

Guidelines for Judges

Teaching students about the EU, inspiring further interest in the EU, and developing leadership skills are important goals of the Model EU Summit simulation. The criteria are meant to be a general guide for judges, suggestions for things to watch for, and points to begin discussion during the final judges' meeting. They are not intended as a formula for determining awards. In assessing the students both the performance during the Summit and their preparation are to be incorporated.

1) Judging Process

There are five judges that are all to be involved in the judging deliberations. Judges should observe negotiations in both the Heads of State and Government (HoG) and the ECOFIN Ministers negotiation rooms. Participants are evaluated on their preparedness, accurate representation of country position, and use of diplomacy including correct use of parliamentary procedure, negotiating skill, and ability to make compromises. Judges should pay attention to the performance of students during formal as well as informal negotiations. Among the participants there are a few graduate students. These are to be held at a higher standard than undergraduate students.

2) Type of Awards

There will be eight jury awards, of which four will be awarded to the Heads of State and Government (HoG) and four to the ECOFIN Ministers. The jury awards are the following:

- Best Head of Government
- Outstanding Head of Government
- Best Negotiator as Head of Government
- Best Minister of Finance
- Outstanding Minister of Finance
- Best Negotiator as Minister of Finance
- Most Likely to Work for the European Union (x2)

Observe there are two 'Most Likely to Work for the European Union' awards, one for each room. These are essentially 'honourable mentions'. Note that besides the jury awards there will also be a number of peer awards.

3) Judging Criteria

Preparation	Representation	Diplomacy
1) How would you rate the knowledge of the student about their country?	1) How effective was the student in advocating their country's position? (were they realistic in their goals?)	1) How was the student's usage of diplomatic language

<p>2) How would you rate the knowledge of the student about their role for their country and the scope of that role in the context of the negotiations?</p> <p>3) How prepared was the student for topic 1?</p> <p>4) How prepared was the student for topic 2?</p>	<p>2) How accurate and consistent was their portrayal of their country’s overall EU negotiating strategy? Alternatively, how accurate and consistent was their portrayal of the role played by their institution?</p> <p>3) How was their overall speaking ability (clarity, style, organisation, etc)?</p> <p>4) How was their total contribution to the proceedings (balance of quantity and quality).</p>	<p>2) How was the student’s adherence to procedure, including respect for the Chair(s)?</p> <p>3) Did the student show initiative to find consensus through compromise and creativity?</p> <p>4) How persuasive and productive was the student while caucusing away from the table?</p>
<p>/30</p>	<p>/40</p>	<p>/30</p>

Final Score: /100

4) Voting Procedure

At the end of the second negotiation day the judges decide which student should receive the awards above based on their observations during day one and two of Model EU. Jury deliberations are to be on the basis of country and role to make things easier. For example “I found that the HoG of Belgium was...” or “Rumania’s Finance Minister was...”

The judging session is chaired by a Model EU staff member who will also inform the judges of any possible concerns that may have an impact on the judging process. Every judge has one vote. However decisions will most ideally be taken by consensus and on the basis of the impressions and evidence collected by all judges. The Model EU staff member will act as a moderator and even tie breaker, if necessary.

