	EVALUA (Each jud			RM-JUDGII luation Criteria Form-Ju		S. IIII .
nunications.	anco / lex	Jone by Jami be	ind tone, an	choice, attitude a	102	his scale for
Judge's Nam	e: Vana	Worldy Ce	11#: <u>diw g</u>	Date:	Room #	id the way
Team Letter	Designation	: <i>A-</i> /	4	Client Name:	SSBC	en gmy stas
Negotiation (Please circle	judged: e the compet	tition level—Reg	ional or Na	ational / and mar	k the round ob	served)
	Round #1	1 Ro	und #2	Final:		
		NAME OF TAXABLE PARTY.			-ANALYSIS	ILIAS .FV
Criteria I-V are preparit			ying the en	rd of the negotia	ition and whil	e the teams.
This scale as tactics reason	sesses wheth nably design		n set out in	ith the facts and lather the fact pattern. rent strategy?	law and had a	
7	6	5	4	Sepor mort bearing	SHORE BOLLOBER	1/
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared
whether their work effective	strategy and ely in the co	d tactics seemed ontext of the act	scripted or	responsive to the r otherwise pre-p tion. Was this te moves by the op	lanned in a wa am able to ada	y that did no
7	6	no storio bus los	4 Val.	ving resternal tax	(2)	mest and bib
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral 7	Somewhat Flexible	Elexible	Highly Flexible
Based on wh		ved in the negot		he self-analysis, nent was reached		
7	6	3. BD NOT 2180U	4	3	2	(1)
Goals not served at all	Goals not serve	ed Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served wel	Goals served very well
How effective			rking toget	her as a team, in	sharing respon	nsibility, and
providing mu						
7	6	5	4	3	$\binom{2}{}$	- l
Totally lacking Lain teamwork	acking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork
NOTE: For a swhole number)			ria I, II, III, V,	, VI, and VII and en	ter that result (to	the nearest

This scale	focuses on wo	rd choice, attitude	and tone	COTIATING TEA e, and implied and the other team cont	explicit com	
achieving	its client's best	interests?		1-1		
7	6 9 4 0	55mnM.moil	4	3	inoi 2 mgias C	(1)
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well
Criteria V analysis,	/Land VII sho	uld be completed	l after b	oth teams have co	mpleted thei	r self-
Students v following (1) "In ref you do the	questions: lecting on the e same and wha	0-minute period b	if you fa fferently	4-3001 B-G-1250 AV VII		
		analysis during the		session, how adequitation?	uately underst	ood the
7	6	5	4	3	(2)	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand o learn	r Did not understand or learn much	Neutral Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well
Based on standards did the tea	of the legal pro m invent self-s	n, do you believe fession? For exa	the nego	tiating team observed the team misrest select and circle of team TEAM VIOLATED I	present mater ne:	rial facts? 2)
that, in you	ur judgment, th	e team should be	disqualif	NDARDS, was the fed from the compo	etition? Circle	e one: heasti
(1)	211	o, Dioyonan i	p.	110, 20 1101 21300	ALIII	
Please exp	olain in detail:	bowise election malkentrick	185(0.98)		Crowler state states	Signal of the service of the serviced
					MADAIK	
bas valid	ianisa resonsi	ver or a teap), in S	lionol 20	egotiators in worki		The state of the s
					stual backup	OF STUENAUSC

Totally lacking Lacking teamwork

in teamwork

Date: 9/22 Room #: Cell # Judge's Name: Client Name: Team Letter Designation: Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed) Round #2 Final: Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis. NEGOTIATION PLANNING I. This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy? 2 7 Highly Prepared Somewhat Very Neutral Unprepared Unprepared Prepared Prepared Unprepared FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team? 5 7 1 Very Inflexible Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Flexible Highly Flexible Inflexible Inflexible OUTCOME OF SESSION LANGUAGE STANDARD GET ALLOW MASTE BEIOTO HOW TH Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals? 7 1 Goals served Goals served Goals somewhat Goals served well Neutral Goals not served Goals not served very well not served somewhat at all IV. TEAMWORK How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup? 5

NOTE: For a single-person team, average criteria I, II, III, V, VI, and VII and enter that result (to the nearest whole number) as the teamwork rating.

Neutral

Somewhat lacking in

teamwork

Somewhat good

teamwork

Excellent

Teamwork.

Good

		ord choice, estitude	and tone,		explicit com	
	ay this team ma its client's best	anage its relations	ap with t	ne other team con	tribute to or c	letract from
7	6		4 -	3	(2)	cam Leuer
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well
Criteria V malysis.	Land VII she	ould be completed	after bo	th teams have co	mpleted thei	r self-
Students we following (1) "In refleyou do the	questions: lecting on the e same and wha	10-minute period bentire negotiation, at would you do di	if you fac fferently?	ed a similar situat		
(2) "How v	well did your s	strategy work in re	lation to t	he outcome?"	sesses wheth	an olava sid
		analysis during the learned from toda			uately underst	tood the
7	6	5	4	(3)	2	1
Oid not inderstand or earn at all	Did not understand of learn	or Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood an learned extremely wel
Based on y	of the legal pro	on, do you believe ofession? For exar	mple, 1) d	iating team observid the team misre	present mater	d the ethical
did the tea	m invent self-s			8		NDARDS
did the tea	(3)	CAL STANDARDS		FEAM VIOLATED I		NDARDS
TEAM OB	SSERVED ETHIC led TEAM VIO ur judgment, th	CAL STANDARDS  OLATED ETHICA  ne team should be	or MAL STAN	TEAM VIOLATED IDARDS, was the	ethical viola	tion so seven
TEAM OB	SSERVED ETHIC led TEAM VIC ur judgment, th	CAL STANDARDS  OLATED ETHICA  ne team should be	or mon 7	TEAM VIOLATED I	ethical viola	tion so seven
TEAM OB	SSERVED ETHIC led TEAM VIC ur judgment, th	CAL STANDARDS  OLATED ETHICA  ne team should be	or mon 7	TEAM VIOLATED IN THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY	ethical viola ethical viola etition? Circle	tion so sever e one:
TEAM OB  If you circle that, in you	SERVED ETHIC led TEAM VIC ur judgment, the YE olain in detail:	CAL STANDARDS  OLATED ETHICA  ne team should be	or mon 7	DARDS, was the ed from the compe	ethical violatetition? Circle	tion so sever e one:
TEAM OB  If you circle that, in you	SERVED ETHIC led TEAM VIC ur judgment, the YE olain in detail:	CAL STANDARDS  OLATED ETHICA  ne team should be of the control of	or mon 7	TEAM VIOLATED I	ethical violatetition? Circle	tion so sever e one:

The Exaligation Canteria Counts will be collected by the competition administrator <u>PRIOR</u> to the properties of the prop

PLEASE be sure to complete ALL categories before turning in this form.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES (Each judge should receive four copies of the Evaluation Criteria Form—Judging Scales.)

