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

This s	iéét should be complete	ed only after observing all fo	our teams.
Judge's Name: LAJ MATAN &	Cell #:	Date: 9/21/13	Room #: 217
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition le	,		
Regional Competition Roun	d #1 Rou	und #2 Final:	
Based on my personal opinion, l	aving observed the	negotiation between tean	ns $A-9$ & $B-1$ and between
(Please fill in all blanks above a	nd immediately belo	w with the team letter de	signations.)
1 = Most effectiv	e team: A-12		
2 = Next most ef	ective team: 13-	$ar{ar{f}}$	
	fective team: 3-		
4 = Least effective	e team: A - Q		
Suggested criteria:			
Remember that parties no	ges should focus on		ations, the best outcome might be the negotiation process, rather tha
.A good negotiation outcome is	often one that:		
 Is better than the best alternative 	rnative to a negotiar	ted agreement (with this	party)
• Satisfies the interests of			
	- very well	and for them to some a	nd fallow through)
		nough for them to agree a ey won't disrupt the agree	• /
•			agreement or seek approval for

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

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

This sheet should be completed only after observing all four teams.
Judge's Name: 20570 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 #2 Final:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams $A-9 & B-10$ and between $A-12 & B-7$. 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 9 3 = Third most effective team:
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 no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather to 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: Lacy Todes 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 Rinal:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams $\frac{19}{2}$ & $\frac{10}{2}$ and between $\frac{10}{2}$ 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: B10
2 = Next most effective team:
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 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)

- 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: John Rees Cell #: Date: 092113 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 $\frac{B-15}{2}$ & $\frac{A-\frac{1}{2}}{2}$ and between $\frac{B-4}{2}$. 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: $\beta - \psi$
2 = Next most effective team:
3 = Third most effective team: $B - 15$
4 = Least effective team: A - 4
 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.)

			observing all four teams	
Judge's Name:	linte Cell	[₹] ² Dat	e: <u>4/21/13</u> Roor	n#: 310
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the compet	tition level—Regio	onal or National, an	d mark the round obse	rved.)
Regional Competition	Round #1	Round #2	Final:	
Based on my personal op B4& A15, I rank th	inion, having obse te teams I observed	erved the negotiation	n between teams <u>AU</u>	& <u>BIS</u> and between
(Please fill in all blanks o	above and immedi	ately below with the	team letter designatio	ns.)
$1 = Most \epsilon$	effective team: 🔟	BOULDE INAUTHURIN P)-4	
2 = Next r	nost effective tean	u: BOOOSTONBYINA	A-15	
3 = Third	most effective tear	m: B-15		
4 = Least	effective team: <u>f</u>	4-4		
Suggested criteria:				
				ne best outcome might be
	ll. Judges should ams reach agreem		planning and the nego	tiation process, rather than
.A good negotiation out	come is often one	that:		
		a negotiated agreem	ent (with this party)	
 Satisfies the interest 				
	client – very well		4 4 6-11-	41
			nem to agree and follor srupt the agreement)	w uitougn)
				nt or seek approval for

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

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

Judge's Name: Matt Olyko Cell # : 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 A2 & B17 and between A1\ & B-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 11	
2 = Next most effective team: 817	
3 = Third most effective team: λ	
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 tha	ın
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.)

32194	This sheet should be completed only after observing all four teams.
Judge's	Name: Leuh Christengen Cell #: ate: SAT. PM Room #: 227
Negoti	ation judged:
(Please	circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)
Region	ation judged: circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.) al Competition Round #1 Round #2 Final: bin my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams & Michael Anterical fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designations.) 1 = Most effective team: B - 17 USC Jessica fredict to Anterical Anterical Anterical Anterical
30	Siedvich 1 kmcci
10	Testica Michael Her
Banad	my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams∧ 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-11 USC Jessica fredit Antenucci
je.	1 = Most effective team: B-17 USC Jessica-fredict by Antenvecti 2 = Next most effective team: A-2 Hunter Simon
sad s	
A West	$3 = \text{Third most effective team: } \underline{B-8}$
1.1.10	4 = Least effective team: A - 11
A TIM	Hady T Ecast cricetive team.
Migges	ted 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 goo	d 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
	agreements outside soops 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

agreement

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: Joshn Herm Cell # 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 A2 & B17 and between H11 & B2, 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: BY
2 = Next most effective team: $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{I}$
3 = Third most effective team: BE
4 = Least effective team: All
 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)
 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.)

