14.083.

41 35 34

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # LC 124 Round 1 Judge ~~S Herriott~~ Camilla Dwyer

Team # 20 Team # 7

Mediator Name: Cameron Douglas Mediator Name: Wyonna Alberty

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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 1 2 3	Average 4 5 6	Good 7 8	Excellent 9 10

Both: Explain the structure! Didn't discuss the 2 caucuses at start. Introduce yourselves.

Score	Criteria	Score
7	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	7

Comments: Good explanation of process, open body language. Try to look up at parties instead of at notes whilst co-med. is talking. Explain why caucusing 1 team first

Good calm tone, good open body language. ~~Try to speak up a bit - voice is a little too quiet.~~ Should explain why you are asking one team to go first.

8	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	7

Comments: Mention confidentiality again at start. Ask more open questions - allow client to vent and allow them to lead the session more. Good use of open manner, eye contact and tone. Ditch the pen to allow open hand movements. Great to discuss the ~~cons~~ downs of litigation. Ask what will remain confidential. Try to establish a figure they are willing to go down to. Try to make client/Ad appreciate the issues / weaknesses of case more to encourage settlement.

Great to ask about confidentiality at end. Mention confidentiality at start. Be more focussed with aims here - lead the advocate more with first Q rather than basic fact question. Great to ask about strengths and weaknesses. Good to establish ~~the~~ how much they are willing to offer. Great to check confidentiality ~~again~~ at end. Drill down on specifics - why is environmental cleanup separate - this seems a distraction issue. Look it wasn't a trivial offer - ensure you drill down on this.

20

Score		Score
6	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	5

Comments: Try to control and mediate the 2nd conference. [redacted] Need to speak more in ~~2nd~~ 2nd conf!

Clarify the point of environmental issue.
Asking the parties to talk through mediator is artificial ~~and~~ - remember it is client mediation. There was no explanation for this request.
Good attempt to mediate 2nd conference but questions need to add value. Try to control conf better

7	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	8

Comments: Both - try to reflect back what the parties are saying - repeat back to show you have understood

Tore could be more positive and encouraging.

Be clearer and more patient with questions.
Qs are ~~w~~ Sometimes too verbose.

7	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	7

Both: good cooperation in taking a caucus each.

Comments:
Great cooperation in sharing the different caucuses.
Try to cooperate more with body language.
Don't interrupt co-mediator

Don't interrupt parties.

35

34

Wrap it up at the end!

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? Cameron Douglas #20

40 +1

39 -1

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Hannah Beach

Room # 124 Round 1 Judge ~~Brooks II, Leonard W.~~

Team # 20

Mediator Name: Cameron Douglas

Team # 7

Mediator Name: Wyonna Alberty

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
9	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments: Good volume, pacing, explaing the role of mediators	A bit quiet, nice job introducing the parties and asking if parties had questions and explaining ground rules
7	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	7
	Comments: Maybe Start w/ the concerns of the case and strengths and then go into further details. Good job getting them to start thinking non-monetary right away. When the atty was talking money, I would've tried a bit to push more for non-money idias.	Have the atty/client tell the story of what happened before giving the data. Nice job having them identify the strengths of the weaknesses. The parties talked about $ after asked non-monetary solutions try to steer them back.

~~Wyonna~~ Cameron ~~Cam~~ Wyonna

Score		Score
7	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	8

Comments: Did appropriately time the conference. Effective listening.

Nice job clarifying what the party was saying - reflective listening.

8	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	7

Comments: ~~Seemed to waiver a~~ bit in neutrality. Seemed to waiver a bit in neutrality. Watch saying the other side is acting in good faith, - May make that party question you. ~~Don't interrupt co-mediator's~~

The plaintiff's hadn't said $200,000 was their final offer. Nice job clarifying what the offer of the defendant's was. Remained neutral. It's okay for the clients to interact w/each other in conference. When parties got a bit more argumentat may have been a good chance to diffuse the tension.

9	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	9

Comments: Watch interrupting co-mediator. You can do numbers, and solutions they said environmental so they could have creative there.

Mediators can suggest numbers and ideas :)

Good job stepping in when the parties started to argue + reminding them of the rules.

Over all both mediators did a nice job of clearly working with each side, each mediator took over one caucus. Balanced well and gave each other chance to ask for questions before ending each caucus. Some opportunities to come up w/ non money ideas

40

39

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

In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? Cameron

-1 T 41

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

T +1 42

Room # 219 Round 2 Judge Gina Verdoorn

Team # 10

Mediator Name: Anthony Hill

Team # 28

Mediator Name: I-Shen (Kelly) Wu

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
7	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments: Great job being supportive of co-mediator. Love you "drawing the 'cat'" example. Very good speed with your voice & tone	
7	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	8
	Comments: Thanks for clarifying what number they are offering. Thanks for recognizing the public interest accompany	

MED

Score		Score
8	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	10
	Comments:	
9	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	10
	Comments: - Very attentive to the clients Great questions for both sides	
10	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	10
	Comments:	
41		42

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? #2 8 mediator

38 .3 41 +3

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # 219 Round ____ Judge Larry Handley

Team # 10 Team # 28

Mediator Name: Anthony Hill Mediator Name: I-Shen (Kelly) Wu

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
7	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments: Actual Loss / Recovery Request } good; Strength vs. Weakness {$200,000.00}	
6	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	7
	Comments: good workable relationship w/ co-mediator; 3 principles/fd - good; confidential; Agmt to mediate to be signed; - they moved - so what can you do; Looking forward / good theme; Benefits of mediation; open minded; needs/interests - not positions - good	

Score		Score
8	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	8
	Comments: addressing safety issues / not for future but father comparative fault.	
8	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	9
	Comments: good communication skills good eye contact when addressing parties good effort to make sure parties understand process	
9	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	9
	Comments: very well done on both sides good communication and effort to find settlement	

38

41

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? #29

+2

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

-2

Room # LC220 Round 1 Judge Mark Deutsch

39 Team # 29

Mediator Name: Najib Gazi

Team # 8 37

Mediator Name: Stacy Davenport

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
7	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	7
	Comments: Weak explanation of process. Pls explain the benefits of confidentiality!	
8	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	8
	Comments: Mediator should ask both what they feel the chances of going to court are and what the judgment outcomes might be. Mediator should look at both are in agreement with the core issues	

Score		Score
8	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	7
	Comments: Najib did a good job at the end dismissing the talk about irrelevant issues and refocusing on the $$$	
8	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	7
	Comments: I would have liked to have seen more creativity by the Mediators good grip of the issues by both sides good thinking on their feet" - Some wondering off topic	
8	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	8
	Comments: good cooperation but not really great division of tasks and complimenting roles Mediators could do a better job keeping the relevant issues on track - pun intended... Creativity was a bit low	

39

37

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

In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? Najib Gaji

+1 38

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

-1 37

Room # LC-220 Round 1 Judge Henry Harmon

Team # 29 Team # 8

Mediator Name: Najib Gazi Mediator Name: Stacy Davenport

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
8	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	7
	Comments: Good Eye Contact - | Good ground rules -	
6	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	6
	Comments: ~~Good~~ Bringing up Other incidents Good: Bring up family need solution Confirm: No Offer | Good Summarize Strengths " Ask for Weakness What about interest in non $ consideration Good: Clarify Counter Offer Good: Restate Qs	

Score		Score
7	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	8
	Comments: Good Ask re: Other Concerns Good to reiterate interests of parties Confidentiality? Good to explore how far they can go Write / Document contends of damage itemization	
7	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	6
	Comments: ? Trust Could reign in "Training Costs" & Relevance How RR spends $ — any of their business How past impass	
10	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	10
	Comments: Good Cooperation Step in to narrow discussion Could Memorialize Agreement @ Session	

38

37

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? Majib Gazi

44

+5

39

-5

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # Law Clinic boardroom Round 1 Judge R. Bauer

Team # 23 Team # 14

Mediator Name: Carlos Ruiz Mediator Name: Lexi Austring

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
9	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments: keep hands visible, not hidden under table. otherwise, good equal eye contact, confident speech. | good body + handlanguage, but delivery sounded rehearsed (as in stageplay).	
9	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	8
	Comments: ~~@1 keep hands visible, not hidden under table~~ See also other mediator comments. replace "I understand" w/ "I hear what you're saying". (e.g.). Relaxed, professional, confident appearance + posing of questions. Did conduct the 1st caucus as requested. Found another questions, ask one more question, and another question, etc (to both) * mixed (~50/50 mediator involvement by both in 2nd caucus. | Lexi started out so I assume she is to conduct 1st caucus w/ team 27 but 1st caucus turned into a very collaborative, almost equal effort of both mediators. "Is there anything that you would like us to ask them?" → slippery slope. → Purpose? - good summary of co-mediators' 1st caucus.	

Mediator

Score		Score
8	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	7
	Comments: don't deviate from caucus, keep it equally paired (3x w/ one, then 3 times w/ other, no short cuts). replace "compromise" w/ (mutual) agreement.	
9	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments: ~ good/excellent performance, x remember hands. & a bit more generated Q's, ~~[illegible]~~, hands. ↳ natural mediator, leading (+/- bag) keep your body aligned w/ table or move it equally to each party, not angled favoring one of the parties throughout.	
9	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	9
44	Comments: Both worked well together, Carlos ~~[illegible]~~ propped up Lexi though, and not the other way around. Carlos is smooth, confident, comes across as in charge + control. Some of his refinement could rub. They started instead of "I think the safety latch was ~~[illegible]~~ off"	39

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

In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? #23

+1 46

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

-1 45

Room # CLINIC Library Round 1 Judge CASE

Team # 23 Mediator Name: Carlos Ruiz

Team # 14 Mediator Name: Lexi Avstring

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
10	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	9
	Comments: OVERALL "TONE" WAS GREAT GOOD EYE CONTACT - " LACK of Notes GOOD COVERAGE OF PROCESS POSSIBILITY OF NO SETTLEMENT = NO harm Really good statement EXCELLENT ORGANIZATION CONTENT WAS TERRIFIC SEEMED A LITTLE NERVOUS (OK) HAVE A NICE SMILE - SHOULD US IT MORE - RELAX. [WHY DID you interrupt advocate and say "talk to us?]	
8	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	9
	Comments: WAY TOO MUCH INVOLVEMENT WITH LEXI's 1st CAUCUS - SHE WAS DOING FINE - YOU JUMPED IN 3X MID CAUCUS REALLY DID GREAT DISCUSSING WITH "CARTER" REALLY SHINED WHEN OPENING up and having sincere discussion with party. ASKED ALL THE RIGHT QUESTIONS DIDN'T REALLY GET NEW (REDUCED) DEMAND 1st QUESTION → YOU ASKED NICK WHAT HIS "CEILING" WAS. Little too early to ask for "ceiling." Very nice relating that P's were sympathetic to Scott. - THIS WOULD HAVE Been a better way to open caucus. + conveying P concessions VERY Good Good, conversational style. (eye contact etc)	

Score		Score
10	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	10
	Comments: Nice job letting them talk. Possibly would have been better early in process.	
9	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments: The more relaxed and conversational Lexi became, the more she shined. Carlos had a great demeanor from start to finish.	
9	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	9
	Comments: Only negative - you both stepped on each other's 1st caucus time. Otherwise, you were a great team!	
46		45