Team Letter	Designation:	A-1	<u> </u>	Client Name:	SSBL	
Negotiation (Please circ		ion level—Regio	onal or Na	tional / and mark	the round obs	4 The / Industria
	Round #1	Rour	nd #2	Final:		
are prepar	ing for the self	-analysis.	ing the en	d of the negotiat	no san no znisa	the teams
This scale a tactics reason	onably designed	r the team was f	set out in	th the facts and la the fact pattern.		rategy and
7	6	5	4	3	(2)	1
		the second	Ministral	C b	Dunmanad	Highly
Very Unprepared	Unprepared  EXIBILITY IN	Somewhat Unprepared  UDEVIATING	Neutral FROM P	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared PTING STRA	Prepare
II. FLF This scale a whether the work effect	EXIBILITY IN ssesses whethe ir strategy and ively in the con	Unprepared  N DEVIATING  r the negotiators tactics seemed s text of the actua	FROM P seemed r scripted or al negotiat		PTING STRA negotiation as i anned in a way m able to adap	Prepare ATEGY t unfolded t that did n
II. FLF This scale a whether the work effect	EXIBILITY IN ssesses whethe ir strategy and ively in the con	Unprepared  N DEVIATING  r the negotiators tactics seemed s text of the actua	FROM P seemed r scripted or al negotiat	Prepared PLANS OR ADA esponsive to the r otherwise pre-pl ion. Was this tea	PTING STRA negotiation as i anned in a way m able to adap	Prepare ATEGY t unfolded t that did n
II. FLE This scale a whether the work effect to for exam	EXIBILITY IN ssesses whethe ir strategy and ively in the con	Unprepared  N DEVIATING  r the negotiators tactics seemed s text of the actua	FROM Passeemed rescripted or all negotiate inforeseen	Prepared  LANS OR ADA  esponsive to the r  otherwise pre-pl  ion. Was this tea	PTING STRA negotiation as i anned in a way m able to adap	Prepare ATEGY t unfolded that did n t its strates
Unprepared  II. FLF  This scale a whether the work effect to for exam  7  Very Inflexible  III. OU' Based on w	exibility in seeses whether is strategy and ively in the comple, to new information of the inflexible in the seesion, region in the seesion.	Unprepared  N DEVIATING  r the negotiators tactics seemed s atext of the actual formation or to un  Somewhat Inflexible  ESSION ed in the negotiat gardless of whether	FROM Paseemed rescripted or all negotiate inforeseen  4 Neutral	Prepared PLANS OR ADA esponsive to the responsive to the responsiv	PTING STRA negotiation as in anned in a way arm able to adaptoosing team?	Prepare ATEGY t unfolded t that did n t its strateg  1 Highly Flexible
Unprepared  II. FLF  This scale a whether the work effect to for exam  7  Very Inflexible  III. OU' Based on w	exibility in seeses whether is strategy and ively in the comple, to new information of the inflexible in the seesion, region in the seesion.	Unprepared  N DEVIATING  r the negotiators tactics seemed s ntext of the actual formation or to un  Somewhat Inflexible  ESSION ed in the negotia	FROM Paseemed rescripted or all negotiate inforeseen  4 Neutral	Prepared PLANS OR ADA esponsive to the responsive to the responsive to the responsive pre-plaion. Was this teamoves by the opput a somewhat Flexible  The self-analysis, to the control of	PTING STRA negotiation as in anned in a way arm able to adaptoosing team?	Prepare ATEGY t unfolded t that did n t its strates  1 Highly Flexible
Unprepared  II. FLE This scale a whether the work effect to for exam 7  Very Inflexible  III. OU' Based on w outcome of	exibility in seeses whether is strategy and ively in the comple, to new information of the inflexible inflexib	Unprepared  N DEVIATING  r the negotiators tactics seemed s atext of the actual formation or to un  Somewhat Inflexible  ESSION ed in the negotiat gardless of whether	FROM Paseemed rescripted or all negotiate inforeseen  4 Neutral	Prepared PLANS OR ADA esponsive to the responsive to the responsiv	PTING STRA negotiation as in anned in a way arm able to adaptoosing team?	Prepare ATEGY t unfolded t that did n t its strates  1 Highly Flexible
Unprepared  II. FLF This scale a whether the work effect to for exam  7 Very Inflexible  III. OU' Based on w outcome of  7 Goals not served at all  IV. TEA How effecti	EXIBILITY IN ssesses whethe ir strategy and ively in the cor ple, to new info  6 Inflexible  TCOME OF S hat you observe the session, reg  6 Goals not served	Unprepared  N DEVIATING  r the negotiators tactics seemed s stext of the actual formation or to un  Somewhat Inflexible  ESSION ed in the negotiat gardless of wheth  Goals somewhat not served	FROM Paseemed recripted or all negotiate inforeseen  4 Neutral  Attion and ther agreements  4 Neutral	Prepared PLANS OR ADA esponsive to the responsive to the responsiv	egotiation as is anned in a way am able to adaptosing team?  The serve the client a control of the control of t	Prepare ATEGY t unfolded t that did n t its strates  Highly Flexible did the nt's goals?  Goals served very well
Unprepared  II. FLF This scale a whether the work effect to for exam  7 Very Inflexible III. OU' Based on w outcome of  7 Goals not served at all IV. TEA How effect	EXIBILITY IN ssesses whethe ir strategy and ively in the cor ple, to new info  6 Inflexible  FCOME OF S hat you observe the session, reg  6 Goals not served  AMWORK ve were the neg	Unprepared  N DEVIATING  r the negotiators tactics seemed s stext of the actual formation or to un  Somewhat Inflexible  ESSION ed in the negotiat gardless of wheth  Goals somewhat not served	FROM Paseemed recripted or all negotiate inforeseen  4 Neutral  Attion and ther agreements  4 Neutral	Prepared PLANS OR ADA esponsive to the r otherwise pre-plaion. Was this tea moves by the opp  3 Somewhat Flexible he self-analysis, t nent was reached,  3 Goals served somewhat	egotiation as is anned in a way am able to adaptosing team?  The serve the client a control of the control of t	Prepare ATEGY t unfolded t that did n t its strates  Highly Flexible did the nt's goals?  Goals served very well

