

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

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

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

Judge's Name: DAVID Tiffery Cell # Date: 9-21 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 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: B-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 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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

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

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

Judge's Name: R Galante Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/24/13 Room #: 316

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 A8 & B8 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: A8
2 = Next most effective team: B17
3 = Third most effective team: B8
4 = Least effective team: A17

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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

(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 #: [REDACTED] Date: 09-21-13 Room #: 316

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: B-17
2 = Next most effective team: A-8
3 = Third most effective team: B-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)
 - 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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

(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 #: [REDACTED] 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: B10
3 = Third most effective team: A9
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)
 - 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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

(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 # [REDACTED] 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: A-9
2 = Next most effective team: B-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 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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

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

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

Judge's Name: A. Flores Cell # [REDACTED] 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 A.9 & B.9 and between A.10 & B.10, 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: B.10
3 = Third most effective team: A.10
4 = Least effective team: B.9

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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

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

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

Judge's Name: Claire Zovko Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/21 Room #: 231

Negotiation judged:

(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)

Regional Competition Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams A1 & B1 and between A14 & B14, 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-1
2 = Next most effective team: B-1
3 = Third most effective team: A-14
4 = Least effective team: B-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)
 - 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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

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

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

Judge's Name: Michael Tanar Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/24/2013 Room #: 231

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-1 & B-1 and between A-14 & B-14 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-1
2 = Next most effective team: A-14
3 = Third most effective team: B-14
4 = Least effective team: B-1

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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

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

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

Judge's Name: C. BURK Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/24/13 Room #: 231

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 A1 & B1 and between A14 & B14, 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: A1
2 = Next most effective team: B1
3 = Third most effective team: A14
4 = Least effective team: B14

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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

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

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

Judge's Name: ERIC GARCIA Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/24/13 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 A-7 & B-7 and between A-6 & B-6, 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: B-6

2 = Next most effective team: A-6

3 = Third most effective team: A-7 B-7

4 = Least effective team: B-7 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 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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

(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 #: [REDACTED] Date: 09/21/13 Room #: 229

Negotiation judged:

(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)

Regional Competition Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams A7 & B7 and between A16 & B16, 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: B-7
2 = Next most effective team: A-7
3 = Third most effective team: B-16
4 = Least effective team: A-16

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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

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

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

Judge's Name: LAS MARIAN Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/20/13 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-18 & A-18, 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: B-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
 - 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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

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

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

Judge's Name: COLOSIA Cell #: [REDACTED] 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 #2 _____ Final: _____

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: A4
2 = Next most effective team: A-18
3 = Third most effective team: B-4
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
 - 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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

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

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

Judge's Name: Lacy Rhodes Cell #: 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 B4 & A4 and between B18 & A18, 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: A18
2 = Next most effective team: A4
3 = Third most effective team: B4
4 = Least effective team: B18

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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

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

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

Judge's Name: Frank V. Drummond Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 216

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-3 & B-3 and between A-12 & B-12, 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-3
2 = Next most effective team: B-3
3 = Third most effective team: B-12
4 = Least effective team: A-12

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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

(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 #: [REDACTED] Date: 7/21 Room #: 216

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 B12 & A12 and between A-3 & B-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: A B-12

2 = Next most effective team: A-12 A-12

3 = Third most effective team: A-3

4 = Least effective team: ~~B-3~~ B-3

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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

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

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

Judge's Name: Lenden Webb Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 216

Negotiation judged:

(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)

Regional Competition Round #1 2 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams A3 & B3 and between A12 & B12, 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: B12
2 = Next most effective team: A3
3 = Third most effective team: B3
4 = Least effective team: A12

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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

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

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

Judge's Name: Bronken Leopoldus Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 225

Negotiation judged:

(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)

Regional Competition Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams AZ & BZ and between A1 & B1, 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: BZ
2 = Next most effective team: A11
3 = Third most effective team: B-11
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
 - 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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

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

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

Judge's Name: Sene/aro Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/21 Room #: 225

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 A2 & B2 and between A1 & B1, 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: B-2
2 = Next most effective team: A-2
3 = Third most effective team: B-11
4 = Least effective team: A-11

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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

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

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

Judge's Name: Kim Nakamaru Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21 Room #: 225

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 A2 & B2 and between A1 & B1, 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-1
2 = Next most effective team: B-2
3 = Third most effective team: A-2
4 = Least effective team: B-1

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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

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

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

Judge's Name: Matthew Ober Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 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 A6 & B6 and between A13 & B13, 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: A13
2 = Next most effective team: B13
3 = Third most effective team: A6
4 = Least effective team: B6

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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

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

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

Judge's Name: Leah Christensen Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: Sat. a.m. Room #: 227

Negotiation judged:

(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)

Regional Competition Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

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 = Least effective team: 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 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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

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

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

Judge's Name: Justin Heim Cell: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 227

Negotiation judged:

(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)

Regional Competition Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams _____ & _____ and between _____ & _____, 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: B-13
2 = Next most effective team: A-13
3 = Third most effective team: B-6
4 = Least effective team: 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 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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

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

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

Judge's Name: Rebeca Valenzuela Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/24/13 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-15 & B-15 and between A-15 & B-15, 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: ~~B-15~~ B-15
3 = Third most effective team: B-15
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

Attachment A

RANKING SHEET

(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 #: [REDACTED] 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 AS & BS and between AIS & BIS, 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: B-S
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