2.5 ②.5	3 ③	3.5 ③.5	4 ④	4.5 ④.5	5 ⑤	
			Poor		Fair		Avg.		Exc.		Outst.	
7	Facts	Did the team understand the given facts accurately and sufficiently? Did they research and present appropriate information on the factual background?	1 ①	1.5 ①.5	2 ②	2.5 ②.5	3 ③	3.5 ③.5	4 ④	4.5 ④.5	5 ⑤	
			Poor		Fair		Avg.		Exc.		Outst.	
8	Opening and Closing Statement	Was the opening statement effective in conveying the overall picture of the team's arguments? Was the closing statement effective, reflecting the discussions at the hearing? Did the team use time effectively?	1 ①	1.5 ①.5	2 ②	2.5 ②.5	3 ③	3.5 ③.5	4 ④	4.5 ④.5	5 ⑤	
			Poor		Fair		Avg.		Exc.		Outst.	
9	Presentation Speech Attitude	Did the team members speak in a clear and confident manner? Did the team members become excessively excited, emotional or confused? Were the team's speech and attitude appropriate as attorneys in arbitration?	1 ①	1.5 ①.5	2 ②	2.5 ②.5	3 ③	3.5 ③.5	4 ④	4.5 ④.5	5 ⑤	
			Poor		Fair		Avg.		Exc.		Outst.	
10	Teamwork	Did each member of the team perform his or her role appropriately? Did any member perform too dominantly, or make little contribution?	1 ①	1.5 ①.5	2 ②	2.5 ②.5	3 ③	3.5 ③.5	4 ④	4.5 ④.5	5 ⑤	
			Poor		Fair		Avg.		Exc.		Outst.	

Good	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Bad	<input type="radio"/>
	<input type="radio"/>

< Remarks for Evaluation >

- Evaluation should be made on an absolute basis (rather than in comparison with the other team).
- Please mark the score and also write the score clearly for each item. You may award half-points, such as giving a score of 2.5 or 3.5 for an item.
- In evaluating the team's performance, take into consideration the composition of the team (i.e., whether it is composed of undergraduate students or graduate students or persons with legal practice experience). If the team's performance meets the judge's expectations for a team of that level, a score of 3 should be awarded. (If it exceeds that level, the score should be 4; if it greatly exceeds it, 5; if it falls below that level, 2; and if it falls far below that level, 1).
- Please remember that "3: Good" is for average performance, in other words, 3 is the baseline.  
If the team includes members with experience in business or legal practice, please hold the team to a higher standard.
- Evaluation should be made by each judges independently. However, to ensure accuracy and fairness, we ask the judges to share their views on the scores with each other prior to submitting the evaluation sheets.