

Academic Year/course: 2023/24

25034 - Experiencing the EU: a Simulation of Council Negotiations and Decision-making

Teaching Guide Information

Academic Course: 2023/24

Academic Center: 339 - Faculty of Political and Social Sciences

Study: 3391 - Bachelor's (Degree) Programme in Political and Administration Sciences

Subject: 25034 - Experiencing the EU: a Simulation of Council Negotiations and Decision-making

Credits: 4.0

Course: 701 - Minor in Political Science: 1
420 - Bachelor's degree in Political and Administration Sciences: 4
420 - Bachelor's degree in Political and Administration Sciences: 3

Teaching languages:

Theory: Group 1: English

Teachers: Joan Ricart Angulo, Francisco Javier Arregui Moreno

Teaching Period: First Quarter

Presentation

The aim of this course is to teach, through the medium of a simulation game, the principal concepts, models and themes in European Union negotiations. We focus on the European Union (EU) as the most developed rule making international organization, whose extensive policy outputs in a broad range of policy areas have important consequences for its citizens. Negotiations are essential to policy making in the EU which is characterized by negotiation between its 27 Member States, its component institutions and civil society actors.

The course provides an overview of negotiation theories and practices. The emphasis is on what drives negotiation processes and what explains the outcomes. Among the themes covered in the theoretical section of the course are: preferences; the role of power; institutions; leadership and coalitions and their role in explaining outcomes. Practical negotiation information, including negotiation tactics and techniques as well as communication and diplomatic language are also included.

Associated skills

This course is part of the optional courses itinerary "citizenship and government" that, altogether, develops the following competencies:

BASIC SKILLS:

CB2. That students can apply their knowledge to their work or vocation in a professional manner and have competences typically demonstrated through devising and sustaining arguments and solving problems within their field of study.

CB3. That students have the ability to gather and interpret relevant data (usually within their field of study) to inform judgments that include reflection on relevant social, scientific or ethical.

CB4. That students can communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences.

CB5. That students have developed those skills needed to undertake further studies with a high degree of autonomy.

GENERAL SKILLS:

CG1. Capacity for analysis and synthesis.

CG3. Knowledge of a second language.

CG4. Basic computer skills.

CG6. Interpersonal skills.

CG7. Ability to work in an interdisciplinary team.

CG10. Research skills.

CG12. Ability to generate new ideas (creativity).

CG13. Leadership.

CG15. Project design and management.

TRANSVERSAL SKILLS:

CT1. Identify and analyze critically gender inequality and its intersection with other axes of inequality.

SPECIFIC SKILLS:

CE2. Analyze the structure and functioning of political systems.

CE6. Identify citizen behavior and democratic values.

CE7. Analyze the functioning of electoral processes.

CE17. Apply the methods and techniques of political and social research.

CE18. Analyze quantitative and qualitative data.

CE19. Examine the techniques of political communication.

CE20. Categorize information and communication technologies (ICT) and analyze their impact on the political system.

Learning outcomes

The overall aim of the course is to give students a systematic understanding of the main concepts and approaches to European Union negotiations. Through active participation and simulation, students acquire knowledge through “doing”. The Skills that are developed include capacity for independent and critical assessment, public speaking and negotiation skills.

The course is designed to give students:

- a. An introduction to key questions and concepts in the study of international negotiations (e.g. components, actors, factors that influence outcomes).
- b. An overview of actual case-studies of international negotiations, with a focus on EU negotiations.
- c. The ability to analyze independently cases of negotiation using the theories and concepts common to the field.

Hands-on feel for the complexity of conducting international negotiations, through role-plays in the classes as well as the final simulation.

Contents

FINAL SIMULATION

The final simulation will be a negotiation of the Multi-Annual Financial Framework (2021-2027). The date of the simulation will be agreed upon in session 1.

Each student will be assigned a Member State in the first session which they will represent during the practical sessions during the course and in the final negotiations.

The objective of the final simulation is that participants representing the different EU Member States reach agreement across SIX conflictive issues in the Multi-Annual Financial Framework negotiations (2021-2027). The six issues which will be discussed in the negotiations are contained in a budgetary proposal. This document will be available on Aula global.

During the negotiations, each player will be required to plan and act their roles as close as possible to how EU Member States conduct themselves.

Further information (as well as the date of the final simulation) will be elaborated upon in session 1.

CLASS STRUCTURE

The classes are designed to combine learning the principal theoretical and analytical concepts associated with negotiations as well as affording the maximum time possible to put these into action in simulations of negotiations around the European Union's Multi-Annual Financial Framework (MFF).

To this end the classes will combine a lecture of around 45 minutes – 1 hour, followed by a practical session (1 hour) in which we will negotiate a different component of the MFF each week.

With the exception of session 1, the group will be divided into two sub-groups (group A and group B) in order to facilitate the practical sessions. The practical session for group A will be from 16.30 – 17.30 and for group B from 17.30 – 18.30. These sessions will alternate so week 2 = group A @ 16.30, while group B @ 17.30 and week 3 = group B @ 16.30 and group B @ 17.30 ...and so on.

Normal Class structure (with exception of session 1)

First hour: Class Lecture

Second hour: Practical Session (Group A)

Third hour: Practical Session (Group B)

PRACTICAL SESSIONS & DELIVERABLES

Practical Sessions

Preparing effectively for the simulation is essential for an effective, productive simulation. The objective of the practical sessions (and the deliverables) is to prepare effectively for the final simulation.

To this end, in each session (starting from the 2nd session) we will prepare and practice negotiating one of the six issues which compose the final negotiation. For example in session 2 we will practice negotiating issue 1a: “the overall size of the budget”; and issue 1b “the introduction (or not) of “own resources” for the EU”.

