

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Lendon Wells Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/11 Room #: 216

Team Letter Designation: B12 Client Name: Blackhawk

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National—and mark the round observed)

Round #1 2 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, at [redacted] and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Charles G. Batek Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21 Room #: 216

Team Letter Designation: B-12 Client Name: Blackhawk

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 Final:

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Fender W Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21 Room #: 216

Team Letter Designation: B3 Client Name: Blackhawley

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 2 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Charles G. Batch Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21 Room #: 216

Team Letter Designation: B-3 Client Name: Blackhawk

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

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

Team Letter Designation: B-3 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 _____ Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	<u>6</u>	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	<u>4</u>	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	<u>4</u>	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	<u>4</u>	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 ————— 6 ————— 5 ————— 4 ————— 3 ————— 2 ————— 1

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 ————— 6 ————— 5 ————— 4 ————— 3 ————— 2 ————— 1

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc- Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Lacy Rhodes Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: [REDACTED] Room #: [REDACTED]

Team Letter Designation: A-18 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 Round #2 Final:

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: COLDSIA Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/21 Room #: 217

Team Letter Designation: A-18 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, ~~and implied and explicit communications.~~ Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: RAJ MATANB Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 217

Team Letter Designation: A-18 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 ✓ Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	<u>1</u>
Very inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Lacy Rhodes Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: _____ Room #: _____

Team Letter Designation: B-18 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 _____
 Round #2 _____
 Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: COLOSIA Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21 Room #: 217

Team Letter Designation: B-18 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 _____ 6 _____ 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 1 _____

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 _____ 6 _____ 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 _____ 1

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: LAS MANANZ Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 217

Team Letter Designation: B-18 Client Name: BLACKHAWKS

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 ✓ Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: FRANK V. DRUMMOND Cell #: Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 216

Team Letter Designation: A-3 Client Name: W6N

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 _____ Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 ————— 6 ————— 5 ————— 4 ————— 3 ————— 2 ————— 1

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 ————— 6 ————— 5 ————— 4 ————— 3 ————— 2 ————— 1

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Charles G. Batch Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21 Room #: 216

Team Letter Designation: A-3 Client Name: WGA

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude, tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Linda Webb Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21 Room #: 216
 Team Letter Designation: A-3 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 2 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

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

Team Letter Designation: B-12 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 _____ Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Prepared Highly
 Unprepared Unprepared Unprepared Prepared Prepared Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Flexible Highly
 Inflexible Inflexible Inflexible Flexible Flexible Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served Goals not served Goals somewhat Neutral Goals served Goals served well Goals served
 at all not served not served somewhat very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in Neutral Somewhat good Very Good Excellent
 in teamwork teamwork teamwork Teamwork Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

WGN

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Rebeca Valenzuela Cell #: [redacted] Date: 2/21/13 Room #: 318

Team Letter Designation: A-15 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 B Round #2 3 Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

WGN

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on words, tone, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Parker Smith Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 318

Team Letter Designation: A-15 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 B Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback for the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: DAVID TIFUN Cell: [REDACTED] Date: 9-21 Room #: 318

Team Letter Designation: A-15 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 B Round #2 [scribble] Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

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

Team Letter Designation: A-11 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	②	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	②	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	①
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	②	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

A: WGN

B: Blackhanks

Attachment B

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Kim Nakamary Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/2 Room #: 225

Team Letter Designation: A-2 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 _____ 6 _____ 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 (circled) _____ 1 _____

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well (circled) Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 _____ 6 _____ 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 (circled) _____ 1 _____

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well (circled) Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS (circled)

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY (circled)

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator PRIOR to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Brendan Legoldus Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 228

Team Letter Designation: A-2 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	<u>1</u>
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

