## INTERNATIONAL LAW SCHOOL MEDIATION TOURNAMENT MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

	Round	_ Judge		
Team #	Mediator	Team #	Mediator	

**Instructions:** The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored <u>independently</u> based on their own performances and skill level. There are six categories, each earning 1–10 points. Please put your score (whole numbers only) on the line provided. *Because this is an instructional tournament, your written comments on this ballot are important.* 

Below Average	Average	Good	Excellent
1 2 3	4 5 6	78	9 10

Score

<u>Score</u>

- 1. <u>Opening Statement of the Mediator</u> (1-10 points) (Both mediators must make opening statements. They may make independent statements or collaborate in a single statement.) Was the mediator prepared? Did he/she (1) calm the parties, (2) explain the mediation process effectively, and (3) adequately explain his/her role in the mediation?
- 2. <u>First Caucus</u> (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with the co-mediator observing.) Did the mediator develop the strengths and weaknesses of the party's case? Did he/she determine the party's real needs and interests? Did he/she review settlement discussions, if any, and seek a new demand/offer?
- 3. <u>Conference</u> (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least one conference session during the mediation. The required conference may be conducted during the initial group session, following the initial caucuses, or both, at the discretion of the mediators.) Did the mediators choose an appropriate time to have the parties meet in conference? Was the conference session used effectively toward reaching agreement and/or helping the parties to move forward in their relationship? Did this mediator contribute to an effective process and outcome?
- 4. <u>Qualities Of A Good Mediator</u> (1-10 points) Did the mediator establish rapport and trust with the parties? Was he/she neutral and nonjudgmental, and did he/she maintain confidentiality? Did he/she remain patient, positive, persistent and professional at all times? Did the mediator employ techniques of active listening as well as proposing creative settlement possibilities where necessary or appropriate? Did the mediator recognize and appropriately deal with any ethical and/or cross cultural issues?
- 5. <u>Cooperation Between Mediators</u> (1-10 points) How well did this mediator cooperate with his/her co-mediator? Did they work effectively together (whether or not settlement was achieved)?

6. <u>Self-Evaluation</u> (1-10 points) How thoughtfully did the mediator answer these questions: A) If you had to do the mediation over again, what would you do the same or differently? B) What were your goals and strategies coming into the mediation and how did they play out during the mediation? (Judges may ask questions during self-evaluation, to clarify points made or to clarify issues of strategy or performance, but should not offer critique at this time. Self-evaluations that are overly generic, that feel like prepared speeches, and that do not seem to reflect thoughtful analysis of this specific mediation, should be scored no higher than a 5.)

Ties are not permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same score.

In your judgment, who was the better mediator in this round?\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS:

## INTERNATIONAL LAW SCHOOL MEDIATION TOURNAMENT <u>ADVOCATE/CLIENT EVALUATION FORM</u>

	Round	Judge
Team #		Team #
Advocate/Client _		Advocate/Client

**Instructions:** In each round, there is an advocate/client team representing the plaintiff and another team representing the defendant. There are six categories, each earning 1-10 points. Please place your score on the line provided for each category (whole numbers only). *Because this is an instructional tournament, your written comments on this ballot are important.* 

buildt u		or iunii.						
<u>Score</u>			Below Average 1 2 3	Average 4 5 6	Good 78	Excellent 9 10 <u>Score</u>		
1	1.	<u>Advocate's Opening Statement</u> . (1-10 points) Did the advocate adequately present the facts and law of his/her client's case, as well as goals for the mediation? How organized and prepared was the advocate and how persuasive was his/her presentation?						
	2.	<u>First Caucus</u> (1-10 points) Did the advocate accurately and appropriately outline both the strengths and weaknesses of his/her client's case? Did he/she appropriately develop his/her client's real needs and interests? Did he/she make a new offer or demand that took those needs and interests into account?						
3	3.	to es collab	tence (1 – 10 points tablish an atmost pration without s ts? How well did th	sphere of po sacrificing his/	sitive coope her client's	eration and goals and		
2	4.	advoca Was t client	vork Between Adv ate and client com he advocate recept during the mediati ate keep him/her un	municate effective to changes on? If the clie	tively with c in position t	one another? aken by the		
	5.	effecti throug achiev contrib	<u>Il Evaluation</u> (1-10 vely express and ac hout the mediation, ing this outcome? oute to the settlement with the mediators?	hieve the goals and did the clie How much did t nt and how well	of his/her clie ent effectively he advocate/o did they nego	ent assist in client team otiate and		

resolve the dispute where necessary or appropriate? If settlement was not reached, how much of the failure is attributable to this advocate/client team? (If the advocate/client team obstructed an overall settlement, they should be scored accordingly low.) Did the advocate recognize and appropriately deal with any ethical and/or

cross cultural issues?

6. <u>Self-Evaluation</u> (1-10 points) How thoughtfully did the advocate and client answer these questions: A) If you had to do the mediation over again, what would you do the same or differently?
B) What were your goals and strategies coming into the mediation and how did they play out during the mediation? (Judges may ask questions during self-evaluation, to clarify points made or to clarify issues of strategy or performance, but should not offer critique at this time. Self-evaluations that are overly generic, that feel like prepared speeches, and that do not seem to reflect thoughtful analysis of this specific mediation, should be scored no higher than a 5.)

Ties are not permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same score.

In your judgment, who was the better advocate/client team in this round?

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS: