| **TEAM NAME: XXXX** **STATE: XXXX****RANKING**  | Poor (1) | Fair (2) | Good (3) | Very good (4) | Excellent (5) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Identifying interests** – did the team appear to understand the interests of other states? Did the team recognise other states’ strengths and weaknesses?  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Advocacy** – how well did the team advocate for their state’s interests (clarity, persuasiveness etc)?  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome** – to what extent did the outcome serve the team and their state’s interests?  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Flexibility** – to what extent was the team willing to compromise with other states? Did the team think of creative solutions? |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Teamwork** – how effective was the team in working together? To what extent did both members of the team contribute equally?  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Respect** – did the team show an appropriate degree of respect to other teams, the Chairperson, and the competition more generally?  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Research** – to what extent has the team researched its state’s position on the subject matter of the negotiation?  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Diplomacy** – to what extent were teams able to establish a constructive relationship or form alliances with other states?  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Drafting** – to what extent was the team able to amend the draft clauses to reflect the general consensus?  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Memorandum** - did the team provide a clear and concise memo on time? |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Comments:**  | Total | /50 |