	The state of the s			OTIATING TEA , and implied and		munications
Did the wa	ay this team ma	nage its relations		he other team cor		
achieving	its client's best			1 1	F	Lauren Franzo T
7	6	S_59maN men	4	3 73	(2)	l camplication l
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Manage Somewhat Well	d Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well
Criteria V analysis.	T and VII shot	ıld be completed	Lafter bo	th teams have co	ompleted thei	r self-
Students v following (1) "In ref you do the	questions: lecting on the eresame and what	)-minute period l	if you fac		tion tomorrov	
		nalysis during th earned from toda		ession, how adeq	uately underst	cood the
7	6	5	4	$\binom{3}{3}$	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well
Based on standards	of the legal prof	n, do you believe fession? For exa	mple, 1) d	iating team obser lid the team misre Select and circle o	epresent mater	
TEAM OF	SSERVED ETHIC	AL STANDARDS	or <sub>equests</sub>	TEAM VIOLATED	ETHICAL STA	NDARDS
that, in yo	ur judgment, the	e team should be	disqualifi	DARDS, was the	etition? Circle	e one:
	YES	S, DISQUALIFY		NO, DO NOT DISQ		Outcome of
Please exp	olain in detail:	Godde ggwed symewhat	lyeaks)	Coals somewhat havestern	bearing they also (1)	Soats not served
		- W - E			зиочи	
bris, visite	HARDING FESTIONS	et as criexma, un s	ting togeth	ROTESIALS IN WORK	re wee <del>e the ne</del> utual backue?	
	n.v.				LEMENORIO TEMPO	tel Ritera And the
5431018401		Why will be	19 77	1		

# EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES (Each judge should receive four copies of the Evaluation Criteria Form—Judging Scales.)

		0		11°	22BC	
Team Letter	Designation:	B-15	(	Client Name: _		alder of the
Negotiation Please circ	indged:	ion level—Regio	nal or Nat	ional / and mo	ark the round ob	damaged Vary M
	Round #1	Roun	d #2	Final:	<u>/</u>	3.71
	v should be co ing for the self	mpleted followi Fanalysis.	OCCUPATION IN	and the solution of	mino sin ne giao	e the teams
This scale a	onably designed	PLANNING or the team was fa d to the situation performance and	ımiliar wit set out in	th the facts and the fact pattern	d law and had a s	strategy and
		5 / TITCH	4	3	(2)	1
7	6	5 4				
Very Unprepared	6 Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared  N DEVIATING	Neutral FROM P	Somewhat Prepared LANS OR Al	DAPTING STR	ATEGY
Very Unprepared  II. FLI This scale a whether the	EXIBILITY IN assesses whether ir strategy and	Unprepared	FROM P seemed re cripted or al negotiat	LANS OR All esponsive to the otherwise preion. Was this	DAPTING STR ne negotiation as -planned in a wa team able to ada	ATEGY it unfolded on the property in the prope
Very Unprepared  II. FLI This scale a whether the	EXIBILITY IN assesses whether ir strategy and	Unprepared N DEVIATING or the negotiators tactics seemed sometimes tactics from the actual	FROM P seemed re cripted or al negotiat	LANS OR All esponsive to the otherwise preion. Was this	DAPTING STR ne negotiation as -planned in a wa team able to ada	ATEGY it unfolded on that did not
Very Unprepared  II. FLI This scale a whether the work effect to for exam	EXIBILITY IN assesses whether ir strategy and	Unprepared N DEVIATING or the negotiators tactics seemed sometimes tactics from the actual	FROM P seemed re cripted or al negotiat	Prepared  LANS OR All esponsive to the otherwise pre- ion. Was this moves by the of	DAPTING STR ne negotiation as -planned in a wa team able to ada	ATEGY it unfolded on that did not per its strateged.  Highly
Very Unprepared  II. FLI This scale a whether the work effect to for exam  Very Inflexible  III. OU Based on w	EXIBILITY IN assesses whether ir strategy and cively in the couple, to new info  f  Inflexible  TCOME OF Souther you observe	Unprepared N DEVIATING or the negotiators tactics seemed s ntext of the actual formation or to un  5  Somewhat Inflexible	FROM P seemed recripted or al negotiat aforeseen in Neutral	Prepared  LANS OR All esponsive to the otherwise pre- ion. Was this moves by the office of the control of the c	DAPTING STR ne negotiation as i-planned in a wa team able to ada opposing team?  2 t Flexible is, to what extent ned, serve the cli-	Prepared ATEGY it unfolded on that did not the strategory  I Highly Flexible t did the
Very Unprepared  II. FLI This scale a whether the work effect to for exam  Very Inflexible  III. OU Based on w	EXIBILITY IN assesses whether ir strategy and cively in the couple, to new info  f  Inflexible  TCOME OF Souther you observe	Unprepared N DEVIATING or the negotiators tactics seemed sometate of the actual formation or to un  Somewhat Inflexible SESSION red in the negotia	FROM P seemed recripted or al negotiat aforeseen in Neutral	Prepared  LANS OR All esponsive to the otherwise pre- ion. Was this moves by the office of the control of the c	DAPTING STR ne negotiation as i-planned in a wa team able to ada opposing team?  2 t Flexible is, to what extent ned, serve the cli-	Prepared ATEGY it unfolded on that did not the strategory  I Highly Flexible t did the
Very Unprepared  II. FLI This scale a whether the work effect to for exam  Very Inflexible  III. OU Based on w outcome of	EXIBILITY IN assesses whether are strategy and cively in the couple, to new info  f  Inflexible  TCOME OF So what you observe the session, re	Unprepared N DEVIATING or the negotiators tactics seemed sometic of the actual formation or to un  Somewhat Inflexible SESSION red in the negotial gardless of whet	FROM P seemed recripted or al negotiat aforeseen in Neutral	Prepared  LANS OR All esponsive to the otherwise pre- ion. Was this moves by the office of the control of the c	DAPTING STR ne negotiation as planned in a wa team able to ada opposing team?  2 t Flexible is, to what extent ned, serve the cli-	Prepared ATEGY it unfolded on that did not the pt its strategy  I Highly Flexible that did the ent's goals?
Very Unprepared  II. FLI This scale a whether the work effect to for exam  7 Very Inflexible  III. OU Based on w outcome of 7 Goals not served at all  IV. TE How effect	EXIBILITY IN assesses whether are strategy and cively in the couple, to new info  6 Inflexible TCOME OF So what you observe f the session, re  6 Goals not served	Unprepared N DEVIATING or the negotiators tactics seemed sometate of the actual formation or to une  Somewhat Inflexible SESSION red in the negotial gardless of wheth  Goals somewhat not served	FROM P seemed re cripted or al negotiat aforeseen Neutral	Prepared  LANS OR All esponsive to the otherwise pre- ion. Was this moves by the or a somewhar Flexible  A Goals ser somewhar som	DAPTING STR ne negotiation as i-planned in a wa team able to ada opposing team?  2 t Flexible is, to what extent ned, serve the clic 2 ved Goals served we t	Prepared ATEGY it unfolded on that did not the pt its stratege  I Highly Flexible that did the ent's goals?  I Goals served very well
Very Unprepared  II. FLI This scale a whether the work effect to for exam  7 Very Inflexible  III. OU Based on w outcome of 7 Goals not served at all  IV. TE How effect	EXIBILITY IN assesses whether ir strategy and cively in the couple, to new info  6 Inflexible TCOME OF So what you observe the session, re  6 Goals not served AMWORK tive were the ne	Unprepared N DEVIATING or the negotiators tactics seemed sometate of the actual formation or to une  Somewhat Inflexible SESSION red in the negotial gardless of wheth  Goals somewhat not served	FROM P seemed re cripted or al negotiat aforeseen Neutral	Prepared  LANS OR All esponsive to the otherwise pre- ion. Was this moves by the or a somewhar Flexible  A Goals ser somewhar som	DAPTING STR ne negotiation as i-planned in a wa team able to ada opposing team?  2 t Flexible is, to what extent ned, serve the clic 2 ved Goals served we t	Prepared ATEGY it unfolded on that did not the pt its stratege  I Highly Flexible that did the ent's goals?  I Goals served very well