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

Team Letter Designation: A-11 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 ✓ Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Unprepared Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Prepared Highly Prepared
 Unprepared Unprepared Unprepared Prepared Prepared Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Inflexible Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Flexible Flexible Highly Flexible
 Inflexible Inflexible Inflexible Flexible Flexible Flexible Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served Goals not served Goals somewhat Neutral Goals served Goals served well Goals served
 at all not served not served Neutral somewhat somewhat well very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in Neutral Somewhat good Very Good Excellent
 in teamwork teamwork teamwork Neutral teamwork Teamwork Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, ~~_____~~ and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

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

Team Letter Designation: A2 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Semerard Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/20/13 Room #: 225

Team Letter Designation: A-11 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 Round #2 Final:

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Prepared Highly
 Unprepared Unprepared Prepared Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Flexible Highly
 Inflexible Inflexible Flexible Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served Goals not served Goals somewhat Neutral Goals served Goals served well Goals served
 at all not served somewhat very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in Neutral Somewhat good Very Good Excellent
 in teamwork teamwork teamwork Teamwork Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS

TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled ~~TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS~~ TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

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

Team Letter Designation: A-13 Client Name: AGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 _____ Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Unprepared Somewhat Unprepared Neutral Somewhat Prepared Prepared Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Inflexible Somewhat Inflexible Neutral Somewhat Flexible Flexible Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served at all Goals not served Goals somewhat not served Neutral Goals served somewhat Goals served well Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking in teamwork Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in teamwork Neutral Somewhat good teamwork Very Good Teamwork Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation criteria forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Leah Christensen Cell # [REDACTED] Date: SAT Room #: 227

Team Letter Designation: A-13-WGN Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

Name: _____

7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

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

Team Letter Designation: A-13 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 ✓ Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Unprepared Somewhat Unprepared Neutral Somewhat Prepared Prepared Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Inflexible Somewhat Inflexible Neutral Somewhat Flexible Flexible Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served at all Goals not served Goals somewhat not served Neutral Goals served somewhat Goals served well Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking in teamwork Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in teamwork Neutral Somewhat good teamwork Very Good Teamwork Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: G. Walters Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 128

Team Letter Designation: A-10 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 ✓ Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Prepared Highly
 Unprepared Unprepared Unprepared Prepared Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Flexible Highly
 Inflexible Inflexible Inflexible Flexible Flexible Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served Goals not served Goals somewhat Neutral Goals served Goals served well Goals served
 at all not served not served somewhat very well very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in Neutral Somewhat good Very Good Excellent
 in teamwork teamwork teamwork teamwork Teamwork Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Bruner Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/21 Room #: 128

Team Letter Designation: A-10 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 ✓ Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Prepared Highly
 Unprepared Unprepared Prepared Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Flexible Highly
 Inflexible Inflexible Flexible Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served Goals not served Goals somewhat Neutral Goals served Goals served well Goals served
 at all not served not served somewhat very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in Neutral Somewhat good Very Good Excellent
 in teamwork teamwork teamwork Teamwork Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: A. Flaker Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 128

Team Letter Designation: A: 10 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 Round #2 Final:

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM - JUDGING SCALES

(Each judge should receive four copies of the Evaluation and Judging Scales.)

Judge's Name: Kim Nakamaru Cell #: [Redacted] Date: 9/2 Room #: 228

Team Letter Designation: B - 2 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 ✓ Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

The GC spoke signed more

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Brandon Leopoldus Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/29/13 Room #: 225

Team Letter Designation: B-2 Client Name: Hachhawks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	<u>1</u>
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	<u>1</u>
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	<u>1</u>
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: DAVID Tiffany Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9-21 Room #: 318

Team Letter Designation: B-15 Client Name: BLACK HAWKS

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 B Round #2 [REDACTED] Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well.