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? 23 Carlos

43 (+2)

-2 41

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # 267 Round 1 Judge M. Roth

Team # 26 Team # 18

Mediator Name: Elle Lannon Mediator Name: Austin Duke

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
8	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	9
	Comments: Very soothing manner - Great! I liked that you encouraged creativity / Great explanation very calm	
9	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	8
	Comments: Very personable - I liked the summary of open. statements. Good job keeping positive w/ new offer + keeping framing. Great job getting at the strengths + weaknesses / I like that you reminded them of confidentiality. Good job getting the necessary info + encouraging movement	

26 Elle

18 Austin

Score		Score
7	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	6
	Comments: Perhaps setting structure would keep things less hostile / confrontational.	
9	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments: Great interpersonal skills Great job keeping it upbeat + moving. / Good job bringing in depth legal issues/argument back to a mediation/ resolution posture.	
10	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	10
	Comments: Great job working together! You worked together very well	

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

In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? Elle

44 (+1) -1 43

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # 267 OP Round II Judge Mary Lynn Neuhaus

Team # 26 Team # 18

Mediator Name: Elle Lannon Mediator Name: Austin Duke

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Nice job of introducing everyone. The two of you established good rapport right away.

Score	Criteria	Score
9	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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? Yes	9
	Comments: ELLE Authority to sign? Well done! AUSTIN - Liked the way the two of you shared the opening, and clear ground rules incl "YOU GUYS MUST GO." There are three women at the table. Sexist, stinky You both explained the process well, covered all the points. Nice job of smiling and nodding. Great non-verbal. Make certain that you ask if there is an offer on the table. It gives us a starting point AND that way the Δ does not have to bid against itself.	
9	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	9
	Comments: ELLE for Δ So you only want to pay 50% because of comparative fault, so we are looking at $160k Nope - $130 - $150, Now you have a bracket - let's see what you do. Lots of talk about attractive nuisance, CAN & HINA just made the mistake of bidding against themselves with $140k. You have a real advantage now in money this along. AUSTIN FOR TT See if you can find another word for weakness. Ask, what do you think a jury would find? You covered everything necessary. So we know that the offer is $265 at the 1st caucus. Nice job of including Elle at the end of process. Excellent summary of what clients said.	

ELLE | AUSTIN

Score		Score
6	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	5
	Comments: The parties are talking over each other. Try to have them take a breath. Please CALM the parties. Don't say that things are getting heated. Not really - just lawyer posturing. Keep language positive. ~~Don't tell~~	
10	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	10
	Comments: Neither mediator suggested a creative settlement possibility. OI & CV gave you a great tool Loved the Q about how OI and CV are not moving. Good to point out that CYN & H/NA have gone up $90K. CV came down to $200K from $250K. Excellent job getting her to move.	
10	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	10
	Comments: Obviously you are both experienced and have this down. You worked so well together.	

ELLE LAWSON

* This is the first thing I wrote - I am going to predict that this case will settle for half of damages: $162K. RESULT → $166K

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

→ **In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round?** 20 20 ELLE

Train safety in schools program

Close call. This was an excellent round and both mediators were stellar. The client-advocate teams were so NICE that they did not really challenge you. All around wonderful. Good luck on further

30 -2

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT +2 32
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # Opp 175 Round 1 Judge Kristen Hall

Team # 21 Team # 3

Mediator Name: Vijay Joshi Mediator Name: Lisa Gemmer

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
5	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	7
	Comments: Take a little more time to welcome everyone. Thus is your chance to set the time. Nice job explaining the process & making sure everyone understood	
6	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	6
	Comments: Make sure you take time to build rapport. You have a vulnerable dependent, need to make sure they understand what is going on. Take the time to build rapport. This one on one time can build that foundation. Ask more follow up to get underlying facts. Don't jump to the money too soon	

Score		Score
6	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	6
	Comments: Timing of the conference was appropriate after both sides expressed their opinions. The mediators could have facilitated the clarification of who was in the room + where it was coming from. Conference ended to soon	
6	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	6
	Comments: Both mediators addressed the issues but both could spend more time connecting with the parties and clarifying the specific issues on the table - Good job scheduling followup when things started to go off track	
7	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	7
	Comments: Mediators worked well between caucuses + conferences. Facts needed to be clarified earlier	

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? _____

33 -2

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

+2 35

Room # 175 Round 1 Judge Brunette

Team # 21
Mediator Name: Vijay Joshi

Team # 3
Mediator Name: Lisa Gemmer

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
5	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	7
	Comments: Deferred to Lisa to explain process & role. Should consider expanding opening statement	Explained process & role of mediator. May want to improve delivery
5	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	6
	Comments: Asked questions that could help structure a settlement. Could take more steps to structure direction of negotiations.	Encouraged parties to set forth goals & concerns about their case.

Vinay | Lisa

Score		Score
6	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	5
	Comments: Good job of identifying issue of source of settlement & that the confusion is impeding successful mediation. I appreciate your interest in encouraging parties to think outside the box, but this is the type of case that comes down to money.	
8	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments: Both mediators made concerted efforts to keep the parties focused & moving towards settlement. Mediators should work to develop more self confidence (or at least fake it in the presence of the pa	
9	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	9
	Comments: Very good cooperation in the face of a confusing fact scenario.	

