RANKING SHEET
(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.) This sheet should be completed only after observing all four teams.

Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)	
Regional Competition Round #1 Round #2 Final:	
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams $A5$ & $B5$ and between $A15$ & $B15$, I rank the teams I observed as follows:	
(Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designations.)	
1 = Most effective team: A - 15	
2 = Next most effective team: $A - 5$	
3 = Third most effective team: $8-5$	
4 = Least effective team: $B - 15$	
Suggested criteria:	
 Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather the on whether the teams reach agreement. 	
.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:	
Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)	
Satisfies the interests of	
the client – very well	
the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)	
third parties – tolerably (so they won't disrupt the agreement)	
 Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for agreements outside scope of authority 	
 Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options 	
Is legitimate – no one feels "taken"	
Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational	
 Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and 	
 Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further. 	
 See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an agreement 	

Please note that the competition administrator will collect the Ranking Sheets and Evaluation Criteria Forms before judges provide feedback to the last two teams. They will verify that judges have completed all categories before leaving the

agreement

RANKING SHEET

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

This sheet should be resolved, after observing all four features.
Judge's Name: Ralente Cell# Date: 9/2/13 Room #: 31 ()
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)
Regional Competition Round #1 Final:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams AB&BB and between A17 & B17, I rank the teams I observed as follows:
(Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designations.)
1 = Most effective team: <u>AB</u>
2 = Next most effective team: A /7
3 = Third most effective team: <u>B8</u>
4 = Least effective team:
Suggested criteria:
 Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather than on whether the teams reach agreement.
.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:
• Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)
Satisfies the interests of
the client – very well the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)
third parties – tolerably (so they won't disrupt the agreement)
 Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for agreements outside scope of authority
Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options
 Is legitimate – no one feels "taken"
Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
• Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the

agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

	This sheet should be completed only after observing all four teams.
	Judge's Name: John Rees Cell #: Date: 09-21-13 Room #: 3/6
	Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)
	Regional Competition Round #1 Round #2 Final:
13	Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams $A-8$ & $B-8$ and between $B-17$ & $A-17$. I rank the teams I observed as follows:
	(Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designations.)
	1 = Most effective team: $8 - 1$
	2 = Next most effective team:
	3 = Third most effective team: $8-8$
	4 = Least effective team: A - 17
	 Suggested criteria: Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather than on whether the teams reach agreement.
	 A good negotiation outcome is often one that: Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party) Satisfies the interests of

the client - very well

the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)

- Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for agreements outside scope of authority
- Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options
- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the
 agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an
 agreement

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

This sheet should be completed only after observing all four teams.
Judge's Name: G. Walters Cell #. Cell #. Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 128
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)
Regional Competition Round #1 Round #2 Final:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams A9 & B9 and between A10 & B10, I rank the teams I observed as follows: (Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designations.) 1 = Most effective team: A10 2 = Next most effective team: A1 4 = Least effective team: B9

Suggested criteria:

• Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather than on whether the teams reach agreement.

.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:

- Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)
- Satisfies the interests of

the client - very well

the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)

- Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for agreements outside scope of authority
- Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options
- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- · Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an agreement

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

This sheet should be completed only after observing all four teams.
Judge's Name: Bruner Cell #
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National and mark the round observed.)
Regional Competition Round #1 Round #2 Final:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams A9 & b9 and between A10 & b10, I rank the teams I observed as follows:
(Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designations.)
1 = Most effective team: $A - 9$
2 = Next most effective team: \mathbb{E}^{-9}
3 = Third most effective team: $A - 10$
4 = Least effective team: B = 10
Suggested criteria: Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be
no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather that on whether the teams reach agreement.
.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:
 Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)
Satisfies the interests of
the client – very well
the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through) third parties – tolerably (so they won't disrupt the agreement)

· Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options

agreements outside scope of authority

- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- · Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the
 agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an
 agreement

Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

This sheet should be completed only after observing all four teams.

Judge's Name: A. FLOWS Cell # Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 178
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)
Regional Competition Round #1 Round #2 Final:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams A.9 & B.9 and between A.10& B.70, I rank the teams I observed as follows:
(Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designations.)
1 = Most effective team:
2 = Next most effective team: B:10
3 = Third most effective team:
4 = Least effective team:
 Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather than on whether the teams reach agreement.
.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:
 Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)
• Satisfies the interests of
the client – very well
the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through) third parties – tolerably (so they won't disrupt the agreement)
Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for agreements outside scope of authority
• Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options
• Is legitimate – no one feels "taken"
Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and Pagulta in an anhanced working relationship or an agreement to pagetists further.
 Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further. See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the
agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an agreement

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

	This sheet should be o	completed only after o	bserving all fou	r teams.
Judge's Name: Caire	Zovko Cell#	Date:	9/21	Room #: 23
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the compet				
Regional Competition	Round #1	Round #2	Final:	
(Please fill in all blanks at 1 = Most e	te teams I observed a above and immediate effective team:	s follows: ely below with the te		s A & B and between ignations.)
	most effective team: _most effective team:			
$4 = \text{Least } \epsilon$	effective team:	3-14		
Suggested criteria:				

 Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather than on whether the teams reach agreement.

.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:

- Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)
- Satisfies the interests of

the client - very well

the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)

- Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for agreements outside scope of authority
- Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options
- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an agreement

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

This sheet should be completed only after observing all four teams.	
Judge's Name: Michael Janao Cell # Date: 9/21/2013 Room #: 23/	
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)	
Regional Competition Round #1 Pinal: Final:	
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams ## & and between ## and between ## and between ## and between ## &	
(Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designations.)	
1 = Most effective team:	
2 = Next most effective team: A 1 4	
3 = Third most effective team: $\cancel{B} + \cancel{Y}$	
4 = Least effective team:	

Suggested criteria:

• Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather than on whether the teams reach agreement.

.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:

- Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)
- · Satisfies the interests of

the client – very well

the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)

- Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for agreements outside scope of authority
- Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options
- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an agreement

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

This sheet should be completed only after observing all four tea	ns.
Judge's Name: BCAK Cell # Cell # Record Reco	om #:
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round ob	served.)
Regional Competition Round #1 Round #2 Final:	
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams 4	∧ between
(Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designation	tions.)
1 = Most effective team:	
2 = Next most effective team:	
3 = Third most effective team: 7/4	
4 = Least effective team:	
Suggested criteria:	
 Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the ne on whether the teams reach agreement. 	
.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:	
Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)	
Satisfies the interests of	
the client – very well	
the other side - acceptably (enough for them to agree and fol	등 프로마 (1) 시작님님의 모아(1) (프라마스)
third parties – tolerably (so they won't disrupt the agreement)	
 Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreer agreements outside scope of authority 	nent or seek approval for
 Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options 	
Is legitimate – no one feels "taken"	
 Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational 	
 Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and 	
 Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate for 	rther.
 See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating agreement 	

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

This sheet should be completed only after observing all four teams.
Judge's Name: ERIC GANCI Cell#: Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 229
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)
Regional Competition Round #1 Round #2 Final:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams <u>A-7</u> & <u>BV</u> and between <u>A-16</u> & <u>B-16</u> , I rank the teams I observed as follows:
(Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designations.)
1 = Most effective team: $8 \sim 16$
2 = Next most effective team: A-16
3 = Third most effective team: $\frac{4}{8}$
4 = Least effective team: A-7
Suggested criteria: Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather that are whether the teams reach agreement.

on whether the teams reach agreement.