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or **TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS**

If you circled **TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS**, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or **NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY**

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Parker Smith Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 318

Team Letter Designation: B-15 Client Name: Blackhawk

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 B Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: John Rees Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 09/21/08 Room #: 316

Team Letter Designation: B-17 Client Name: Blackhawk

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator PRIOR to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: R Galante Cell: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21 Room #: 316

Team Letter Designation: B 17 Client Name: BH

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 _____ Round #2 Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria forms will be collected by the competition administrators **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Rebecca Valenzuela Cell [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 318

Team Letter Designation: B-15 Client Name: Blackhanks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 B Round #2 3 Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

PH

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

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

Team Letter Designation: B-19 Client Name: Blahhanks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Kim Nakhman Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 1/21 Room #: 275

Team Letter Designation: B-11 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on words, phrases, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

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

Team Letter Designation: B-2 Client Name: Blackhawk

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 ✓ Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Prepared **Highly**
 Unprepared Unprepared Prepared Prepared Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Somewhat Neutral **Somewhat** Flexible Highly
 Inflexible Inflexible Flexible Flexible Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served Goals not served Goals somewhat Neutral Goals served Goals served well Goals served
 at all not served somewhat very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in Neutral Somewhat good **Very Good** Excellent
 in teamwork teamwork teamwork Teamwork Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Semefeld Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/20 Room #: 225

Team Letter Designation: B-11 Client Name: Black Hawks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 Final:

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Prepared Highly
 Unprepared Unprepared Prepared Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Flexible Highly
 Inflexible Inflexible Flexible Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served Goals not served Goals somewhat Neutral Goals served Goals served well Goals served
 at all not served somewhat very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in Neutral Somewhat good Very Good Excellent
 in teamwork teamwork teamwork Teamwork Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the first two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

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

Team Letter Designation: B13 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

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

Team Letter Designation: B-13 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	<u>1</u>
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	<u>1</u>
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	<u>1</u>
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 ————— 6 ————— 5 ————— 4 ————— 3 ————— 2 ————— 1

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 ————— 6 ————— 5 ————— 4 ————— 3 ————— 2 ————— 1

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the first two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

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

Team Letter Designation: B-13 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 _____ Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 _____ 6 _____ 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 _____ 1 1

Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well
----------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------	------------------------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------------------

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 _____ 6 3 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 3 2 _____ 1 2

Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well
------------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------	---------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------------

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY 2 NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: G. Walters Cell # [redacted] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 128

Team Letter Designation: B-10 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Bruner Cell: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21 Room #: 128

Team Letter Designation: B-10 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: A. Flores Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 128

Team Letter Designation: B-10 Client Name: BlackHawks

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 2 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

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

Team Letter Designation: B-14 Client Name: Blackhawk

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	<u>5</u>	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	<u>6</u>	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	<u>6</u>	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	<u>5</u>	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Michael Tomas Cell # [redacted] Date: 4/2/13 Room #: 231

Team Letter Designation: B-14 Client Name: Black Hawk

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 Final:

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Very Unprepared Unprepared Somewhat Unprepared Neutral Somewhat Prepared Prepared Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Very inflexible Inflexible Somewhat Inflexible Neutral Somewhat Flexible Flexible Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Goals not served at all Goals not served Goals somewhat not served Neutral Goals served somewhat Goals served well Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

6 5 4 3 2 1
Totally lacking in teamwork Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in teamwork Neutral Somewhat good teamwork Very Good Teamwork Excellent Teamwork

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

—ultimately we are flexible but mentioned your interests "good"
- TV
50 million for TV
15 million
10 million for mobile
Per year

Other programming good they

Endent
→ party much
would go be millions to do

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well Relationship manages extremely well

Handwritten: 1

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well Understood and learned extremely well

Handwritten: 2

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

Handwritten: NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: G. BOYD Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 231

Team Letter Designation: B14 Client Name: Blackhawk's

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 2 Round #2 3 Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS

or

TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Konze Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 09/21/13 Room #: 229

Team Letter Designation: B-16 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Konze Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 09/2/13 Room #: 229

Team Letter Designation: B-16 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National/ and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	<u>4</u>	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: ERIC GANCI Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/2/13 Room #: 229

Team Letter Designation: B-16 Client Name: Hawks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 _____ Round #2 ✓ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	(2)	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	(2)	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Claire Zurko Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/24 Room #: 231

Team Letter Designation: A-14 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Richard Jones Cell #: [redacted] Date: 9/21/11 Room #: 231