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? _____

35 -2 (+2) 37

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # 261 Round 1 Judge Reiman

Team # 31 Team # 27

Mediator Name: Zahraa Saheb (plaid shirt) Mediator Name: Marissa Joers

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Z Score	Criteria	M Score
7	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments: M - took lead & handled logistics; held all power; take a break perfect solution; your mediation - repeated several times (all power) Did not discuss confidentiality line in sand/not in concrete - very good perfect resolution Z - congratulate all for taking 1st step (med); confidentiality ~~[illegible]~~	
7	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	7
	Comments: Z - took lead at beginning of 1st conf Z - what facts strong - excellent M - picked up red/green Z - empathic; restated facts well, excellent job of clarifying what may be disclosed M - ask Q's ∀ wants M's to ask - excellent M lead caucus w/ ∆; what strengths	

M - excellent job of starting second caucus - answering Delcan's Q's tell me your thoughts

C		M
Score		Score
7	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	7
	Comments:	
7	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments:	
7	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	7
	Comments:	

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? _____

37 -3

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

+3 40

Room # 61 Round _____ Judge Cathleen Siebrecht

Team # 31 Team # 27

Mediator Name: Zahraa Saheb Mediator Name: Marissa Joers

[redacted] Plaid Shirt

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
7	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	9
	Comments: Marissa - nice job explaining process, comparing to litigation, making parties comfortable 😊 Good "Line in Sand" analogy. Zahraa good explanation about/option to caucus. Make sure you try to make eye contact equally with both sides.	
7	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	8
	Comments: Zahraa - Good summation of strengths, weaknesses - Marissa - Good use of recognizing some holes in the advocate's explanation so that you as mediator have a correct understanding of the case.	

Score		Score
7	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	7
	Comments: "Conferences" between client & advocates appeared to occur naturally. Both did a good job allowing advocates to communicate w/clients as needed. Group conference was called a little too early (but understood time constra. due to competi.	
9	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	9
	Both exhibited all the above qualities!	
	Comments: Marissa - good suggestion when Defendants were not willing to comitt "Scott" to being part of "train Program" to get them to at least agree to discuss it with him. Zahraa -	
7	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	7
	Comments: Not much interaction w/one another but regardless both concentrated on parties; didn't waste time with eachother. Very Respectful of one another, didn't interupt each other. Don't be afraid to bounce ideas off of each other.	

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? Marissa

24 (+3) -3 21

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # 268 Round 1 Judge Neil Browne

Team # 1

Mediator Name: Jorge Noguera

Team # 2

Mediator Name: Andrew Thain

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
5	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	6
	Comments: Andrew – good eye contact. You seemed to want to communicate w/ the parties. Andrew – please be more conversational. You seem to be reading off a teleprompter in terms of your tone. Also, your comments h no unity. They seem like you are going over a mental list in your head. Jorge – you are running through a mental list of what you should say. talk.	
7	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	5
	Comments: Andrew, search below the obvious. The plaintiff wants money but what other needs do they have. The plaintiff's counsel is a great Mock Trial witness. ~~Andrew – I like your emphasis on liability. I would have liked to hear more about comparative negligence, rather than just saying the words over + over.~~ Jorge – I'm glad you asked – is there more than money. Mediators – The rule is 1 person does the first caucus fi each side. Jorge – great exploration of court costs.	

Score		Score
3	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	3

Comments:
A conference is called when the parties are very far apart. Plaintiffs have not shown a willingness to move beyond de minimus offers. Poor timing for a conference. The conference becomes war-like.

5	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	4

Comments:
Both mediators are efficient + trained. Neither has the kind of warmth that would relax the clients. Both mediators, especially ~~the~~ Andrew, need to focus on listening below the surface. Repeat what the parties say is only the beginning of listening skills. Andrew ~~[illegible]~~ - don't suggest to parties what should be confidential. The parties are rigid; they make moves, but they moves are so negligible that the mediator should be prepared for a 2-week mediation. Mediate

4	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	3

Comments:
Jorge does strong work late in mediation trying to find out the interests lying behind the rigidity of the ~~#~~ plaintiff. Mediators have 2 tough advocate/client pairs. These provide terrific opportunities to provide mediator chops to solve the problem

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? _____

39 (+4) -4 35

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # 264 Round 1 Judge Anthony Scifo

Team # 11 | Team # 2
Mediator Name: Jorge Noguera | Mediator Name: Andrew Thain

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
8	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	6
	Comments: ← SPLIT → • Confirmation that Dec. makers are present • 3 tenets of mediation 1. Voluntary 2. Neutrality 3. Confidentiality • Hands! ∴ Bring to the table repetitive ∴ created some distraction. • Knowledgeable about the process; clearly defined	
9	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	8
	Comments: • Asked about creative solutions other than monetary • Made assumptions ; spoke for client family • Led well generally • Addressed Q's asked by OP. as asked. • Asked about C.o.O. • Promoted Mediation well ∴ discouraged Trial well. (costs) • Engaged well w/ Advocates. • Forgot to ask about reaffirmation of 1st offer	

Score		Score
7	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	6
	Comments: (1) Parties met after ~~[illegible]~~ 2nd Caucus. (2) (3)	
7	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (1-10 points) (1) Did the mediator establish rapport and trust with the parties? (2) was he/she neutral and nonjudgmental, and did he/she maintain confidentiality? (3) Did he/she remain patient, positive, persistent and professional at all times? (4) Did the mediator employ techniques of active listening as well as proposing creative settlement possibilities where necessary or appropriate? (5) Did the mediator recognize and appropriately deal with any ethical and/or cross cultural issues?	7
	Comments: (*) Assertively Attempted to Reign in both sides (*) Had each party Review how Mediation Ended & to verify	
8	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)? Mediators gave each other liberal Amount of ~~[illegible]~~ Deference	8
	Comments:	

