

## Marking Sheet to Assess Mediator

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Team: \_\_\_\_\_

### Student Performance Categories

CRITERIA	COMMENTS	1 <sup>st</sup> Judge	2 <sup>nd</sup> Judge
<b>1. Preparation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Appropriate opening statement/response, procedural matters/rules explained</li> <li>➤ Common ground anticipated</li> <li>➤ Understood both parties interests</li> <li>➤ Understood both parties BATNA/WATNA</li> </ul>		/10	/10
<b>2. Focus on Interests rather than positions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Avoiding positional statements</li> <li>➤ Asking questions/exploring other team's interests</li> <li>➤ Acknowledging other team's interests</li> <li>➤ Establishing/summarizing issues to resolve</li> </ul>		/10	/10
<b>3. Separating the people from the problem</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Use of "I" messages</li> <li>➤ Use of conciliatory or neutral language including acknowledging other's feelings/views</li> <li>➤ Recognizing the need for face-saving</li> <li>➤ Not assuming; check-out/clarify/summarise/reframing/paraphrasing</li> </ul>		/5	/5
<b>4. Inventing options for mutual gain</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Not fixing on single solution (position)</li> <li>➤ Generating options to meet both parties' interests</li> <li>➤ Assisting in exploring conditional offers</li> <li>➤ Complies with ethical responsibilities</li> </ul>		/10	/10
<b>5. Insisting on objective criteria</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Strategies used to overcome deadlocks</li> <li>➤ Casting doubt on positions when reality testing</li> <li>➤ Casting doubt on unsupported statements</li> </ul>		/5	/5
<b>6. Communication</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Eye contact</li> <li>➤ Awareness of non-verbal communication</li> <li>➤ Appropriate speed of delivery</li> <li>➤ Appropriate body language</li> <li>➤ Adequate closing statement</li> </ul>		/10	/10
	<b>Total out of 50</b>		
	<b><u>FINAL MARK</u></b> <b><u>(Out of 100)</u></b>		

**Remarks:**

The total mark is out of 50 per judge. In the interests of fairness and consistency marks should be allocated in the range of:

≤ 29 = low; 30-34 = average; 35-39 = good; 40-44 = very good; 45-50 = excellent.



**Marker's Notes:**