Team Letter Designation: A-14 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

Home at Blackboards
Good uThink
WGN → think Blackboard
Keep in mind what offer
were pretty good
lot of agreement, but executed → good

had to go on unless we narrow number

may consider drop → good collaboration

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on work ethics, attitude or tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 ————— 6 ————— 5 ————— 4 ————— 3 ————— 2 ————— 1

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well Relationship managed extremely well

(Handwritten: 1)

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 ————— 6 ————— 5 ————— 4 ————— 3 ————— 2 ————— 1

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well Understood and learned extremely well

(Handwritten: 1)

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

(Handwritten: NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY)

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

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

Team Letter Designation: A14 Client Name: WGS

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 (circled) Round #2 (crossed out) Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS

TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Eric Ganci Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 229

Team Letter Designation: A-16 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 _____ Round #2 ✓ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	②	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	②	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	④	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	②	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last five teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Konze Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 09/21/13 Room #: 229

Team Letter Designation: A-16 Client Name: WIGN

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the release of the results, providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Konze Cell [REDACTED] Date: 09/2/13 Room #: 229

Team Letter Designation: A-16 Client Name: KIGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	<u>4</u>	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the first two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Konze Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 09/21/13 Room #: 229

Team Letter Designation: A-7 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National) and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Konze Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 09/21/13 Room #: 229

Team Letter Designation: A-7 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Konze Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 09/2/13 Room #: 229

Team Letter Designation: B-7 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Konze Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 09/11/13 Room #: 229

Team Letter Designation: B-7 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National /) and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: FIL GANC Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/2/13 Room #: 22A

Team Letter Designation: A-7 Client Name: W&N

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 ✓ Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	(2)	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	(3)	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	(2)	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	(4)	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	④	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	②	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: ERIC GANCI Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 5/2/13 Room #: 229

Team Letter Designation: B-7 Client Name: BHank

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 ✓ Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	<u>6</u>	5	<u>4</u>	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

Team

Attachment B

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Matthew Odgers Cell #: _____ Date: _____ Room #: 227

Team Letter Designation: B-6 Client Name: AGN

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy? *Great intro set the tone*

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 _____ 6 4 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 2 1 _____

Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well
----------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------	------------------------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------------------

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 _____ 6 2 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 2 1 _____

Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well
------------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------	---------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------------

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

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

Team Letter Designation: A-6 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Prepared Highly
 Unprepared Unprepared Prepared Prepared Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Flexible Highly
 Inflexible Inflexible Flexible Flexible Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served Goals not served Goals somewhat Neutral Goals served Goals served well Goals served
 at all not served somewhat very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in Neutral Somewhat good Very Good Excellent
 in teamwork teamwork teamwork Teamwork Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 _____ 6 _____ 5 _____ 4 (circled) _____ 3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 _____ 6 _____ 5 _____ 4 (circled) _____ 3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS (circled) or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Justin Heim Cell: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/15 Room #: 227

Team Letter Designation: A-6 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: A. FLORES Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 128

Team Letter Designation: A-9 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 _____ Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Very inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Gordon Walters Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 128

Team Letter Designation: A-9 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Unprepared Somewhat Unprepared Neutral Somewhat Prepared Prepared Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Inflexible Somewhat Inflexible Neutral Somewhat Flexible Flexible Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served at all Goals not served Goals somewhat not served Neutral Goals served somewhat Goals served well Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking in teamwork Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in teamwork Neutral Somewhat good teamwork Very Good Teamwork Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Bruner Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 128

Team Letter Designation: A-9 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National) and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Prepared Highly
 Unprepared Unprepared Prepared Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Flexible Highly
 inflexible Inflexible Flexible Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served Goals not served Goals somewhat Neutral Goals served Goals served well Goals served
 at all not served somewhat very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in Neutral Somewhat good Very Good Excellent
 in teamwork teamwork teamwork Teamwork Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled ~~TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS~~ TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