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

In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? Mr. Nogueira

27 -20

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT +20 47
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # 177 Round 1 Judge MacKenzie Dreeszen

Team # 22 Team # 24

Mediator Name: Taylor Yancey Mediator Name: Adam Coe

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
4	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	9
	Comments: -Taylor- I felt that the info you provided was good, but I would have liked to hear more. You also seemed nervous, which doesn't help the parties to feel comfortable. -Adam- great job giving details. Explained your role in a way that was easy to understand, and your demeanor was very appropr	
5	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	9
	Comments: -Adam- good job escorting parties in & out - good job asking Taylor to lead -Taylor- good probative ?'s - take a larger role while meeting w/ first party	

Score		Score
5	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	9
	Comments: Adam - good job asking Brianna about contingency funds - good job stepping back to let advocates & clients communicate with each other Taylor - definitely warmed up, & demeanor ~~got~~ better	
6	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	10
	Comments: - Adam - you seemed very professional but still natural - Taylor - Stayed neutral, but also stiff	
7	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	10
	Comments: Adam - good job giving Taylor opportunities to speak Taylor - take the chance to speak when he gives it	

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? Mediator 24 (Adam)

29 -16 +16 45

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # 177 Round 1 Judge CH Pelton

Team # 22 Team # 24

Mediator Name: Taylor Yancey Mediator Name: Adam Coen

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
5	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	9
	Comments: Adam has fine demeanor + very effective opening statement.	
5	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	8
	Comments:	

Score		Score
6	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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? Comments: Adam continues to keep the momentum going.	9
6	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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? Comments: Adam does a remarkably fine job & mature	10
7	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)? Comments:	9

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? Adam Coen

35 -4 (+4) 39

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # LL269 Round 1 Judge John Rink

Team # 9 Team # 15

Mediator Name: CLAYTON SLAGLE Mediator Name: YING GAO

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
5	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments: • a little bit of nerves on both sides showing at the start • avoid "up talking" • memory loss • need to touch all the bases • Good to get introductions • You were interrupted by the sec'y and didn't get a chance to ~~[illegible]~~ restart • How does it work? Good question from a party; Good answer dis you	
6	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	7
	Comments: This is a first caucus. Isn't one of you supposed to do all the talking on each side.	

Score		Score
8	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	8
	Comments: Are you going to hold a conference? OK, I hope it goes well. There wasn't much left to do.	
8	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments:	
8	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	8
	Comments: Pretty good! You got better as you went along. Events did not work in your favor, but you did well.	

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? 15

33 -6

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

+6 39

Room # 269 Round 1 Judge Van Der Maaten

Team # 9
Mediator Name: Clayton Slagle

Team # 15
Mediator Name: Ying Gao

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
6	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments: Good explanation of mediation pointed out contract outcome – better than Judge Bring back for everyone to seek solution Asking questions to clarify opening statements is good idea Good to do introduction of all parties. Good description of benefits of mediation win-win situation is positive approach Confidentiality Nice job of explaining process Nice idea to stop and ask for questions	
6	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	8
	Comments: Good job of asking if can communicate info to other side Sought response to demand by plaintiff Good job of being thorough in description of other parties' proposal Nice job of getting them to talk Brought up strengths + got to weaknesses Good follow-up best/worst case Be careful in confronting parties (50/50 to reduce damages by half) & neutral Brought out costs of litigation Had to push on $ amt of offer – not insured	

Score		Score
7	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	7
	Comments: Good timing to do conference — tied up loose ends and dealt with details of non-monetary settlement	
6	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments: patient persistent neutral good rapport professional active listener	
8	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	8
	Comments: worked well together good job of sharing responsibilities final review of settlement details always a good idea	

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? Ying Bao

37 -2

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT

MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

+2 39

Room # 15 Round 1 Judge Dale Sikes

Team # 13

Mediator Name: Peter Guess

Team # 30

Mediator Name: Sofia Zocca

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
7	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	9
	Comments: Relax you are in charge - / Good eye contact -	
8	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	8
	Comments: Good eye contact / concise - directed / get the parties to broach ideas - / How do we avoid court? / Good interaction -	

Score		Score
6	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	6
	Comments: STAY IN CONTROL / DIRECT CONVERSATION / STAY in control / DIRECT THE CONVERSATION	
8	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments: GOOD SUGGESTIONS / good eye contact / Kept involved – ATTENTIVE	
8	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	8
	Comments:	

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? SOFIA

36 -6

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT

+6 42

MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # 445 Round 90 min Judge Knudson E

Team # 13 Team # 30

Mediator Name: Peter Guess Mediator Name: Sofia Zocca

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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.***

no tie

Below Average	Average	Good	Excellent
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
8	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	9
	Comments: 8 #13 Good analogy (Budget) checking Notes a good idea to be as clear as possible #30 9 Great Smile clear friendly voice	
7	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	9
	Comments: #13 good referencing w inferences tempo well done what did you know Good? #30 nods show understanding Great! clearity - good discussion eye contact well done	

#13 #30

Score		Score
1	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	8
	Comments: (1) (8)	
8 (8)	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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? (9)	9
	Comments:	
6	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	7
	Comments:	

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? 30

33 -6

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT +6

39

MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # LL16 Round 1 Judge BELAY

Team # 17

Mediator Name: Hannah L Smith

Team # 25

Mediator Name: Kristen Field

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
6	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments: Hannah - puzzle analogy - good - cooperation + neutrality. Kristen - good explanation of role. Very good tone + demeanor / also followup after opening. Could slow down a little - both	
7	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	8
	Comments: Hannah - good followup. style - Kristen - good to recognize the concession. by π - good to ask of weaknesses (already heard strengths) Hannah - good question - anything you want to say privately - draw them into process. ~~Tried~~ push. ~~[illegible]~~ + ~~[illegible]~~ - (Why won't [illegible] insurance co.)	