Judge's Name:end	1 1/4//	e completed only after obs	Room #:	
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the compet	tition level—Regio	nal or National, and m	eark the round observed.)	
Regional Competition	Round #1	Round #2	Final:	
			A8 6	31/
Based on my personal op	ie teams i observed	as follows:		and between
(Please fill in all blanks of	_	7.1	m letter designations.)	
	effective team:	01		
2 = Next r	nost effective team	n: <u>BJ</u>	35	
3 = Third	most effective team	n: 4/2	-414	
4 = Least	effective team:	A8		
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. Batel Cell #: Date: 9/2/ Room #: 7/6
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 $B-11 & A-8$ and between $A-17 & B-5$ 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: $B-1/$
2 = Next most effective team: $A - 8$
3 = Third most effective team:
$4 = \text{Least effective team:} \underline{A - 14}$
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: Frank V. I	OCUMNIND Cell # Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 216
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competi	ition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)
Regional Competition	Round #1 Final:
Based on my personal opi	nion, having observed the negotiation between teams $\frac{\lambda - 8}{8}$ & $\frac{\beta - 11}{8}$ and between teams I observed as follows:
(Please fill in all blanks a	bove and immediately below with the team letter designations.)
1 = Most e	ffective team:
2 = Next m	nost effective team: A-8
3 = Third n	nost effective team: <u>B-11</u>
4 = Least e	ffective team: A-14
Suggested criteria:	
 Remember that part no agreement at all 	rties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be l. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather than ms reach agreement.
.A good negotiation outc	ome is often one that:
 Is better than the b 	est alternative to a negotiated agreement (with this party)
 Satisfies the interest 	
	client – very well
	other side – acceptably (enough for them to agree and follow through)
	d parties – tolerably (so they won't disrupt the agreement) Its instructions and creatively uses them to shape agreement or seek approval for

• 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

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

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

Judge's Name: DAID TITTING Cell # Date: _	5-21 Room #: 318
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and m Regional Competition Round #1 Round #2	
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation be	tween teams A7 & 812 and between
(Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the tea	m letter designations.)
1 = Most effective team: $B - 12$	
2 = Next most effective team: $A - 17$	
3 = Third most effective team: β -2	
4 = Least effective team: $A - 7$	
Suggested criteria:	
 Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' plan 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

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: Reblet Valenzy #: Date: 911 Room #: 318
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)
Regional Competition Round #1Final:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams∧ 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: 5-12
2 = Next most effective team: B-2
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
 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 SmithCell # 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 Final:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams $A-7$ & $B-12$ and between $A-12$ & $B-2$, 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 - 7
2 = Next most effective team: <u>B-12</u>
3 = Third most effective team: $R - 2$
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: Brandon Legoldus Cell #: Date: 9/2/173 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 By & As and between by & 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>52</u>
2 = Next most effective team: $\triangle \ \bigcirc$
3 = Third most effective team: <u>A5</u>
4 = Least effective team: <u>B4</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

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.)

