ROUND "A" EVALUATION FORM (2005)

Team Name:
(Opposing Team Name:)
Name of Referee:
Each evaluation item should be evaluated on a 5-point scoring system. (You may give middle point if necessary like 3.5 or 4.5.), based on an absolute evaluation, rather than a comparative assessment. Accordingly, if, for example, both teams have performed in an exceptional manner, both teams should be given 5 points. For the evaluation of the scores, the following suggestions may be helpful. An average performance should be awarded a score of 3. Your view of the result of the arbitration award (i.e., which team would have won the arbitration)
should not be considered.
5 points: Excellent. Their performance matches that of young business persons and excellent as students. 4 points: Good. Very good as students. 3 points: Average. 2 points: Rather unsatisfactory. 1 point: Very unsatisfactory.
1. Logicality and Persuasiveness General guidelines regarding Logicality and Persuasiveness: Logicality and clarity of the arguments. Whether the explanation of law was persuasive. Whether the facts supporting the arguments were properly stated.
(1) ISSUE 1: Regarding the responsibility of Blue with regard to the damage arising from the fact that the Happy Bridge was subjected to
a passage prohibition.
Criteria of evaluation:points (1)

Whether the arguments were well founded. Whether there was inconsistency within arguments. Whether the arguments were persuasive. Whether false logic was used as an excuse. Whether the team missed important arguments that should have been raised.

(2) ISSUE 2: Amount of damages
points (2)
Criteria of evaluation:
Whether the arguments were well founded. Whether there was inconsistency within the arguments. Whether the arguments were persuasive. Whether false logic was used as an excuse. Whether the team missed important arguments that should have been raised.
(3) ISSUE 3: US\$5 million that Blue expended following the construction
of ZONE B.
points (3)
Criteria of evaluation:
Whether the arguments were well founded. Whether there was inconsistency within the arguments. Whether the arguments were persuasive. Whether false logic was used as an excuse. Whether the team missed important arguments that should have been raised.
(4) Whether opening statement and closing statement were well
organizedpoints (4)
Criteria of evaluation:
Whether all important issues were covered. Whether the
allocated time was used effectively. Whether statements were
easy to understand and persuasive.
(5) Whether arguments and counter-arguments were persuasivepoints (5)
Criteria of evaluation:
Whether arguments were persuasive. Whether

counter-arguments got to the heart of the matter. Whether arguments and counter-arguments were within the bounds of common sense.

2. Attitudes, l	behavior and teamwork		
(1) Attitud	le, behavior and manner	r of discussion	
		points	s (6)
Crite	ria of evaluation:		
	Whether the player in	nadvertently gave way to his feeling.	
	Whether there was a	personal attack. Whether the player	
	tried to address argur	ments to arbitrators. Whether player	's
	attitude and use of wo	ords were decent.	
Exan	nples of reasons for dedu	acting points:	
	Losing one's head. Act	ts of impoliteness. Unduly soft voice.	
Exan	nples of reasons for enha	ancing score:	
	Being calm. Quick and	d witty response.	
(2) Teamw	vork	points	(7)
Crite	ria of evaluation:	P	()
	Whether each membe	er played his/her given role, coordina	ting
	efficiently with other		O
3 Sufficiency	of preparation	points	(8)
· ·	ria of evaluation:	points	(0)
Office		mbers have studied well the problem	,
		'Principles. Whether all team memb	•
		understood well the relevant laws ar	
	facts.	understood wen the relevant laws ar	Iu
			- \
4. Scoring of t		points (9)
Crite	ria of evaluation:		
	_	ed. Whether sentences were easy to	
		ly written. Whether the arguments v	vere
,	persuasively supporte		
(Atte		e 5 scale points in order to place grea	ıter
	weight on this ite	m.)	

Total score Σ (1 \sim 9) = _____