Score		Score
6	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	7
	Comments: Hannah – good instinct to ask f offer from Δ Kristen – good transition – slow down on questions (wait f answers)	
6	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments: Hannah – settled into the role – good rapport + techniques Kristen – good technique – work on ask a question, wait... hard to do Hannah – good idea to do suggest bracking – good timing.	
8	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	8
	Comments: – Good, respectful working relationship – – At some point, ok to tell MDS it was their time to move – Posturing is hard to counteract. – – Community event – That ins co. pays f. Divorce issue – ask f permission to tell Δ that π already knew about that.	

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

In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? Kristen #25

Conference – use rarely (minimum)
Caucus – keeps emotions down
Mediators – consider suggesting stopping conference when emotions get high.

44 -1

(+1) 45

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # LL16 Round 1 Judge Payson

Team # 17
Mediator Name: Hannah L Smith

Team # 25
Mediator Name: Kristen Field

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
8	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	9
	Comments: Good clear explanation. Hannah talked less than Kristen. Very good. Both did a fine job! / Nice friendly manner. Informative. Relaxing. Excellent.	
9	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	9
	Comments: Kristen Good summary of what Sarah did day and. Best case result for med? Worst case scenario? / To Sarah what are the risks in your case? K + H did not ask for a specific response to $50K offer. K's? to Grata/Nathan	

Hannah did most of talking

H - Followed up on non-monetary options.

Hannah to Grata: anything else you want to add. Re strength of case? Weakness of your case?

Why $50K?

Best option? (Grata) Settle.

Score	3. Conference: (1-10 points)	Score
8	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	8
Hannah asked questions along the [illegible] case. Good summary	Comments: Good and more info. The 2 mediators worked very well together. Good? about damages + repair. Before 1st caucus Good explanation. Conf 1st so ? can be answered. Good ? have opening ? Great $50K - "initial" offer	
9	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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? None perceived.	9
	Comments: Both did a very good job in establishing trust + rapport. Both were non-judgmental. Showed real interest. Patient, positive and professional. Good persistence + follow through. Both of them impressed me.	
10	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	10
	Comments: Excellent cooperation & different, but complementary styles. I thought both of the Mediators deserved a 10 within the particular situation - never having worked together before (presumably), college students new to mediation (not lawyers). Hard for me to give anyone a perfect score. I prefer 9.5, but that's not available, so	

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

In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? I give the close nod to Kirsten based on style. However, Hannah did a great job. Very hard to call.

(Award a 10)

40 -2

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

+2 42

Room # Opp. 262 Round 1 Judge Marcus Smetka

Team # 16 Team # 5

Mediator Name: Lauren Webster Mediator Name: Chelsie Schmitz

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
8	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	9
	Comments: - Explained purpose/role of mediators - Described legal effect/impact of process - Very reassuring to advocate(s)/client(s) - Enthusiastic, expressed optimism + excitement - Great job explaining process + purpose of mediation	
8	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	8
	Comments: - Very engaging w/ client + advocate - Thorough job of getting facts from client/advocate - Great job proposing non-monetary damages to opposing party - Wanted a specific percentage/split of fault from parties ☺ Great way to get a starting point for negotiating - Use of hypotheticals - Suggesting non-monetary damages in settlement - Tried to find a damage cap - Proposed potential middle ground	

	Team #16	Team #5
Score	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	Score
8		8
	Comments: - Let both parties discuss openly - Allowed parties to reach settlement - Ensured agreement was finalized	
8	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	9
	Comments: - Great job of asking questions & allowing parties to answer - Stayed neutral, very professional - Was always sure to clarify what each side was willing to disclose - Very engaging w/ all parties - Creative settlement suggestions	
8	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	8
	Comments: - Both worked well together - Didn't interupt co-mediator, took turns speaking w/ client/advocates - Both worked well together	
40		42

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

In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? Team #5: Chelsie Schmitz

45 (+2) **INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT** 43

MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM -2

Room # 262 Round 1 Judge Annie Tucker

Team # 16 Team # 5

Mediator Name: ~~Chelsie Schmitz~~ Lauren Webster Mediator Name: ~~Lauren Webster~~ Chelsie Schmitz

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
9	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	9
	Comments: Both mediators were prepared & made a successful effort to calm & inform the parties. Both collaboratively explained mediation, their role, neutrality & confidentiality. Lauren said - Don't worry about time spent in caucus - use just clarifying questions. - Good. • I did wonder if words like "keep upbeat, be willing to compromise, children fight & adults compromise" would be welcome or too strong for the parties. What is a good balance between encouraging & mirroring? Straightforward & clear. We want an agreement beneficial to everyone involved.	
9	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	8
	Comments: It seemed that they worked together. They had created an environment where parties spoke honestly. Lauren - Good - Good questions + restating. "... want to elaborate...?" (re safety latch) Good - "I want to reiterate.." re itemizing costs MDS had incurred (already paid. She made sure all #'s added up. Restated re strengths. Chelsie - asked good clarification question re MDS take ownership but not complete responsibility. - Can you put a percentage on liability? [50/50] - Good on Restate of itemized payments. Asked open-ended opening question to ins. co. ✓ Good - what would happen in com	

Asked if 50,000 = ceiling.

★ Good clarification w/ Insurance - "there was no intent"

they said they had a strong case

Lauren asked where is safety latch on the switch?

Revealed MDS perception of 50/50 & itemization of 275,000. Said - And you are willing to pay 50,000?