		IIP BETWEEN Tord choice, attitude				munications
Did the w	ay this team r	nanage its relations	hip with t	he other team con	tribute to or o	letract from
achieving	its client's be	st interests?				
7	6 2	liont Name 2	4	351·E	2	Feam <sub>I</sub> Letter I
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship  Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Manageo Somewhat Well	i Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well
Criteria: analysis;	VI and VII st	ould be completed	d after bo	th teams have co	mpleted the	ir self-
	ELF-ANALY					
	will begin this questions:	10-minute period l	by answer	ing directly to the	judges, respo	onses to the
		entire negotiation,	if you fac	ed a similar situa	tion tomorroy	w what would
you do the	e same and wh	nat would you do d	ifferently?	H Charters a ret	The second secon	
(2) "How	well did your	strategy work in re	lation to t	he outcome?"		i. NEGI This enale as
Based on negotiation	the team's self	f-analysis during th d learned from toda	e review s v's negoti	ession, how adequation?	uately underst	tood the
7	6	5	4	(3)	2	1 1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand learn	d or Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well
VII. N	EGOTIATIN	C FTHICS	seemed re	motallogua edi in	sessos wheth	en of non sinff
CLEAR TO ANY EVEN AND ADDRESS.	2011 NOTES AND CLEAR OF BUILDING AND ALERS	ion, do you believe	the negot	iating team observ	ved or violate	d the ethical
standards	of the legal pr	rofession? For exa -serving material fa	mple, 1) d	id the team misre	present mater	rial facts? 2)
	21/2	400	(4)	3	- 6	4
TEAM O	BSERVED ETH	ICAL STANDARDS	or	FEAM VIOLATED	ETHICAL STA	NDARDS
If you circ	eled TEAM V	IOLATED ETHIC	AL STAN	DARDS, was the	ethical viola	tion so severe
that, in yo	ur judgment,	the team should be	disqualific	ed from the comp	etition? Circle	e one:
Talsog a'	erve the client	a bodonon anw Ine.				outcome of
1	Y	ES, DISQUALIFY	A	NO, DO NOT DISQU	JALIFY	
Please exp	olain in detail:	Lovine etseell terhou nau	Neusal	d Grade samprochet nat served		Energe ten sigota lik te
					MHO WHE	
bas viilid	wing responsi	ier as a ream, in shi	Poscul ani)	enotiators in work	re artiferance of	How effects

A monufacina.

PLEASE be sure to complete ALL categories before turning in this form.

The Lyadination Criteria-Larms will be collected by the competition administrator PRIOR to the state of the kist two terms

whole number) as the teamwork rating.

#### **EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM-JUDGING SCALES**

(Each judge should receive four copies of the Evaluation Criteria Form-Judging Scales.) Cell # Judge's Name: Team Letter Designation: B-12 **Negotiation judged:** (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed) Round #2 Final: Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis. **NEGOTIATION PLANNING** I. This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy? 7 Highly Neutral Somewhat Prepared Somewhat Unprepared Very Prepared Prepared Unprepared Unprepared FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team? 5 7 6 Somewhat Flexible Highly Very Somewhat Neutral Flexible Inflexible Inflexible III. OUTCOME OF SESSION TRACTIONATE JAMETY GET A JOIN MAET INSIGN BOY I Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals? 2 1 7 6 Goals served Goals served Goals served well Goals somewhat Neutral Goals not served Goals not served somewhat very well not served at all **TEAMWORK** IV. How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup? 5 Excellent Somewhat good Very Good Totally lacking Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in Neutral **Teamwork** teamwork teamwork NOTE: For a single-person team, average criteria I, II, III, V, VI, and VII and enter that result (to the nearest

The Exaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the

Attachment B

				RM-JUDGIN luation Criteria Form-Ju		v. rec
nunications.	mic/Lour	ind implied and	nd tone, a	choice, arttude s	102-	This scale li
Judge's Nam	ie: Vanta	Cell	#: 53.97.51	Date:	Room #:_	Did the way
Team Letter	Designation:	13-12	4	Client Name:	SSBC	a) Bin voenor
Negotiation (Please circl	•	tion level—Regio	onal or No	ational / and mar	k the round obs	erved)
	Round #1	Rou	nd #2	Final:		
					I-ANALYSIS	VI. SEX
	should be co ig for the sel		ing the er	id of the negotia	tion and while	the teams
This scale as tactics reason	nably designe	er the team was f	set out in	ith the facts and lather the fact pattern.		rategy and
7	6	5	4	3	2	(1)
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared
This scale as whether thei work effecti	ssesses whether r strategy and vely in the co	er the negotiators tactics seemed s ntext of the actua	s seemed r scripted or al negotia	responsive to the rotherwise pre-ption. Was this tempores by the opposite the rotherwise pre-ption.	negotiation as i lanned in a way am able to adap	t unfolded o that did no
7	6	5	4	3	2	[1]
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible Flexible	Highly Flexible
Based on wh		ed in the negotia		the self-analysis, nent was reached		
7	6	5	4	3	(2)	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Geals served well	Goals served very well
How effective	MWORK we were the neutual backup?	•	king toget	her as a team, in	sharing respons	sibility, and
7	6	5	4	3	2	(1)
Totally lacking I in teamwork	acking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork
	single-person tec as the teamwor		a I, II, III, V	, VI, and VII and en	er that result (to th	he nearest

actific 4 title	ay this team mights best		ship with t	he other team cont	tribute to or o	letract from
7	6	5omaH tooil	4 -	3	:nol2ngiasO	$\binom{1}{1}$
Relationship Managed Ver Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well
Criteria analysis.		ould be completed	l after bo	th teams have co	mpleted thei	ir self-
Students following (1) "In re you do the	questions: flecting on the e e same and wha	0-minute period l	if you fac ifferently?	TENER WINDS STATE OF THE CONTROL OF		
		analysis during th learned from toda		ession, how adequation?	uately unders	tood the
7	6	5	4	3	(2)	1
					ERO MACCO ET LUCIO	Understood and
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand of learn	or Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	learned extremely well
vII. N Based on standards did the te	EGOTIATING your observation of the legal-properties an invent self-se	FETHICS on, do you believe	the negot mple, 1) d acts? etc. S		red or violate present materne:	learned extremely well and the ethical rial facts? 2)
vII. N Based on standards did the te  TEAM C  If you cir that, in ye	EGOTIATING your observation of the legal properties of	GETHICS on, do you believe ofession? For exa serving material for CAL STANDARDS OLATED ETHIC ne team should be	the negot mple, 1) d acts? etc. S or AL STAN disqualifi	Learned Somewhat iating team observable the team misrepolect and circle of TEAM VIOLATED INTERPOLECTION TO THE COMPONENT OF T	ved or violate present materine: ETHICAL STA ethical viola etition? Circl	learned extremely well and the ethical rial facts? 2)  NDARDS  tion so sever e one:
vII. N Based on standards did the te  TEAM O  If you cir that, in ye	EGOTIATING your observation of the legal-property and invent self-self-self-self-self-self-self-self-	GETHICS on, do you believe ofession? For exa serving material for CAL STANDARDS OLATED ETHIC ne team should be	the negot mple, 1) d acts? etc. S or AL STAN disqualifi	Learned Somewhat iating team observable the team misreposed and circle of TEAM VIOLATED INTERPOSED TO THE COMPART OF THE COMPA	ved or violate present materine: ETHICAL STA ethical viola etition? Circl	learned extremely well and the ethical rial facts? 2)  NDARDS  tion so sever e one:
vII. N Based on standards did the te  TEAM O If you cir that, in you	EGOTIATING your observation of the legal properties of	GETHICS on, do you believe ofession? For exa serving material for CAL STANDARDS OLATED ETHIC ne team should be	the negot mple, 1) d acts? etc. S or AL STAN disqualifi	Learned Somewhat iating team observation the team misrepole of the team misrepole of the team with the team of the team violated in the team of the te	ved or violate present materine: ETHICAL STA ethical viola etition? Circl	learned extremely well and the ethical rial facts? 2)  NDARDS  tion so sever e one:

The Lyakagion Cateria Larms will be collected by the competition administrator <u>PRIOR</u> to the

## EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES (Each judge should receive four copies of the Evaluation Criteria Form—Judging Scales.)

Judge's Name				Date: 9/2	client's best in	eli gnivoldo
Team Letter	Designation:	B-17		Client Name:	URCE	
Negotiation (Please circle	judged: the competi	tion level—Re	gional or Na	ntional / and mark	the round obs	erved)
	Round #1	R	ound #2	Final:	_	
Criteria I-V	should be co	ompleted follo	owing the en	d of the negotia	EIRY JAMA J	et a viviage
are preparin						
This scale ass tactics reason	sesses whethe ably designe		on set out in	th the facts and lather the fact pattern.		trategy and
7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared
whether their work effective	strategy and ely in the co	tactics seeme ntext of the ac	d scripted or tual negotiat	esponsive to the responsive pre-place of the contract of the c	anned in a way m able to adap	y that did no
7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	AHI Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible
	at you observ	ed in the nego		he self-analysis, t nent was reached		
7	6	(5)	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewh	at Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well
			orking toget	her as a team, in s	sharing respons	sibility, and
7	6	5	4	(3)	2	1
Totally lacking La	cking teamwork	Somewhat lacking is teamwork	n Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork
NOTE: For a s whole number)			eria I, II, III, V,	VI, and VII and ente	er that result (to t	he nearest

achieving its client's bes	POST PORT OF THE POST OF THE P	hip with t	he other team con		munications. letract from
7 6 338	lient Name: 7 / A	04	351-8	2	Feam Letter I
Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well
Criteria VI and VII sh analysis:	ould be completed	Lafter bo	th teams have co	mpleted thei	ir self-
Students will begin this following questions: (1) "In reflecting on the you do the same and wh (2) "How well did your states."	entire negotiation, at would you do di	if you fac ifferently?	ed a similar situat	ion tomorrov	
Based on the team's self- negotiation dynamics and				emisch wirte	
7 6	5	4	(3)	2	1
Did not understand understand or learn	or Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well
VII. NEGOTIATING Based on your observations standards of the legal prodict the team invent self-	on, do you believe ofession? For exa	mple, 1) d	id the team misre	present mater	
TEAN ODGEDATED PETT	CAL STANDARDS	or or	TEAM VIOLATED I	ETHICAL STA	NDARDS
TEAM OBSERVED ETHI	The state of the s		DADDC the	ethical viola	tion co caven
If you circled TEAM VI that, in your judgment, t	he team should be	disqualifi	ed from the compe	etition? Circl	e one:
If you circled TEAM VI that, in your judgment, the	he team should be	disqualifi	ed from the compe	etition? Circl	e one:
If you circled TEAM VI that, in your judgment, the	he team should be	disqualifi	ed from the compo	etition? Circl	e one: pased Outcome of t

### **EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM-JUDGING SCALES**

(Each judge should receive four copies of the Evaluation Criteria Form-Judging Scales.)

