

UC Berkeley Law Competitions

Halloum Negotiation Competition

2026 Scoring Rubric

Name of Scorer/Judge:		Date:	
Email:		Phone Number:	

SCORING & FEEDBACK EXPECTATIONS FOR JUDGES

Thank you for your invaluable support of Berkeley Law students through these advocacy competitions. We are incredibly grateful for your time and expertise, as these events would not be possible without you.

These competitions expose law students to legal practice through a constructive learning environment. To ensure a positive experience for all participants, we ask that you keep the following expectations in mind:

- **Professionalism and Kindness:** Please interact with students in a kind and professional manner. Many of them are participating in a competition of this nature for the first time.
- **Targeted Feedback:** All feedback should be specific, tied directly to the criteria you have been asked to assess, and focused on the skills demonstrated.
- **Time Management:** Oral feedback following the round should be limited to 5-7 minutes per judge.
- **Constructive Oral Feedback:** When providing oral feedback, please identify 1-2 things each team did well and 1 specific area for improvement with actionable suggestions.

UC Berkeley Law Competitions

All judges should give separate scores for **each team** evaluated, starting on pages **3 and 7**.

Notes will not be shared with students. Give pertinent feedback orally.

SCORING GUIDELINES

While judging, remember that the goal of this competition for first-year law students is to promote fundamental negotiation skills. You'll notice that in an effort to reduce the impact of bias and improve the accuracy of scoring, this rubric provides categories of evaluation and includes objective criteria for each category to guide scores. **Please refer to the provided criteria throughout the negotiation and give an average performance the benchmark score to ensure consistency of scoring.**

We expect all judges to be fair and objective in their evaluations of student performance. Unconsciously, we all carry favorable and unfavorable biases that can impact our assessments of others. These attitudes and stereotypes can shape our decisions without our knowledge, so it is important to be mindful of implicit bias when judging students in an advocacy competition. As a judge, you are encouraged to think critically and assess all students' performances consistently.

During the negotiation, please consider taking notes so you can provide detailed & constructive oral feedback that will benefit the students' learning. Upon completion of the round, we ask that you immediately proceed to complete your scores without discussing your thoughts with others. On the last page of this document, please make sure to list all scores in the table provided and calculate the total score.

After completing your scoring, then each judge should provide oral feedback to the participants using your rubric as a guide but not revealing your scores or who "won" the round (What went well? What could each team have done differently to be more effective?). (Your written notes will not be made available to students.)

SCORING STANDARDS

To ensure uniformity in scoring, please keep the following standards in mind:

1-2	Poor	<u>Lacking fundamental</u> knowledge, preparation, or skill
3-4	Fair	Exhibiting <u>basic</u> knowledge, preparation, or skill
5-6	Good <i>Benchmark</i>	Exhibiting a <u>solid base</u> of knowledge, preparation, or skill
7-8	Very Good	Exhibiting <u>advanced</u> knowledge, preparation, or skill
9-10	Excellent	Exhibiting <u>exemplary</u> knowledge, preparation, or skill
A detailed description of a "10" score will be provided with each question. Scorers should be hesitant to provide a 10 score unless they truly believe there is no room for improvement.		

UC Berkeley Law Competitions

Negotiation Time:		Team Number:	
Full Name of Team Member 1			
Full Name of Team Member 2			

I. OVERALL CASE PRESENTATION

Score: /10

Benchmark score: 5-6

A top-scoring team will:

- Present the facts and law in a way that could be heard productively by the other side
- Offer proposals in a manner that reflected careful planning and skillful implementation
- Accurately assess and discuss any business or litigation benefits or risks and consequences of failing to reach a settlement
- Start the conversation strategically, set up rationale and justifications for future offers/counteroffers, and provide more than baseline levels of organization

Notes:

II. ADVOCATING CLIENT'S INTERESTS & OUTCOME OF SESSION

Score: /10

Benchmark score: 5-6

A top-scoring team will:

- Serve the client's goals regardless of whether an agreement was reached
- Understand and advance the client's legal and non- legal interests throughout
- Make sure to not sacrifice the client's interests for the sake of collaboration or competitive advantage

Notes:

UC Berkeley Law Competitions

III. TEAMWORK

Score: /10

Benchmark score: 5-6

A top-scoring team will:

- Communicate effectively with each other as teammates and consistently work together throughout the round
- Provide mutual support to each other as teammates whenever appropriate

Notes:

IV. PROBLEM-SOLVING & RELATIONSHIP BUILDING WITH OPPOSING TEAM

Score: /10

Benchmark score: 5-6

A top-scoring team will

- Work well with the opposing team to contribute and not detract from achieving their own client's best interests
- Establish a problem-solving relationship with the other side if possible
- Recognize the other side's interests and try to satisfy them if helpful to their own client's interests
- Take initiative to convert other team into problem-solvers if discussions become difficult (rather than participating in ineffective circular argumentation)

Notes:

UC Berkeley Law Competitions

V. MAKING EFFECTIVE OFFERS/COUNTEROFFERS & GENERATING CREATIVE OPTIONS

Score: /10

Benchmark score: 5-6

A top-scoring team will:

- Generate a range of legal and non-legal options to meet the client's interests as well as the interests of the other side
- Choose options based on interests and, if appropriate, objective criteria
- Actively encourage the development of creative ideas generally
- Effectively manage distributive bargaining ("hard numbers") aspects of the deal when relevant
- Make attempts to "sell" counterpart offers by appealing to areas of crossover in the other side's interests
- Counteroffers were responsive to reactions from the other side without sacrificing their own client's interests

Notes:

VI. POST-NEGOTIATION ANALYSIS

Score: /10

Benchmark score: 5-6

A top-scoring team will:

- Exhibit preparation and forethought that shows evidence of effective strategic thinking in their planning and strategy
- Demonstrate they learned from the negotiation and recognized the strengths and weaknesses of their performance and their outcome appropriately.

Notes:

UC Berkeley Law Competitions

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Did the team observe ethical standards? Examples of potential ethical violations include:

- Misrepresenting material facts purposefully
- Grossly exceeding negotiating authority
- Inventing self-serving facts

Circle: YES or NO

YES	<i>This team conducted itself ethically</i>
NO	<i>I observed a possible ethical violation by this team*</i>

*If you selected NO, thereby indicating a possible ethical violation, please provide a brief explanation here. Without an explanation, we will not consider a team to have participated unethically.

Notes:

END OF ROUND

At the end of the round, and before providing any feedback, judges should total the scores below.

**Tournament Organizers will double-check the overall score*

Total Team Score: /60

UC Berkeley Law Competitions

Negotiation Time:		Team Number:	
Full Name of Team Member 1			
Full Name of Team Member 2			

I. OVERALL CASE PRESENTATION

Score: /10

Benchmark score: 5-6

A top-scoring team will:

- Present the facts and law in a way that could be heard productively by the other side
- Offer proposals in a manner that reflected careful planning and skillful implementation
- Accurately assess and discuss any business or litigation benefits or risks and consequences of failing to reach a settlement
- Start the conversation strategically, set up rationale and justifications for future offers/counteroffers, and provide more than baseline levels of organization

Notes:

II. ADVOCATING CLIENT'S INTERESTS & OUTCOME OF SESSION

Score: /10

Benchmark score: 5-6

A top-scoring team will

- Serve the client's goals regardless of whether an agreement was reached
- Understand and advance the client's legal and non- legal interests throughout
- Make sure to not sacrifice the client's interests for the sake of collaboration or competitive advantage

Notes:

UC Berkeley Law Competitions

III. TEAMWORK

Score: /10

Benchmark score: 5-6

A top-scoring team will:

- Communicate effectively with each other as teammates and consistently work together throughout the round
- Provide mutual support to each other as teammates whenever appropriate

Notes:

IV. PROBLEM-SOLVING & RELATIONSHIP BUILDING WITH OPPOSING TEAM

Score: /10

Benchmark score: 5-6

A top-scoring team will

- Work well with the opposing team to contribute and not detract from achieving their own client's best interests
- Establish a problem-solving relationship with the other side if possible
- Recognize the other side's interests and try to satisfy them if helpful to their own client's interests
- Take initiative to convert other team into problem-solvers if discussions become difficult (rather than participating in ineffective circular argumentation)

Notes:

UC Berkeley Law Competitions

V. MAKING EFFECTIVE OFFERS/COUNTEROFFERS & GENERATING CREATIVE OPTIONS

Score: /10

Benchmark score: 5-6

A top-scoring team will:

- Generate a range of legal and non-legal options to meet the client's interests as well as the interests of the other side
- Choose options based on interests and, if appropriate, objective criteria
- Actively encourage the development of creative ideas generally
- Effectively manage distributive bargaining ("hard numbers") aspects of the deal when relevant
- Make attempts to "sell" counterpart offers by appealing to areas of crossover in the other side's interests
- Counteroffers were responsive to reactions from the other side without sacrificing their own client's interests

Notes:

VI. POST-NEGOTIATION ANALYSIS

Score: /10

Benchmark score: 5-6

A top-scoring team will:

- Exhibit preparation and forethought that shows evidence of effective strategic thinking in their planning and strategy
- Demonstrate they learned from the negotiation and recognized the strengths and weaknesses of their performance and their outcome appropriately.

Notes:

UC Berkeley Law Competitions

VII. NEGOTIATING ETHICS

Did the team observe ethical standards? Examples of potential ethical violations include:

- Misrepresenting material facts purposefully
- Grossly exceeding negotiating authority
- Inventing self-serving facts

Circle: YES or NO

YES	<i>This team conducted itself ethically</i>
NO	<i>I observed a possible ethical violation by this team*</i>

*If you selected NO, thereby indicating a possible ethical violation, please provide a brief explanation here. Without an explanation, we will not consider a team to have participated unethically.

Notes:

END OF ROUND

At the end of the round, and before providing any feedback, judges should total the scores below.

**Tournament Organizers will double-check the overall score*

Total Team Score: /60