Score		Score
8	**3. Conference:** (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?	7

↳ is this too involved with own concerns?

Chelsie - re conference "It might be good to hear more about Tamica's side."

w/ MDS - Chelsea (+ Lauren agreed) - We really appreciate that - your good faith effort - is that supportive AND neutral?

Comments:

- Represented the 75,000 offer.
- Represented details of desired settlement pkg.
- Asked her questions about modifying height of switch.

Good response to parties MDS wanting to clarify what they do/don't want conveyed & good asking.

Chelsie - good clarification about relaying concerns & info re Scott's mom.

→ Ch - We are working really hard w/ other party → I question perception of neutrality

9	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	9

said that MDS needed the 200,000 to cover safety/prevention actions. *

Comments: Mediators are the process people: Good when restating, asking questions, confirming what they did & don't want to reveal to other parties. & conveying.

Concern re perception of neutrality - "If we could get them to budge to 150,000 & - "We are working hard w/ the other party (Scott)"

10	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	10

Comments: Lauren did a good job of caucusing w/ Chelsie before 2nd cauc. w/ MDS.

Seemed to be a good balance between them. Worked together effectively to provide an opportunity for the parties to express what was important to them & what they wanted & why. Usually remembered @ end of caucus to ask parties what they did & didn't want conveyed. Keep in mind the 'perception of neutrality.'

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

In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? Lauren

Lauren asked us whether going to 2nd cauc = ok w/ us.

Lauren & Chelsie - what could be part of settlement pkg - & Chelsie restated settlement pkg & asked for anything else; Be sure to ask if anything we shouldn't convey

#150,000 is more than 50/50

35 -5 | +5 32 40

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT

MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # 282 Round 1 Judge LYN KENDRICK

Team # 32 Team # 4

Mediator Name: JAMIE Mediator Name: CAITLYN

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

JAMIE Score	Criteria	CAITLYN Score
7	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments: C — OVERSELL — 345 PATIENCE PRAC — MED. LIKE A DAY AT THE BEACH [illegible] ?? TRIAL LIKE STORM — BATTERED W/ WIND / CONFIDENT. J — HELP W/ NEW IDEAS / LIKE RECIPE. BE OPEN-MINDED. DIDN'T FINISH GROUND RULES GOOD. Both should have clarified atty's role — family or PR?	
7	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	8
	Comments: C — should ask for more specifics re prevention. What is best outcome? Worst outcome — ?? re atty not helpful to client. Need for non-monetary. Confid. agreement value. J — Why PP thinks strong case. Asked for more prevention — Backed down when PP not prepared to share specifics. Checked confid. terms — Needs more confidence. How case affected family — Not enough prevention. Train safety class OK — Other concerns beyond monetary or new offers. Did not push ins. co. further. No questions to mother re warnings to Scott previously re.	

Caitlyn dominant. How affected PP? Would add re [illegible]. Ins. adjuster not present, no further authority. Would Mom consider job w/ PP?

Score		Score
6	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	8
	Comments: Asked about ins. co. offer → up to $100K. Why does family have good chance in court? C shouldn't back in med. before probing more w/ PP – Good spiel re costs of trial. T needs to add perspective after C. Too quiet. Did ask for more $$.	

C – good in clarifying $s. Parties agree to 40/60 split.

Score		Score
7	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments: C skillful in explaining process, articulating specific issues, clarifying questions & concerns, kept momentum going. T – attentive to parties, listens carefully, very careful wording. Should be more confident.	
8	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	8
	Comments:	
35		40

Lyn Kendrick

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

In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? Caitlyn

30 -1

(+1) 31

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # 282 Round 1 Judge JASON WALKE

Team # 32 Team # 4

Mediator Name: Jamie Zheng Mediator Name: Caitlyn Reeder

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
6	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	7
	Comments: Emphasis on "practicality"... good. Try to avoid putting time constraints on the process. Starting w/a confident outlook... good. Be careful w/ "cute" catch phrases... they can be good but they can also be a little too "canned". Good pace.	
6	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	6
	Comments: I like you asking the parties if they had questions. Good question @ "what could you have done"... they didn't answer but, by refusing to answer, they would. Good use of the phrase "reality check". You got the parties wrong as you asked for opening statements. Good first question in the caucus. You need to respond to them hammering on insurance. the jury won't hear that. Make sure you listen to what they say... they pick it up... the lady said 50/50... its a short trip to 51/49.	

The π being concerned @ btey is your biggest lever against the Δ

This is the score for the mediator

Score 5

3. Conference: (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?

Score 5

This is the score for the media

move these comments to the other sheet

Comments: LAWYER: you need to know who you represent... you should be pushing for the ins. co. to pay $160K

I liked you talking @ "good news" no fatalities. You played the "we're leaving card at the right time.

6

4. Qualities of a Good Mediator: (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?

6

Comments: You both did a good job being not judgmental. You both need to work on being "in charge" without being "bossy". That's the true skill of a mediator.

7

5. Cooperation Between Mediators (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)?

7

Comments:

This is tough. You both did a nice job trying to do your job while at the same time being respectful of the other.