Judge's Nan	(	Manual 10 Ce	nii . ell #:	Date: 9/	   22   Room #:	0:
Team Letter	Designation	B-17	l.	Client Name:	NRCE	scheving us 7
Negotiation (Please circ		tition level—Reg		ational / and ma	rk the round obs	
	Round #	1 Ro	ound #2	Final:	operated for the same	
	should be e		wing the er	nd of the negoti:	SESTIAMA-N	A
This scale as tactics reaso	ssesses wheth nably design		s familiar w	ith the facts and the fact pattern. rent strategy?	law and had a s	trategy and
7	6	5	4	3	(2)	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared
This scale as whether the work effecti	ssesses wheth ir strategy and ively in the co	ner the negotiato d tactics seemed ontext of the act	ors seemed of d scripted of mual negotian	responsive to the otherwise pre-ption. Was this te moves by the op	negotiation as i lanned in a way am able to adap	it unfolded of that did no
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible
Based on wl	the session, r	ved in the negot egardless of who	ether agreer	he self-analysis, nent was reached		did the
7	6	1021G TOM OG 10	4	(3)	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not serve	d Goals somewhat not served	t Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well
How effective	AMWORK ve were the nutual backup	_	orking toget	her as a team, in	sharing respons	sibility, and
7	6	5	4	3	/2	1
Totally lacking I	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork
	single-person to as the teamwo		ria I, II, III, V,	VI, and VII and en	ter that result (to ti	he nearest

This scale	focuses on wo	IP BETWEEN To ord choice attitude	and tone	, and implied an	d explicit com	
	ay this team m its client's bes	anage its relations t interests?	hip with t	he other team con	ntribute to or o	letract from
7	IRCE 6	Mem Names	04 -	3	Jesign <sub>2</sub> tion:	Team <sub>1</sub> Letter
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Manage Somewhat Well	ed Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well
Criteria V analysis.	VI and VII sh	ould be completed	Lafter bo	th teams have e	ompleted thei	ir self-
Students v following (1) "In ref you do the	questions: lecting on the same and wh	SIS 10-minute period be entire negotiation, at would you do di strategy work in re	if you fac ifferently?	ed a similar situa	ation tomorrov	
		-analysis during th			quately unders	tood the
7	6	5	4	(3)	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand learn	or Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well
Based on standards did the tea	of the legal prum invent self-	G ETHICS on, do you believe ofession? For exa serving material fa	the negot mple, 1) d acts? etc. S	lid the team misr	rved or violate epresent mater one:	rial facts? 2)
that, in yo	ur judgment, t	OLATED ETHIC he team should be	disqualifi	ed from the comp	petition? Circl	e one:
		ES, DISQUALIFY		NO, DO NOT DISQ		outrome of
Please exp	olain in detail:					Coarte pur enreca
from weithd	to recognize the second	da er unsat s ac te	dinamental second	dance of ourseless	MAOWM	
LORE PERM	SETTE TENJOLOGI	HE ALL AIMSTAN TO THE		AND	er ser swewer gwel backup?	

The Lyaluation Criteria Lorins will be collected by the competition administrator PRIOR to the

Attachment B

should receive four copies of the Evaluation Criteria Form—Judging Scales.) Judge's Name: Team Letter Designation: Client Name: Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed) Round #1 Round #2 Final: Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis. **NEGOTIATION PLANNING** I. This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy? 7 Very Unprepared Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Highly Unprepared Prepared Prepared Unprepared FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team? 6 5 Very Inflexible Somewhat Somewhat Highly Neutral Flexible Inflexible Inflexible Flexible Flexible OUTCOME OF SESSION PAGEATS TO DESTRUCT GET A LOTY MADE DESTRUCTION IN Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals? 5 7 6 Goals somewhat Goals served Goals served Goals not served Goals not served Neutral not served somewhat very well at all IV. **TEAMWORK** How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup? 7 Totally lacking Lacking teamwork Excellent Somewhat good Somewhat lacking in Neutral in teamwork teamwork Teamwork

NOTE: For a single-person team, average criteria I, II, III, V, VI, and VII and enter that result (to the nearest whole number) as the teamwork rating.

This scale Did the w	focuses on we	IP BETWEEN TH ord choice, attitude anage its relationsh	and tone	and implied an	d explicit com	
7	6	5 maid thail	4	[ ] 3	Destruction:	
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Manage Somewhat Well	ed Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well
Criteria V analysis.	/Land VII sh	ould be completed	after bo	th teams have c	ompleted thei	r self-
Students v following (1) "In ref you do the	questions: lecting on the same and wh	SIS 10-minute period be entire negotiation, at would you do dis strategy work in rel	if you fac fferently?	ed a similar situa		
		-analysis during the learned from today			quately underst	tood the
7	6	5	4	3	$\binom{2}{2}$	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand learn	or Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well
Based on standards did the tea	of the legal pr m invent self-	G ETHICS on, do you believe ofession? For example of the serving material factors CAL STANDARDS	nple, 1) d cts? etc. S	id the team misr	epresent mater one:	rial facts? 2)
that, in yo	ur judgment, t	OLATED ETHICA he team should be one ES, DISQUALIFY	disqualifi		petition? Circle	e one:
Please exp	olain in detail:	be mos elemin figurames			Godis not served	
					MYORK	AT M
bag wille	aring responsi	har as a team, in sh	lag of opic	laow ni atutaitos		
					erinal backup?	IN METHOLOGY