1 YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: DAVID Tiffan Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9-21 Room #: 318

Team Letter Designation: A-5 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 1 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Unprepared Somewhat Unprepared Neutral Somewhat Prepared Prepared Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Inflexible Somewhat Inflexible Neutral Somewhat Flexible Flexible Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served at all Goals not served Goals somewhat not served Neutral Goals served somewhat Goals served well Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking in teamwork Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in teamwork Neutral Somewhat good teamwork Very Good Teamwork Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 ————— 6 ————— 5 ————— 4 ————— 3 ————— 2 ————— 1

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 ————— 6 ————— 5 ————— 4 ————— 3 ————— 2 ————— 1

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

1 YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Rebeca Valenzuela Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 318

Team Letter Designation: A-5 (10/15) Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Unprepared Somewhat Unprepared Neutral Somewhat Prepared Prepared Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Inflexible Somewhat Inflexible Neutral Somewhat Flexible Flexible Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served at all Goals not served Goals somewhat not served Neutral Goals served somewhat Goals served well Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking in teamwork Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in teamwork Neutral Somewhat good teamwork Very Good Teamwork Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 _____ 6 _____ 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well Relationship managed extremely well

(Handwritten: 1 is circled)

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 _____ 6 _____ 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well Understood and learned extremely well

(Handwritten: 2 is circled)

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Parker Smith Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 318

Team Letter Designation: A-5 Client Name: WGAJ

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 A Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Prepared Highly
 Unprepared Unprepared Unprepared Prepared Prepared Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Flexible Highly
 inflexible Inflexible Inflexible Flexible Flexible Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served Goals not served Goals somewhat Neutral Goals served Goals served well Goals served
 at all not served not served somewhat very well very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in Neutral Somewhat good Very Good Excellent
 in teamwork teamwork teamwork Teamwork Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or **TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS**

If you circled **TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS**, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or **NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY**

Please explain in detail:

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

This evaluation Criteria Form will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Colosita Cell # [redacted] Date: 9/21 Room #: 217

Team Letter Designation: A-4 Client Name: NGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	1.5	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria I-III will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: RAJ MATAM Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 217

Team Letter Designation: A-4 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

-Solo team member

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

1 - Average good school score

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 _____ 6 _____ 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 _____ 1

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 _____ 6 _____ 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 _____ 1

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Lacy J. Rhodes Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: Room #: 217

Team Letter Designation: A-4 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 Final:

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Prepared Highly
 Unprepared Unprepared Unprepared Prepared Prepared Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Flexible Highly
 inflexible Inflexible Inflexible Flexible Flexible Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served Goals not served Goals somewhat Neutral Goals served Goals served well Goals served
 at all not served not served somewhat very well very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in Neutral Somewhat good Very Good Excellent
 in teamwork teamwork teamwork teamwork teamwork Teamwork Teamwork

1 person team

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 _____ 6 _____ 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 2 1 _____

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 _____ 6 _____ 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 _____ 1 1

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

1 YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

10/21/00
1000

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: C. Blank Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21 Room #: 231

Team Letter Designation: A1 Client Name: WBAI

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Prepared Highly
 Unprepared Unprepared Prepared Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Flexible Highly
 Inflexible Inflexible Flexible Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served Goals not served Goals somewhat Neutral Goals served Goals served well Goals served
 at all not served somewhat very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in Neutral Somewhat good Very Good Excellent
 in teamwork teamwork teamwork Teamwork Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

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

Team Letter Designation: A-1 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Unprepared Somewhat Unprepared Neutral Somewhat Prepared Prepared Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Inflexible Somewhat Inflexible Neutral Somewhat Flexible Flexible Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served at all Goals not served Goals somewhat not served Neutral Goals served somewhat Goals served well Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking in teamwork Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in teamwork Neutral Somewhat good teamwork Very Good Teamwork Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Michael James Cell: [Redacted] Date: 7/21/2013 Room #: 281

Team Letter Designation: A-1 Client Name: WBN

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 (3) Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Good energy at hand

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Unprepared Somewhat Unprepared Neutral Somewhat Prepared Prepared
 Highly Prepared

Regional level out

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Inflexible Somewhat Inflexible Neutral Somewhat Flexible Flexible Highly Flexible

Used their own "man" ↓ from experience...