MARIE PORTONIA PROPERTY	The state of the s	THE RESIDENCE OF THE PROPERTY	bserving all four teams.	
Judge's Name:	im Nakamaryi	Date:	912 Room	#: <u>225</u>
Negotiation judge (Please circle the c	ed: competition level—Regiona	al or National and	mark the round observ	ved.)
Regional Competi	ition Round #1	Round/#2	Final:	
Based on my perso	onal opinion, having observed a	ved the negotiation bas follows:	petween team \$14	∧ between
(Please fill in all b	lanks above and immediate	ely below with the te	am letter designations	r.)
1 =	Most effective team: B-	-5		
2 =	Next most effective team:	B-14		
3 =	Third most effective team:	A-5		
4 =	Least effective team:	7-1b		

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: Sensiaro Cell Barrer Date: 9/2///3 Room #: 225
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 A5 & B14 and between H6&B3, 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: $A - S$
2 = Next most effective team: $\beta - 3$
3 = Third most effective team: $A - 16$
$4 = \text{Least effective team:} \boxed{B - 14}$
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)

- 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: A. FLORES Cell # Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 128
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National, and mark the round observed.)
Taglesian of James and Companies Comp
Regional Competition Round #1 Final:
Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams $\beta \cdot 1 \times 4 \cdot 1 = 100$ and between $\beta \cdot 1 \times 4 \cdot 1 = 100$ and between teams I observed as follows:
(Please fill in all blanks above and immediately below with the team letter designations.)
$1 = \text{Most effective team:} \frac{1}{1 + 1}$
1 = Most effective team:
3 = Third most effective team: 13 · 1
4 = Least effective team: A: 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)

- 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 s	hould be compl	leted only af	ter observing all f	our teams.
Judge's Name:	Bruner	_Cell #	ر	ate: <u>9/21/13</u>	Room #: 128
Negotiation judg (Please circle the	ed: competition level—	-Regional or	National,	and mark the ro	und observed.)
Regional Compe	tition Round #1	R	Round #2	Final:	
<u>D1</u> & #18,1	onal opinion, havin rank the teams I ob blanks above and in	oserved as fol	llows:		ms #BI& Al and between
,	Most effective tea			ie ieum ieiier ui	signations.)
	Next most effective		TANK ILINY		
3 =	Third most effecti	ve team:	B1		
4 =	Least effective tea	nn: <u>A</u>	18		
Suggested criteri		ot reach an ac	greement a	nd in some situ	ations the hest outcome might he

• 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

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

This sheet should be completed only after observing all four teams.
Judge's Name: Gordon Walters Cell # 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\&BIS and between A\8 & B 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 \
2 = Next most effective team: B18
3 = Third most effective team:
4 = Least effective team:A\8
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: Shark Cell# Pate: 9/2//3 Room #: 23/
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 43 & 6/6 and between 40 & 9, 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/D
2 = Next most effective team: 8/6
3 = Third most effective team: A3
4 = Least effective team: <u>Z9</u>
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.)

Market College Spice Sep	This sheet should be con	ompleted only after observing all four teams.
Judge's Name	MSCell #	Pate: 42/13 Room #: 231
Negotiation judged: (Please circle the compe	tition level—Regional	or National, and mark the round observed.)
Regional Competition	Round #1	Round #2 Final:
		Do 211
	pinion, having observed ne teams I observed as	d the negotiation between teams & & and between follows:
Please fill in all blanks	above and immediately	ytelow with the team letter designations.)
1 = Most	effective team:	<u></u>
2 = Next	most effective team:	B9
3 = Third	most effective team: 1	#3
4 = Least	effective team:	3-16

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)

- 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: Claire Zovko Cell Room #: 23
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 A3 & B16 and between A 10 & B9, 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: A3
2 = Next most effective team: AlD
3 = Third most effective team: Blb
4 = Least effective team: 89
 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
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

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: Konse Cell# Date: 9/21 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 313 & A 6 and between A13 & 36, 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: A6
2 = Next most effective team: A 13
3 = Third most effective team: 86
4 = Least effective team: <u>B</u> 13
 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
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: ERICEANCI Cell #: Date: 9/21 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 13 & A6 and between B6 & A13, 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-6
3 = Third most effective team: A-13
4 = Least effective team: B = 6
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 Regults in an aphanead wealing relationship on an agreement to reception 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
Please note that the competition administrator will collect the Ranking Skeets and Evaluation Criteria Forms before - 250000
judges provide feedback to the last two teams. They will verify that judges have completed all categories before leaving the

B-13: Jet 1111 A-13: Jet 1111 B-6: Jet 1111 III