The Evaluation-Criteria Lorms will be collected by the competition administrator <u>PRIOR</u> to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

nunications.		TION CRITE				V RELA
Judge's Nam	e: Vand	well Cel	h#: dtiw q	Date: <u>7</u> /	/22 Room #	and the way
Team Letter	Designation	A-10	p	Client Name: _	NILLE	ek yarvorad
Negotiation (Please circle		ition level—Regi	ional or No	ational / and ma	rk the round ob	served)
	Round #1	Rou	ınd #2	Final:	<u>/</u>	
Criteria I-V. are preparit		ompleted follow lf-analysis:	ing the er	id of the negoti	TANAL VERSE	
This scale ass tactics reason	sesses wheth ably design	PLANNING her the team was a ed to the situation is performance ar	n set out in	ith the facts and the fact pattern		strategy and
7	6	5	4	Yabol men cam	(2)	nadenegen
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared
This scale ass whether their work effective	sesses wheth strategy and rely in the co	N DEVIATING ter the negotiator d tactics seemed ontext of the actual formation or to u	s seemed r scripted or al negotian	responsive to the r otherwise pre-ption. Was this to	negotiation as planned in a wa eam able to ada	it unfolded o y that did no
7	6	10 610113 Dits 1051 5	4	oet lanoleen yn 3	(2)	Great add page
Very MANAGIAN Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Plexible	Highly Flexible
Based on wh		SESSION ved in the negotice gardless of whet				
7	6	JORIG TOMOGLO	4	$\sqrt{3}$	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not serve	d Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well
		egotiators in wor	king toget	her as a team, in	sharing respon	sibility, and
7	6	5	4	3	(2)	1
Totally lacking La in teamwork	cking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork
NOTE: For a s	ingle-person te	eam, average criteri	a I, II, III, V,	VI, and VII and en	ter that result (to t	he nearest

whole number) as the teamwork rating.

Did the w		ord choice, attitude nanage its relations st interests?		A TOTAL CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY	AND THE RESERVE OF THE PARTY OF	
7	6	Some Name 5	4 -	0/3-4	100i2agiasC	$\binom{1}{1}$
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well
Criteria <sup>y</sup> analysis.	VI and VII sh	ould,be completed	Lafter bo	th teams have co	mpleted the	ir self-
Students v following (1) "In ref you do the	questions: lecting on the same and wh	SIS 10-minute period lentire negotiation, at would you do distrategy work in re	if you fac	ed a similar situat	ion tomorrov	
		-analysis during th I learned from toda	OR ALCOHOLOGY BY THE PLANT AND A	经重要用证据 医动物性性神经炎 医肝囊切迹 医甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基甲基	nately unders	tood the
7	6	5	4	3	(2)	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand learn	or Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well
Based on standards did the tea	of the legal prum invent self-	G ETHICS ion, do you believe rofession? For exa serving material fa	mple, 1) ducts? etc. S	lid the team misre	present mate ne:	rial facts? 2)
that, in yo	ur judgment, t	IOLATED ETHIC. the team should be ES, DISQUALIFY	disqualifi	ed from the compe	etition? Circl	e one:
				water and the same of the same		
Please exp	olain in detail:	hearte services		bolistering Steel) bostes oon	arres domalicaci	bliving for slow(i) lift(ic

The Lyaluation Criteria Lorins wilbbe collected by the competition administrator PRIOR to the

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM-JUDGING SCALES**

(Each judge should receive four copies of the Evaluation Criteria Form—Judging Scales.)

	Designation:	A-10	- b.	Client Name:	YRCE	OT SHIADIR
Negotiation (Please circ		ition level—Regi	onal or No	ational / and mari	the round obs	served)
	Round #1	Rou	nd #2	Final: 🔑		
				77 1 1	F AMALYSIS	
	should be educed for the sel		ing the er	d of the negotia	tion and while	the teams
This scale as tactics reaso	ssesses wheth nably designe		set out in	ith the facts and lather the fact pattern. rent strategy?		
7	6	5	4	3	(2)	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepare
II. FLE				LANS OR ADA		
II. FLE This scale as whether the work effecti	ssesses whether ir strategy and vely in the co	er the negotiators I tactics seemed s ntext of the actu	s seemed r scripted or al negotian	PLANS OR ADA esponsive to the re- otherwise pre-plation. Was this tea moves by the opp	negotiation as i anned in a way ım able to adap	t unfolded
II. FLE This scale as whether the work effecti	ssesses whether ir strategy and vely in the co	er the negotiators I tactics seemed s ntext of the actu	s seemed r scripted or al negotian	esponsive to the responsive to the responsive pre-place tion. Was this teat	negotiation as i anned in a way ım able to adap	t unfolded
II. FLE This scale as whether thei work effecti to for examp 7 Very	ssesses whether ir strategy and vely in the co	er the negotiators I tactics seemed s ntext of the actual formation or to us	s seemed r scripted or al negotian nforeseen	esponsive to the responsive to the responsive pre-place tion. Was this teat	negotiation as i anned in a way am able to adap posing team?	t unfolded t that did n t its strates 1 Highly
II. FLE This scale as whether thei work effecti to for examp 7 Very Inflexible III. OUT Based on wi	ssesses whether strategy and vely in the coole, to new information of the coole of the coole of the coole of the coole of the session, respectively.	er the negotiators I tactics seemed s Intext of the actual Cormation or to us  Somewhat Inflexible  SESSION Treed in the negotial Grandless of whet	s seemed rescripted or al negotian inforeseen  4  Neutral  Attion and the agreer	cotherwise pre-plation. Was this teamoves by the opp  3 Somewhat Flexible  he self-analysis, the nent was reached.	negotiation as i anned in a way om able to adap posing team?  2  Flexible  o what extent of a serve the clier	t unfolded y that did n at its strates 1 Highly Flexible
II. FLE This scale as whether thei work effecti to for examp 7 Very Inflexible III. OUT Based on wl	ssesses whether strategy and vely in the coole, to new inf  6 Inflexible  FCOME OF Strategy and the coole in the coole, to new inflexible	er the negotiators I tactics seemed s Intext of the actual Cormation or to us  Somewhat Inflexible  SESSION  Yed in the negotial gardless of whet	s seemed rescripted or al negotian inforeseen  4  Neutral  Attion and the agreer	cotherwise pre-plation. Was this teamoves by the opp  3 Somewhat Flexible  he self-analysis, t	negotiation as i anned in a way om able to adap posing team?  2  Flexible  o what extent of a serve the clier	t unfolded y that did n at its strates 1 Highly Flexible
II. FLE This scale as whether the work effecti to for examp 7 Very Inflexible III. OUT Based on who outcome of 7 Goals not served	ssesses whether strategy and vely in the coole, to new information of the coole of	er the negotiators I tactics seemed s Intext of the actual formation or to us  Somewhat Inflexible  SESSION The did the negotial gardless of whet	s seemed rescripted or all negotiat inforeseen  4  Neutral  Attion and the agreer	cotherwise pre-plation. Was this teamoves by the opp  3 Somewhat Flexible  he self-analysis, the nent was reached.	negotiation as i anned in a way om able to adap posing team?  2  Flexible  o what extent of a serve the clier	t unfolded y that did n at its strates 1 Highly Flexible
II. FLE This scale as whether the work effecti to for examp 7 Very Inflexible III. OUT Based on whoutcome of 7 Goals not served at all IV. TEA How effective	ssesses whether strategy and vely in the coole, to new information of the coole of the session, reference of the session, reference of the session, reference of the session of the sessio	er the negotiators I tactics seemed s Intext of the actual Cormation or to us  Somewhat Inflexible  SESSION  Yed in the negotian gardless of whet  Goals somewhat not served  egotiators in work	s seemed rescripted or al negotian inforeseen 4 Neutral stion and ther agreer 4 Neutral	esponsive to the reconstruction. Was this teamoves by the opposition of the self-analysis, the self-analysis	negotiation as i anned in a way mable to adaptosing team?  2 Flexible  o what extent of serve the clien  Coals served well	t unfolded y that did n t its strates  1 Highly Flexible did the nt's goals?  1 Goals served very well
II. FLE This scale as whether the work effecti to for examp 7 Very Inflexible III. OUT Based on whoutcome of 7 Goals not served at all IV. TEA How effective	ssesses whether strategy and vely in the coole, to new information of the session, results of the session of the s	er the negotiators I tactics seemed s Intext of the actual Cormation or to us  Somewhat Inflexible  SESSION  Yed in the negotian gardless of whet  Goals somewhat not served  egotiators in work	s seemed rescripted or al negotian inforeseen 4 Neutral stion and ther agreer 4 Neutral	esponsive to the reconstruction. Was this teamoves by the opposition of the self-analysis, the self-analysis of the self-analysis, the self-analys	negotiation as i anned in a way mable to adaptosing team?  2 Flexible  o what extent of serve the clien  Coals served well	t unfolded y that did n t its strates  1 Highly Flexible did the nt's goals?  1 Goals served very well

