Arbitrator *

_____

Email *

_____

Claimant

Claimant *

[select ▼]

Claimant - Al Nahrain University - Team Member 1 *

[select ▼]

Claimant Team Member 1 Score *

[select ▼]

Claimant - Al Nahrain University - Team Member 2 *

[select ▼]

Claimant Team Member 2 Score *

[select ▼]

Respondent

Respondent *

| ▲▼ |

Respondent - Al Nahrain University - Team Member 1 *

| ▲▼ |

Respondent Team Member 1 Score *

| ▲▼ |

Respondent - Al Nahrain University - Team Member 2 *

| ▲▼ |

Respondent Team Member 2 Score *

| ▲▼ |

Instructions

SCORING

There is no requirement that the arbitral panel agree on scores. However, the arbitral panels may, and are strongly encouraged to, discuss scoring at the end of a hearing and prior to submitting the scores to the Moot administration. Please also consider a few words of constructive advice that arbitrators can give to the students as feedback to help them improve their arguments. Kindly find guidelines to scoring below for your reference.

Each arbitrator will score each of the orators ON A SCALE OF 50 TO 100.

GRADES

EXCELLENT: 91-100; VERY GOOD: 75-90; GOOD: 60-74; IMPROVEMENT NEEDED: 50-59

PLEASE SUBMIT THIS FORM AT THE END OF THE ARGUMENT. THANK YOU! Arriving at a score in the oral hearings

Each arbitrator is expected to make an individual decision as to the score to be awarded. Nevertheless, a widely divergent score, whether higher or lower than the others, raises questions as to the criteria used by the arbitrator in question. As such arbitrators are encouraged to confer with a view to having scores that are within the same band ((50 – 59 = improvement needed); (60 -74 = good); (75 - 90 = very good); (91 - 100 = excellent)) or otherwise generally within 10 marks.

Criteria to be regarded in the evaluation of the oralists are:

1) Organization and Preparation

Does counsel introduce himself or herself and co-counsel, state whom he or she is

representing, introduce the issues and relevant facts clearly, have a strong opening, present the arguments in an effective sequence, and present a persuasive and generalized conclusion?

Is counsel clearly prepared and familiar with the authorities on which his or her arguments rely? If rebuttal is used, is it used effectively?

2) Knowledge of the facts and the law

Does counsel know the facts and the relevant law thoroughly? Is counsel able to relate the facts to the law so as to make a strong case for his or her client?

Does counsel present arguments which are logically plausible and legally tenable. (Please recall though that you are not assessing the success or otherwise of the legal argument itself).

3) Presentation

Is counsel's presentation appropriately paced, free of mannerisms and loud enough?

Does counsel use inflection to avoid monotone delivery, make eye contact with the arbitrators and balance due deference with a forceful and professional argument? Is counsel poised and tactful under pressure? Most importantly, is counsel's presentation convincing and persuasive, regardless of the merits of the case?

4) Handling Questions

Does counsel answer questions directly and use the opportunity to turn the question to his or her client's advantage?

Scoring Sheet Guideline

Excellent (91-100)

As this is a Pre-Moot, oralists arguments are still in development, it is not expected that any team should receive an Excellent Score (90 - 100), unless they present a flawless argument and showcase a significant knowledge of the law.

Very good (75 - 90)

- **Illustrates a strong command of the relevant facts and laws to the case Only minor presentational flaws**
- **Strong command on how to utilize citations**

Good (60 - 74)

- **Understands the order of the arguments**
- **Illustrates some strong arguments**
- **Responsive to questions posed at basic level**
- **Provides known citations for the case**
- **Illustrates a general command of the facts and the record**

Needs Improvement (50 - 59)

- **Poor management of time**
- **Poor structure of argument**
- **Poor understanding of the facts and record of the case Non-responsive to questions posed by the arbitrator Lacks knowledge on law and facts**
- **Unprofessional demeanor and poor body language**

Submit Form