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served at all Goals not served Goals somewhat not served Neutral Goals served somewhat Goals served well Goals served very well

at your fingertips

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking in teamwork Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in teamwork Neutral Somewhat good teamwork Very Good Teamwork Excellent Teamwork

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

Good weaving of Michael James

we echo your concerns

flexibility

BTB

impover...

we appreciate why "del" wants "del"

[Signature]

I do it but stop swaying in chair →

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Renee G. Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21 Room #: 316

Team Letter Designation: A8 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 Final:

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 ————— 6 ————— 5 ————— 4 ————— 3 ————— 2 ————— 1

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well Relationship managed extremely well

(Handwritten: 5 is circled and crossed out, 2 is circled)

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 ————— 6 ————— 5 ————— 4 ————— 3 ————— 2 ————— 1

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well Understood and learned extremely well

(Handwritten: 5 is circled and crossed out, 3 is circled)

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Logars will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: John Rees Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 09-21-03 Room #: 316

Team Letter Designation: A-8 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Round #2	<input type="checkbox"/>	Final:	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	--------	--------------------------

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Matthew Odgers Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/2/13 Room #: 227

Team Letter Designation: B-6 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 ✓ Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

-good job hearing out other side before making any offers.

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

-Should have - I'd your interest then worked out how they could meet that interest

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

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

Team Letter Designation: Team B-6 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

Jonathan Goeringer
Benjamin Clack

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well Relationship managed extremely well

Handwritten notes: Team B, Blackhawk, Team Letter Designer, Team A, Benjamin Black

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1 1

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Justin Heim Cell: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/15 Room #: 227

Team Letter Designation: B-C Client Name: Chicago Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Prepared Highly
 Unprepared Unprepared Prepared Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Flexible Highly
 Inflexible Inflexible Flexible Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served Goals not served Goals somewhat Neutral Goals served Goals served well Goals served
 at all not served somewhat very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in Neutral Somewhat good Very Good Excellent
 in teamwork teamwork teamwork Teamwork Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or **TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS**

If you circled **TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS**, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: A. Flatts Cell # [redacted] Date: 9/2/13 Room #: 128

Team Letter Designation: B.9 Client Name: Black Hawks

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 Round #2 Final:

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Very Unprepared Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Prepared Highly
Unprepared Unprepared Prepared Prepared Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Very Inflexible Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Flexible Highly
Inflexible Inflexible Flexible Flexible Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Goals not served Goals not served Goals somewhat Neutral Goals served Goals served well Goals served
at all not served somewhat very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Totally lacking Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in Neutral Somewhat good Very Good Excellent
in teamwork teamwork teamwork Teamwork Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Bruner Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21 Room #: 128

Team Letter Designation: B-9 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	<u>2</u>	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	<u>3</u>	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Godon Walters Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 128

Team Letter Designation: B-9 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 ----- 6 ----- 5 ----- 4 ----- 3 ----- 2 ----- 1

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 ----- 6 ----- 5 ----- 4 ----- 3 ----- 2 ----- 1

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or **TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS**

If you circled **TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS**, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY **NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY**

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: David Tiffany Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9-21 Room #: 318

Team Letter Designation: B-5 Client Name: BLACK HAWKS

Negotiation judged:
 (Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1
 Round #2
 Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or **TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS**

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY **NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY**

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Rebeca Valenzuela Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/27/13 Room #: 318

Team Letter Designation: B-5 (Hawks) Client Name: Hawks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on work ~~choices, attitude and tone~~, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Parker Smith Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/2/13 Room #: 318

Team Letter Designation: B-5 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 A Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

This evaluation Criteria Form will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Colosia Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21 Room #: 217