YES, DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

The Lyabiation Criteria Lorins will be collected by the competition religious ration PRIOR to the pudges providing level back to the kist rivo teams.

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Totally lacking Lacking teamwork in teamwork

ttachment B	357 A T TT A 177	ON CDITTE	DIA FOD	M HIDON	CECALES	2
1				M—JUDGIN on Criteria Form—Judg		V. REL
munications.	Call	na beilgmi ba	В.,	ab	cuses on wor	a.
Judge's Name	: 5/1174	Cel	#	Date: 4/2	2 Room #:	CTIM
Team Letter I	Designation:	A-10	Cl	ient Name:	JRCE	-
Negotiation j (Please circle	udged: the competition	on level—Regi	onal or Natio	onal / and mark	the round ob	served)
	Round #1 _	Rou	nd #2	Final:	in the first	
Criteria I-V	should be con	ipleted follow	ing the end	of the negotiati	on and while	e the teams
ATTACA NOT THE TANK	g for∍thë self-a	ANG ROLLING D S	Polymon 3051	ob upv bluow i	other has seen	ea off of one
This scale ass tactics reason	otiation Plesses whether ably designed ging from its p	the team was to the situation	set out in th	the facts and la e fact pattern. I	w and had a s	strategy and
7	6	5	4	3	2	
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared
This scale ass whether their work effective	esses whether strategy and to ely in the cont	the negotiator actics seemed ext of the actu	s seemed resp scripted or or al negotiation	ponsive to the natherwise pre-plan. Was this team	egotiation as inned in a wa n able to ada	it unfolded on the state of the
7	6	5	4	3	(2)	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible
Based on wha	COME OF SE at you observed ne session, rega	d in the negoti	ation and the	self-analysis, to nt was reached,	what extent serve the clie	did the
7	6	214 TOM 00.0	4	3	(2)	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well
		otiators in wor	king togethe	r as a team, in s	haring respon	sibility, and

NOTE: For a single-person team, average criteria I, II, III, V, VI, and VII and enter that result (to the nearest whole number) as the teamwork rating.

Neutral

Somewhat lacking in teamwork

Somewhat good teamwork

Excellent

Teamwork

Very Good Teamwork

	3,140,141,411,411,411,411	IP BETWEEN Tord choice		AND AND THE PARTY OF A	wagowey aboth LES	iastiana
		nanage its relations	THE RESERVE AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF THE		and all the first the second control of the control	
	its client's bes	The state of the s				
7	6 30 3	lient Name <sub>2</sub> AJ	04	31-1	$\binom{2}{2}$	Team Letter I
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Manage Somewhat Well	ed Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well
Criteria V analysis.	/Land VII sh	ould be complete	d after bo	th teams have e	ompleted thei	ir self-
Students v following (1) "In ref you do the	questions: lecting on the same and wh	SIS 10-minute period entire negotiation at would you do d strategy work in re	, if you fac lifferently?	ed a similar situa	ation tomorrov	
Based on t	the team's self	-analysis during th l learned from toda	ne review s	session, how adec	quately underst	tood the
7	6	5	(4)	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand learn	or Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well
VII. NE	EGOTIATIN	G ETHICS	ecented to	r une negetiators	sesies whethe	Titis scale as
standards	of the legal pr	on, do you believe ofession? For exa serving material fa	imple, 1) d	lid the team misr	epresent mater	
TEAM OF	SERVED ETHI	CAL STANDARDS	orsalassi	TEAM VIOLATED	ETHICAL STA	NDARDS
that, in you	ur judgment, t	OLATED ETHIC he team should be	disqualifi	ed from the comp	etition? Circle	e one:
Selong at	crye the effent Y. * )	ES, DISQUALIFY		NO, DO NOT DISQ		ostoome of t
Please exp	lain in detail:	Conse slace		Classic served red served	Cigals you served	Books not served
bra willid	i Ragaret entre	de ni samat a aa aa	ritsaat oni	inova ja sveri	MWORK or no ac	
		TE	ALL STREET	NS-2005 T 1 10 1 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Contant leum	- T - 120 -
	1.2			174		

The Latelliartion Criteria Lorms will be collected by the competition administrator PRIOR to the