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

In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? TEAM 4

45 (+1) -1 44

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # LL 4 Round _____ Judge Susan Low

Team # 12 Team # 19

Mediator Name: Hannah Boal #12 Mediator Name: Lorraine Marsh #19

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
9	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	9
	Comments: Good job explaining caucus and how process will work / Good job of emphasizing comfort / confidentiality	
9	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	9
	Comments: Did a good job at caucus with each / Handled the caucus well made atty and client comfortable with	

Hannah started 2nd caucus thinking that offer — obviously relying on Lorraine's having put on board / put $75K on board BEFORE agreement to offer or to reveal. Maybe I misheard but thought they said not to disclose $ just desire to settle

Score		Score
9	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	9
	Comments: After break in conference did a good job of reminding parties of goal of mediation / Good job of getting parties back on track when they got hung up on	
8	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	7
	Comments: Handled yourself and and the process well neutral and / Good job reminding parties that timing vs cost of value Marked down only on confidentiality of placing $ 75k on board Before agreement to do so. Did have agreement to put up breakdown — Only flaw, Otherwise very professional	
10	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	10
	Comments: Excellent / Excellent	

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? HANNAH

+3 44

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

-3 41

Room # ~~123~~ 124 Round 1 Judge S HERRIOTT

Team # 1 Team # 6

Mediator Name: ~~Anna~~ Christine Lee Mediator Name: Ellie Anglin

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
9	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	8

Comments:

Nice "although a conflict has brought you here ... " Nice points about control, communication, procedure. Good explanation of caucus.

Great "jigsaw puzzle" metaphor. Nice explanation of caucus vs conference.

Score	Criteria	Score
9	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	8

Comments:

Good review of the Ps desired outcome or demand at end of 1st caucus. Nice initial review of points. Great that you asked D to think about other Ps strengths + weak pts. This is very important in a 1st caucus. Good to ask about movement toward solution. And asking about costs of litigation. Good review of Ps statements from the 1st caucus. Good summary of points to obtain answers to P's questions.

Good use of questions to the RR. Good rapport established with them. Good review of confidential points! Nice review of points with the Ds though it was your co-mediator's caucus. You worked well together.

#1

MEDIATORS

#6

Score		Score
8	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	8
	Comments: Good review of what a joint conf is and rule of the conference. Good review of points in the memorandum of agreement. Good explanation of 1st caucus to the P. Interesting suggestion of alternative childcare but I'm not clear how that moves the P's closer to a financial solution. SORRY - THIS WAS NOT IN CONFERENCE Good discussion with both parties in conference.	
9	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments:	
9	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	9
	Comments: Worked very well together. Each contributed equally to the effectiveness of the team	
44		41

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? _____

47 (T) (x1)

-1 46 (T)

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # ~~123~~ 124 Round 1 Judge Brooks ~~II~~ [illegible]

Team # 1 Team # 6

Mediator Name: Christine Lee Mediator Name: Ellie Anglin

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
10	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	9
	Comments: Use of phrases such as: "Would You like ..." "Do You have ..." are all well & good, but consider the tension between empowerment and your authority to guide others. / Always be cognizant the "rules" are mechanisms of facilitation. Your command of the process is great. Just remember you facilitate the process itself. Rules are mechanisms of that role.	
9	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	10
	Comments: It's important to be a good listener. But the saying: "Communication is a two-way street" is by far an over-simplification. Even wrong. Consider listening in a multiplicity of ways. / Excellent in this section Ellie! Are there other areas to which you might direct your powers of observation & information gathering?	

Score		Score
9	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	9
	Comments: See. Comments below.	
10	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	10
	Comments: Both did an excellent job here... so to be fair — words of critique: Consider handing-off the ball to your audience. Inspire thoughtfulness in your participants. Watching that dynamic unfold teaches YOU about the way the session mig unfold.	
(LWBA) See: #2 As reconcilation 8	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	8
#6 47	Comments: Ask Yourselves: what is the difference between an undefeated tag-team Pro-wrestling team and a Las Vegas magic/illusionist team?	46

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? Ms. Lee

34 -4 (+4) 38

INTERNATIONAL INTERCOLLEGIATE MEDIATION TOURNAMENT
MEDIATOR EVALUATION FORM

Room # LL4 Round 1 Judge KELINSON

Team # 12 Team # 19

Mediator Name: HANNAH BOAL Mediator Name: LORRAINE MARSH

Instructions: The tournament utilizes co-mediators from different schools. The mediators are each to be scored independently 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	7 8	9 10

Score	Criteria	Score
7	**1. Opening Statement of the Mediator:** (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?	8
	Comments: NICE BRIDGE METAPHOR / GOOD CONFIDENTIALITY DISCUSSION THEATRE DISCUSSION INTERESTING	
8	**2. First Caucus:** (1-10 points) (Each mediator will conduct a first caucus with 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?	8
	Comments: GOOD DAMAGES DEVELOPMENT / MOVED THE DISCUSSION WELL IN 1ST CAUCUS FOCUS ON SWITCH LATCH VERY GOOD / GOOD JOB OF SETTING UP CONFERENCE	

Score		Score
6	**3. Conference:** (1-10 points) (The mediators are required to conduct at least on 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?	8
	Comments: NICE EFFORT TO GET CONFERENCE BACK ON TRACK / GOOD JOB OF GETTING INTO DISCUSSION TO RE-DIRECT FROM FACTS TO SETTLEMENT DOLLARS	
6	**4. Qualities of a Good Mediator:** (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?	7
	Comments: VERY GOOD JOB, BUT PERHAPS TOO PASSIVE - ALTHOUGH NOT MUCH NEED AS SETTLEMENT REACHED IN CONFERENCE / CERTAINLY NEUTRAL — DID NOT CLARIFY CONFIDENTIALITY ONE TIME GOOD JOB MOVING CONFERENCE TO DISCUSSION	
7	**5. Cooperation Between Mediators** (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)?	7
	Comments: NICE DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITY IN OPENING, LESS CLEAR WHO WAS DOING WHAT LATER ON BUT EACH CONTRIBUTED TO THE EVENTUAL SETTLEMENT	

Ties are NOT permitted. Please check your scores to ensure that the participants have not received the same total score.
In your judgment, who was the better Mediator in this round? MARSH