.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:

- Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)
- Satisfies the interests of

the client - very well

the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)

- Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for agreements outside scope of authority
- Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options
- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an agreement

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

This sheet should be completed only after observing	all four teams.
Judge's Name: Konze Cell #: Date: 09/2	1/13 Room #: 229
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark th	ne round observed.)
Regional Competition Round #1 Round #2 Fin	nal:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between A 16 & B 16, I rank the teams I observed as follows:	teams <u>A7 & B7</u> and between
(Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team lette	er designations.)
1 = Most effective team: 8 - 7	
2 = Next most effective team: A = 3	
The Control of the Co	
3 = Third most effective team: <u>B-16</u>	
4 = Least effective team:A - \ 6	
 Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning on whether the teams reach agreement. 	and a strategic field of the control
A good negotiation outcome is often one that:	
• Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with	this party)
Satisfies the interests of the client – very well	
the other side – acceptably (enough for them to ago	ree and follow through)
third parties - tolerably (so they won't disrupt the	agreement)
 Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to sha agreements outside scope of authority 	ape agreement or seek approval for
 Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options 	
 Is legitimate – no one feels "taken" 	
 Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational 	
 Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and 	
Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to n	
 See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the in- agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of agreement 	

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

This sheet should be completed only after observing all four teams.

Judge's Name: 13 MATANE Cell # Date: 9(1013 Room #: 217
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)
Regional Competition Round #1 Round #2 Final:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams $\frac{1-1}{2}$ & $\frac{1-1}{2}$ and between $\frac{1-1}{2}$ & $\frac{1-1}{2}$. I rank the teams I observed as follows:
(Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designations.)
1 = Most effective team: A - 4
2 = Next most effective team: 8-4
3 = Third most effective team: A-18
4 = Least effective team: B-18
Suggested criteria:
 Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather than on whether the teams reach agreement.
.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:
 Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party) Satisfies the interests of

 Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for agreements outside scope of authority

third parties - tolerably (so they won't disrupt the agreement)

the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)

Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options

the client – very well

- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the
 agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an
 agreement

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

This sheet should be completed only after observing all four teams.
Judge's Name: COLOS A Cell #: Date: 9/21 Room #: 217
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)
Regional Competition Round #1 Round #2Final:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams A4 & B4 and between A18 & B18, I rank the teams I observed as follows:
(Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designations.)
1 = Most effective team:
2 = Next most effective team: A=18
3 = Third most effective team: B4
4 = Least effective team: B = 18
Suggested criteria:
 Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather than on whether the teams reach agreement.
A 1 41-41 1 04 41-4

.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:

- Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)
- Satisfies the interests of

the client - very well

the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)

- Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for agreements outside scope of authority
- Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options
- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an agreement

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

This sheet should be completed only after observing all four teams.
Judge's Name: Lacy TodeScell #: Date: Room #: 217
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level_Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)
Regional Competition Round #1 Round #2 Final:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams $B 4 & A 4$ and between $B 8 & A - 8$, I rank the teams I observed as follows:
(Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designations.)
1 = Most effective team:
2 = Next most effective team: A
3 = Third most effective team:
4 = Least effective team:

Suggested criteria:

Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be
no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather than
on whether the teams reach agreement.

.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:

- Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)
- Satisfies the interests of

the client - very well

the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)

- Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for agreements outside scope of authority
- Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options
- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- · Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the
 agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an
 agreement

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

Judge's Name: Frank I	Cen	Jaic	. 41-	_ Koom #
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the compe	tition level—Regio	onal or National, and	l mark the rou	nd observed.)
Regional Competition	Round #1	Round #2	Final:	
Based on my personal or 4-12 & 17-12, I rank the	oinion, having obse ne teams I observed	erved the negotiation d as follows:	between team	$\frac{4-3}{8}$ & $\frac{8-3}{8}$ and between
Based on my personal op 4-12 & B-12, I rank the	oinion, having obse ne teams I observed	erved the negotiation d as follows:	between team	$\frac{4-3}{8}$ & $\frac{8-3}{8}$ and between
(Please fill in all blanks	ne teams I observed above and immedia	d as follows: ately below with the i		
(Please fill in all blanks of a Most	above and immedia effective team:	d as follows: ately below with the the state of the stat		
(Please fill in all blanks of $1 = Most$ $2 = Next = Most$	above and immedia effective team:	d as follows: ately below with the interpretation in the second		
(Please fill in all blanks of $1 = Most$ $2 = Next = Most$	above and immedia effective team:	d as follows: ately below with the interpretation in the second		

Suggested criteria:

• Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather than on whether the teams reach agreement.

