ROUND		NEGOTIATIONS BALLOT		ROOM	
TEAM A		ROARD of		TEAM B	
Names:		BAI TEXAS TE	RRISTĚRS CH UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW	Names:	
Use the following questions and point values to calculate each team's total score. In the event of a tie, see the Vice Chair of Negotiations, Vice Chair of Judges or the Chairperson.					
When complete, circle the name of the top oralist.					
/5	Pre-Analysis: Did the team speak cohesively?/1 Was the team knowledgeable of the facts?/1 Did the team identify and understand all of the issues?/1 Did the team anticipate the other side's position?/1 Did the team have an apparent strategy?/1		Pre-Analysis: Did the team speak cohesively?/1 Was the team knowledgeable of the facts?/1 Did the team identify and understand all of the issues?/1 Did the team anticipate the other side's position?/1 Did the team have an apparent strategy?/1		/5
/10	Teamwork: Did the team evenly share responsibility?/2 Was the team equally prepared?/2 Did the team refrain from contradicting each other?/2 Did the team appear to be in agreement during the round?/2 Did the team communicate effectively during the round?/2		Teamwork: Did the team evenly share responsibility?/2 Was the team equally prepared?/2 Did the team refrain from contradicting each other?/2 Did the team appear to be in agreement during the round?/2 Did the team communicate effectively during the round?/2		/10
/10	Advocacy: Did the team understand their client's interests?/2 Did the team advance their client's interests?/2 Did the team explain their client's position?/ Did the team's statements respect the client's wishes?/2 Did the team refrain from giving up their client's interests unnecessarily?/2		Advocacy: Did the team understand their client's interests?/2 Did the team advance their client's interests?/2 Did the team explain their client's position?/ Did the team's statements respect the client's wishes?/2 Did the team refrain from giving up their client's interests unnecessarily?/2		/10
/10	Professionalism: Did the team ask effective questions and give effective answers?/2 Did the team attempt to move the negotiation forward?/2 Did the team adapt throughout the round?/2 Did the team concede when necessary?/2 Did the team foster an appropriate professional relationship with the other team based on the negotiation scenario?/2		Professionalism: Did the team ask effective questions and give effective answers?/2 Did the team attempt to move the negotiation forward?/2 Did the team adapt throughout the round?/2 Did the team concede when necessary?/2 Did the team foster an appropriate professional relationship with the other team based on the negotiation scenario?/2		/10
/6	The Result: Did the team push their client to a deal or closer to a deal?/2 Did the team communicate the results of the round with the other team?/1 Rate the outcome of the round for this team's client/3		The Result: Did the team push their client to a deal or closer to a deal?/2 Did the team communicate the results of the round with the other team?/1 Rate the outcome of the round for this team's client/3		/6
/5	Post-Analysis: Did the team accurately summarize the round?/1 Did the team effectively analyze their performance?/1 Did the team answer the judge's questions?/2 Did the team learn from the round?/1		Post-Analysis: Did the team accurately summarize the round?/1 Did the team effectively analyze their performance?/1 Did the team answer the judge's questions?/2 Did the team learn from the round?/1		/5
/5	Ethics: Do you believe that the team observed the ethical standards of the legal profession? Consider whether the team misrepresented material facts, exceeded its authority, or invented self-serving material facts. (0 = unethical, 5 = ethical) *If an ethical violation was so severe that, in your judgment, you think the team should be disqualified, see the Vice Chair of Negotiations or the Vice Chair of Judges.			/5	
/51	Judge's Name	Judge's	Signature		/51
Point Spread:		Winning Team:			