

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: PAJ NAYAN Cell #:            Date: 9/21/13 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 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: A-12  
2 = Next most effective team: B-7  
3 = Third most effective team: B-10  
4 = Least effective team: A-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: Colosia 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: B-7  
2 = Next most effective team: A-9  
3 = Third most effective team: B-10  
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: Lacy J. Rodas 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 A9 & B10 and between A12 & B7, 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: B7  
3 = Third most effective team: A9  
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: John Rees Cell #: \_\_\_\_\_ 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 B Round #2 ✓ Final: \_\_\_\_\_

Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams B-15<sup>14</sup> & A-4<sup>15</sup> and between A-15 & B-4, 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-4

2 = Next most effective team: A-15

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
  - 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. Calente Cell #: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 316

**Negotiation judged:**

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

**Regional Competition** Round #1 \_\_\_\_\_ Round #2 \_\_\_\_\_ Final: \_\_\_\_\_

Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams A4 & B15 and between B4 & A15, 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: ~~B4~~ B-4  
2 = Next most effective team: ~~A15~~ A-15  
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
  - 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: Matt Odgers 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 X Final: \_\_\_\_\_

Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams A2 & B17 and between A11 & 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: A11  
2 = Next most effective team: B17  
3 = Third most effective team: A2  
4 = Least effective team: B8

**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 #: \_\_\_\_\_ ate: SAT. PM Room #: 227

**Negotiation judged:**

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

**Regional Competition** Round #1 \_\_\_\_\_ Round #2 X 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-17 USC Jessica Friedrich & Michael Antenucci
- 2 = Next most effective team: A-2 Hunter Simon
- 3 = Third most effective team: B-8
- 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: John Ham 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 N Final:     

Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams A2 & B17 and between A11 & B8, 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: B17  
2 = Next most effective team: A2  
3 = Third most effective team: B8  
4 = Least effective team: A11

**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 #.      Date:      Room #:     

**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 & B11 and between B5 & A14, 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: B11  
2 = Next most effective team: B5  
3 = Third most effective team: A14  
4 = Least effective team: AS

B5  
A14

**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. Bateh Cell #: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 9/21 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 B-11 & A-8 and between A-14 & 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-11  
2 = Next most effective team: A-8  
3 = Third most effective team: B-5  
4 = Least effective team: 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)
  - 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 #.      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-8 & B-11 and between A-14 & 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-5  
2 = Next most effective team: A-8  
3 = Third most effective team: B-11  
4 = Least effective team: 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)
  - 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: DAVID TIFFANY 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 27-28 Final: \_\_\_\_\_

Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams A-7 & B-12 and between A-17 & 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: B-12  
2 = Next most effective team: A-17  
3 = Third most effective team: B-2  
4 = Least effective team: A-7

**Suggested criteria:**

- Remember that parties need not reach an agreement and, in some situations, the best outcome might be no agreement at all. Judges should focus on the teams' planning and the negotiation process, rather 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: Rebecca Valenzuela Cell #: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 318

**Negotiation judged:**

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

**Regional Competition** Round #1 \_\_\_\_\_ Round #2 \_\_\_\_\_ Final: \_\_\_\_\_

Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams \_\_\_\_\_ & \_\_\_\_\_ 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-12  
2 = Next most effective team: B-2  
3 = Third most effective team: A-7  
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: Parker Smith Cell #          Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 318

**Negotiation judged:**

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

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

Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams A-7 & B-12 and between A-17 & 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: B-12  
3 = Third most effective team: B-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)
  - 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: Brandon 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 \_\_\_\_\_ Round #2 X Final: \_\_\_\_\_

Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams B14 & A5 and between B3 & A16, 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: B3  
2 = Next most effective team: A16  
3 = Third most effective team: A5  
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: Kim Nakamori Cell #:                      Date: 9/2 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 B-3 & A-10 and between B-14 & A-5 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-3  
2 = Next most effective team: B-14  
3 = Third most effective team: A-5  
4 = Least effective team: A-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: Seneraro Cell: [REDACTED] Date: 9/2/13 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 A5 & B14 and between A16 & 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-5  
2 = Next most effective team: B-3  
3 = Third most effective team: A-16  
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: 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 B.18 & A.1 and between B.1 & 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.1  
2 = Next most effective team: B.18  
3 = Third most effective team: B.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)
  - 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 A18 & A1 and between B1 & 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: A1  
2 = Next most effective team: B18  
3 = Third most effective team: B1  
4 = Least effective team: A18

**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: Gordon 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 A1 & B18 and between A18 & 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: A1  
2 = Next most effective team: B18  
3 = Third most effective team: B1  
4 = Least effective team: A18

**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. BLANK Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/2/13 Room #: 231

**Negotiation judged:**

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

**Regional Competition** Round #1 \_\_\_\_\_ Round #2 1 Final: \_\_\_\_\_

Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams A3 & B16 and between A10 & 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: A10  
2 = Next most effective team: B16  
3 = Third most effective team: A3  
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: Michael James Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 231

## Negotiation judged:

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

Regional Competition Round #1 \_\_\_\_\_ Round #2 2 Final: \_\_\_\_\_

Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams A3 & D16 and between A10 & 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: A10  
2 = Next most effective team: B9  
3 = Third most effective team: A3  
4 = Least effective team: B16

## 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 Zvko Cell # [REDACTED] 9/21 Room #: 231

**Negotiation judged:**

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

**Regional Competition** Round #1 \_\_\_\_\_ Round #2 X Final: \_\_\_\_\_

Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams A3 & B16 and between A10 & 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: A10  
3 = Third most effective team: B16  
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: Konze Cell # [REDACTED] 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 X Final: \_\_\_\_\_

Based on my personal opinion, having observed the negotiation between teams B13 & A6 and between A13 & B6, 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: A13  
3 = Third most effective team: B6  
4 = Least effective team: B13

**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 GANCI Cell #: [REDACTED] 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 B13 & 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: B-13  
2 = Next most effective team: A-6  
3 = Third most effective team: A-13  
4 = Least effective team: B-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

B-13: HH IIII

A-6: HH HH I

A-13: HH HH HH HH I

B-6: HH HH HH HH I