.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:

- Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)
- Satisfies the interests of

the client - very well

the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)

- Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for agreements outside scope of authority
- Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options
- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the
 agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an
 agreement

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

This sheet should be completed only after observing all four teams.
Judge's Name: Charles G. Batch Cell #: Date: 921 Room #: 216
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)
Regional Competition Round #1 Final:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams $BIZ & AIZ$ and between $A-3 & D-3$, I rank the teams I observed as follows: (Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designations.) 1 = Most effective team: AIZ
$2 = \text{Next most effective team: } \underline{\mathcal{A}} = 12$
3 = Third most effective team: $A - 3$
4 = Least effective team:
Suggested criteria:

Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather than on whether the teams reach agreement.

.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:

- Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)
- Satisfies the interests of

the client - very well

the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)

- Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for agreements outside scope of authority
- Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options
- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an agreement

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

This sheet should be completed only after observing all four teams.
Judge's Name: Lenger Well #: Date: 9/31/17 Room #: 216
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)
Regional Competition Round #1 Final:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams \$\frac{1}{2}\cdot \cdot \c
Suggested criteria:

Suggested criteria:

Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be
no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather than
on whether the teams reach agreement.

.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:

- Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)
- · Satisfies the interests of

the client - very well

the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)

- Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for agreements outside scope of authority
- Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options
- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- · Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the
 agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an
 agreement

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

This sheet should be completed only after observing all four teams.
Judge's Name: Brankon (lepoldus Cell #: Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 778
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)
Regional Competition Round #1 Round #2Final:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams AZ & BZ and between AI & BI ., I rank the teams I observed as follows:
(Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designations.) $1 = \text{Most effective team:} \underline{62}$
2 = Next most effective team: A11
3 = Third most effective team: $\beta - 17$
4 = Least effective team: AZ
 Suggested criteria: Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather than on whether the teams reach agreement.
 A good negotiation outcome is often one that: Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party) Satisfies the interests of
• Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options

- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an agreement

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

This sheet should be completed only setter observing an rour teams.
Judge's Name: Sono o Cell # Room #: 225
Negotiation indeeds
Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)
Regional Competition Round #1 Round #2 Final:
A 3 A A
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams $A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A$
(Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designations.)
1 = Most effective team: $B - 2$
2 = Next most effective team: $A - \lambda$
$3 = \text{Third most effective team: } \boxed{B - / }$
4 = Least effective team: A - II
Suggested criteria:
 Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather than on whether the teams reach agreement.
.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:
• Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)
• Societies the interests of

Satisfies the interests of

the client – very well

the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)

- Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for agreements outside scope of authority
- Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options
- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the
 agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an
 agreement

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.) Regional Competition Round #1 Round #2 Final: Rased on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams A 2 & B 2 and between
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.) Regional Competition Round #1 Final:
A 7 . B 2
Rased on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams 122 and between \$\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}

Suggested criteria:

• Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather than on whether the teams reach agreement.

.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:

- Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)
- Satisfies the interests of

the client – very well

the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)

- Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for agreements outside scope of authority
- Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options
- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the
 agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an
 agreement

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

Judge's Name: Mattur Officell Pate: 9/21/13 Room #: 227
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)
Regional Competition Round #1 Round #2 Final:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams <u>A</u> & <u>B</u> 6 and between <u>A</u> 13 & <u>R</u> 13, I rank the teams I observed as follows:
(Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designations.)
1 = Most effective team:
2 = Next most effective team: R13
3 = Third most effective team: A 6
4 = Least effective team: <u>B6</u>
 Suggested criteria: Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather than on whether the teams reach agreement.
.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:
 Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party) Satisfies the interests of
the client – very well

Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options

agreements outside scope of authority

- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the
 agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an
 agreement

the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)

Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

This sheet should be completed only after observing all four teams.
Judge's Name: Lean Christon Room #: 227
Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)
Regional Competition Round #1 Round #2Final:
Regional Competition Round #1 Round #2Final:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams $A - 6 & B - 6$ and between $A - 13 & B - 13$ I rank the teams I observed as follows:
(Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designations.)
1 = Most effective team: $A-13$
2 = Next most effective team: $B - 13$
3 = Third most effective team: $B - 6$
$4 = \text{Least effective team:} \underline{A - 6}$
Suggested criteria:
 Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather that on whether the teams reach agreement.
.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:
 Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)
Satisfies the interests of
the client – very well

- Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options

agreements outside scope of authority

- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- · Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the
 agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an
 agreement

the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)

Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for

	(Each judge	should receive one copy of	ranking sheet.)	
Till the state of	his sheet should be c	ompleted only after o	bserving all four teams	•
Judge's Name: Jushn	eim Cell	ate:	9/21/13 Room	m#:_22=
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition				erved.)
Regional Competition R	ound #1 X	Round #2	Final:	
Based on my personal opinio			between teams	_∧ between
(Please fill in all blanks abo	ve and immediate	ly below with the te	eam letter designatio	ns.)
1 = Most effe	ctive team: B	13		
2 = Next mos	ective team: <u>B</u>	A-13		
3 = Third mo	st effective team:	3-6		
4 = Least effe	ective team:	1-6		
Suggested criteria:				
Remember that partie	Judges should foc	cus on the teams' p		ne best outcome might be tiation process, rather than
.A good negotiation outcon	ne is often one th	at:		
 Is better than the best 			nt (with this party)	
 Satisfies the interests 				
	ent – very well	hlv. (amanah far 41-	us to some and fall-	4h
the ou	ner side – accepta	ory (enough for the	m to agree and follo	w uirougn)

- Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for agreements outside scope of authority
- Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options
- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an agreement

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

	only after observing all four teams.
Judge's Name: Rebeca Menzucell #	_Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 318
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National Competition Level—Regional Competition Level—Region Lev	onal, and mark the round observed.)
Regional Competition Round #1 Roun	d #2Final:
	A5 B5
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the ne	
(Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below	with the team letter designations.)
1 = Most effective team: A 15	
2 = Next most effective team:	B-15
3 = Third most effective team:	-5
4 = Least effective team:	5
Suggested criteria:	
	ment and in some situations the best outcome might be

Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be
no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather than
on whether the teams reach agreement.

.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:

- Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)
- · Satisfies the interests of

the client - very well

the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)

- Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for agreements outside scope of authority
- Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options
- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- · Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the
 agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an
 agreement

(Each judge should receive one copy of ranking sheet.)

This sheet should be completed only after observing all four teams.
Judge's Name: Parker Smith Cell #: Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 318
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)
Regional Competition Round #1 Round #2 Final:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams A S & S and between A 15 & 135, I rank the teams I observed as follows: (Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designations.)
1 = Most effective team: $8-5$
2 = Next most effective team: B-15
3 = Third most effective team: $A-5$
4 = Least effective team: A-15
Suggested criteria:

• Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather than on whether the teams reach agreement.

.A good negotiation outcome is often one that:

- Is better than the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)
- Satisfies the interests of

the client - very well

the other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)

third parties – tolerably (so they won't disrupt the agreement)

- Respects clients instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for agreements outside scope of authority
- Adopts a solution that is the best of all available options
- Is legitimate no one feels "taken"
- Involves commitments that are clear, realistic, and operational
- Involves communication that is efficient and well understood, and
- Results in an enhanced working relationship or an agreement to negotiate further.
 - See instructions on individual rounds for an analysis of the instructions that the teams have, the agreements that are possible, and what to look for in terms of evaluating the provisions of an agreement

Please note that the competition administrator will collect the Ranking Sheets and Evaluation Criteria Forms before judges provide feedback to the last two teams. They will verify that judges have completed all categories before leaving the