Team Letter Designation: B-4 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Prepared Highly
 Unprepared Unprepared Prepared Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Flexible Highly
 Inflexible Inflexible Flexible Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served Goals not served Goals somewhat Neutral Goals served Goals served well Goals served
 at all not served somewhat very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in Neutral Somewhat good Very Good Excellent
 in teamwork teamwork teamwork Teamwork Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: RAJ MATANI Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 217

Team Letter Designation: B-4 Client Name: BLACK HAWKS

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 Final:

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Prepared Highly
 Unprepared Unprepared Prepared Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Somewhat Neutral Somewhat Flexible Highly
 Inflexible Inflexible Flexible Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served Goals not served Goals somewhat Neutral Goals served Goals served well Goals served
 at all not served somewhat well very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in Neutral Somewhat good Very Good Excellent
 in teamwork teamwork teamwork teamwork Teamwork Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 _____ 6 _____ 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 _____ 1 **(1)**

Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well
----------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------	------------------------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------------------

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 _____ 6 _____ 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 **(2)** 1 _____

Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well
------------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------	---------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------------

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or **TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS**

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or **NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY**

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Lacy Jones Cell # [redacted] Date: Room #: 217

Team Letter Designation: B-4 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 Round #2 Final:

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: G. Blank Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/24 Room #: 231

Team Letter Designation: B1 Client Name: Blackhawk

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or **TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS**

If you circled **TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS**, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

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

Team Letter Designation: B-1 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 X Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Unprepared Unprepared Somewhat Unprepared Neutral Somewhat Prepared Prepared Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Very Inflexible Inflexible Somewhat Inflexible Neutral Somewhat Flexible Flexible Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Goals not served at all Goals not served Goals somewhat not served Neutral Goals served somewhat Goals served well Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 Totally lacking in teamwork Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in teamwork Neutral Somewhat good teamwork Very Good Teamwork Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Michael Jones Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/21/13 Room #: 231

Team Letter Designation: B-1 Client Name: Blackhawk

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 III Round #2 _____ Final: _____

*sale of
loghomes
region
Combined
Board
ideas
good*

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

*after
break
more
vocal
why
not
alone*

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

*"Business
agreed
long
term
partnership*

*4 goals
shared
forward*

Do you think I exceeded what you expect from your team?
Do you think I exceeded what I expected from my team?
Ask → team work

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

Very vague, rehearsed, not specific

*Shells
of
it
out.*

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: John Reg Cell # [redacted] Date: 09-21-07 Room #: 316

Team Letter Designation: B-8 Client Name: Blackhawk

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI.

SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII.

NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria forms will be collected by the competition administration **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Renee G Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 9/21 Room #: 316

Team Letter Designation: B8 Client Name: Blackhawks

Negotiation judged:

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

Round #1 Round #2 Final:

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator PRIOR to the judges providing feedback to the participating teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: John Rexell Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 09/2/11 Room #: 316

Team Letter Designation: A-17 Client Name: WSN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 ✓ Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Very Unprepared Unprepared Somewhat Unprepared Neutral Somewhat Prepared Prepared Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Very inflexible Inflexible Somewhat Inflexible Neutral Somewhat Flexible Flexible Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Goals not served at all Goals not served Goals somewhat not served Neutral Goals served somewhat Goals served well Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Totally lacking in teamwork Lacking teamwork Somewhat lacking in teamwork Neutral Somewhat good teamwork Very Good Teamwork Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY or NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the first two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: FRANK DRUMMOND Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/24/13 Room #: 216Team Letter Designation: A-12 Client Name: WGN**Negotiation judged:**
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 _____ Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.**I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING**

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the first two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Charles G. Batch Cell # [REDACTED] Date: 9/21 Room #: 216

Team Letter Designation: A-12 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National / and mark the round observed)

Round #1 Round #2 Final:

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship Managed Very Poorly	Relationship Managed Poorly	Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly	Neutral	Relationship Managed Somewhat Well	Relationship managed well	Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Did not understand or learn at all	Did not understand or learn	Did not understand or learn much	Neutral	Understood And Learned Somewhat	Understood and learned well	Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY

NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Forms will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.

EVALUATION CRITERIA FORM—JUDGING SCALES

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

Judge's Name: Linda Webb Cell #: [REDACTED] Date: 7/24/12 Room #: 216

Team Letter Designation: A12 Client Name: WGN

Negotiation judged:
(Please circle the competition level—Regional or National and mark the round observed)

Round #1 2 Round #2 _____ Final: _____

Criteria I-V should be completed following the end of the negotiation and while the teams are preparing for the self-analysis.

I. NEGOTIATION PLANNING

This scale assesses whether the team was familiar with the facts and law and had a strategy and tactics reasonably designed to the situation set out in the fact pattern. How well-prepared was this team, judging from its performance and its apparent strategy?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Neutral	Somewhat Prepared	Prepared	Highly Prepared

II. FLEXIBILITY IN DEVIATING FROM PLANS OR ADAPTING STRATEGY

This scale assesses whether the negotiators seemed responsive to the negotiation as it unfolded or whether their strategy and tactics seemed scripted or otherwise pre-planned in a way that did not work effectively in the context of the actual negotiation. Was this team able to adapt its strategy to for example, to new information or to unforeseen moves by the opposing team?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Very Inflexible	Inflexible	Somewhat Inflexible	Neutral	Somewhat Flexible	Flexible	Highly Flexible

III. OUTCOME OF SESSION

Based on what you observed in the negotiation and the self-analysis, to what extent did the outcome of the session, regardless of whether agreement was reached, serve the client's goals?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Goals not served at all	Goals not served	Goals somewhat not served	Neutral	Goals served somewhat	Goals served well	Goals served very well

IV. TEAMWORK

How effective were the negotiators in working together as a team, in sharing responsibility, and providing mutual backup?

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Totally lacking in teamwork	Lacking teamwork	Somewhat lacking in teamwork	Neutral	Somewhat good teamwork	Very Good Teamwork	Excellent Teamwork

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

V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NEGOTIATING TEAMS

This scale focuses on word choice, attitude and tone, and implied and explicit communications. Did the way this team manage its relationship with the other team contribute to or detract from achieving its client's best interests?

7 _____ 6 _____ 5 _____ 4 4 3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____

Relationship Managed Very Poorly Relationship Managed Poorly Relationship Managed Somewhat Poorly Neutral Relationship Managed Somewhat Well Relationship managed well Relationship managed extremely well

Criteria VI and VII should be completed after both teams have completed their self-analysis.

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS

Students will begin this 10-minute period by answering directly to the judges, responses to the following questions:

- (1) "In reflecting on the entire negotiation, if you faced a similar situation tomorrow, what would you do the same and what would you do differently?"
- (2) "How well did your strategy work in relation to the outcome?"

Based on the team's self-analysis during the review session, how adequately understood the negotiation dynamics and learned from today's negotiation?

7 _____ 6 _____ 5 _____ 4 4 3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____

Did not understand or learn at all Did not understand or learn Did not understand or learn much Neutral Understood And Learned Somewhat Understood and learned well Understood and learned extremely well

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Based on your observation, do you believe the negotiating team observed or violated the ethical standards of the legal profession? For example, 1) did the team misrepresent material facts? 2) did the team invent self-serving material facts? etc. Select and circle one:

TEAM OBSERVED ETHICAL STANDARDS or TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS

If you circled TEAM VIOLATED ETHICAL STANDARDS, was the ethical violation so severe that, in your judgment, the team should be disqualified from the competition? Circle one:

YES, DISQUALIFY NO, DO NOT DISQUALIFY

Please explain in detail:

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

The Evaluation Criteria Form(s) will be collected by the competition administrator **PRIOR** to the judges providing feedback to the last two teams.