The practical session will consist of a simulated negotiation in which participants, representing their Member State, should try to reach agreement on one of the three proposals that are established for each issue in the budgetary proposal by the European Commission.

During the practical sessions, participants should try to represent their Member State as closely as possible, present good arguments to justify their preferences and respond effectively to counter-arguments. The teacher will provide comment and feedback with regards the arguments in line with the evaluation rubric provided below.

Deliverables

In order to prepare for the practical session, each week students will be asked to deliver a 1 page A4 document. This will be delivered on the day of class. In total there are 5 deliverables:

- Session 2: Deliverable 1
- Session 3: Deliverable 2
- Session 4: Deliverable 3
- Session 5: Deliverable 4
- Session 6: Deliverable 5

Each deliverable will compose of preparation for one of the six issues which compose the final negotiation. The details of which issue should be prepared for which class is contained in the course outline below. For example, for session 2, students should prepare issue 1a and issue 1b.

The content of the deliverable should include responses to THREE tasks.

- 1: It should rank the preferences of the assigned Member State over the proposal(s) being negotiated in that week's session.
- 2: It should order the issue areas according to their salience to our Member States.
- 3: It should identify which Member States might share my preferences in this issue area and with whom your Member State may be able to form a coalitions and which Member States might hold positions farthest from my preference.

(For each task we must justify why we reached those decisions.)

For example, in issue 1a "overall size of the EU budget" there are three options: (a) An overall expenditure of €1,025 billion (b) An overall expenditure of €975 billion (c) An overall expenditure of €925 billion. In the deliverable, we should rank the three proposals in order from most preferred to least preferred according to the interests of your Member State, explain the salience of the issue for your Member State and identify which Member States might be willing to accept your state's first preference and which Member States might object to it.

Information on preparing this document should come from the readings as well as own research. A folder in which some suggested readings to assist preparation of the deliverables will be uploaded to Aula Global.

These documents are compulsory and form the basis of the final position paper and will be evaluated as part of the participation in the practical session – 15 % of final grade.

POSITION PAPER

The position paper is intended to be a more detailed version of the deliverables which are done for each week. The final paper will include the responses to the three tasks elaborated above for all of the six issue areas. The papers will be evaluated according to the criteria below. The date of the delivery of the position paper will be established in session one.

OVERVIEW OF SESSIONS

Session 1: Introduction to the Course; Introduction to Negotiations in the European Union

PART 1: LECTURE

- Course overview (course contents; teaching methods; evaluation)
- Introduction to negotiations in the European Union: who are the principal actors and what are the institutions?
- Introduction to European Union Budget and the main issues in the MULTI-ANNUAL FINANCIAL FRAMEWORK (MFF)
- Introduction to the main conflict dimensions in EU negotiations over the MFF

PART 2: PRACTICAL SESSION

(The practical session in week one is conducted as a single group)

- European Union Budget Game: an activity to display the logic of the EU budget and as an introduction to the dynamics of EU MFF negotiations
- While participation in the game will form part of the overall class assessment, there is no deliverable for session 1.
- Students will be assigned a Member State which they will represent in all class simulations as well as the final simulation.

Principal readings for Lecture:

Brunazzo, M & Pierpaolo Settembri. 2013. "Inter-Institutional Negotiations in the European Union", in Experiencing the European Union: Learning how EU negotiations work through simulation games, pp 46-70

Further Reading:

Hix and Hoyland. 2012. "Expenditure Policies", in Political System of the European Union, McGraw Hill, pp. 271 – 307

Lelieveldt, H. and S. Princen 2011. "The institutional framework" in The Politics of the European Union, pp 51-78

Session 2: The Building Blocks of EU Negotiations: The Negotiators: Interests, Preferences and Expected Utility

PART 1: LECTURE

The lecture in session 2 will review the following issues

- The key concepts of preferences & expected utility and their relevance to negotiations.
- Considerations in the formation of Member State preferences.

PART 2: PRACTICAL SESSION

In the practical session, students will simulate negotiations around the following issues:

ISSUE 1A: THE OVERALL SIZE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION BUDGET
ISSUE 1B: INTRODUCTION OF OWN RESOURCES.

The issues are elaborated on in the preparatory document, “A budget for Europe 2021-2027” – available on aula global.

DELIVERABLE 1:

In preparation for the practical session, students are asked to deliver (on day of class) a one side A4 page document in accordance with the criteria established above for:

ISSUE 1A: OVERALL SIZE OF THE BUDGET
ISSUE 1B: INTRODUCTION OF OWN RESOURCES

The issues are elaborated on in the preparatory document, “A budget for Europe 2021-2027” – available on aula global.

Principal readings for Lecture:

Pfetsch, R.F. 2007. “Negotiation and the Theory of Negotiation”, in *Negotiating Political Conflicts*, MacMillan pp. 67-88

Suggested readings to prepare deliverables:

Arregui, Javier. 2015. Dossier: Multi-Annual Financial Framework 2021-2027

Kölling, Mario and Serrano Leal, Cristina. 2012b. “The negotiation of the Multiannual Financial Framework – Budgeting Europe 2020 or Business as usual?”

IMPORTANT: Further readings in folder on aula global

Further Reading for Lecture:

Doran, G. & I Sened 2001. “Introduction”, in *Political Bargaining: Theory, Practice and Process*, Sage, pp.1-15

Pollack, M. 2006. “Rational Choice and EU Politics”, in Knud Erik Jørgensen, Mark A. Pollack & Ben Rosamond (eds), *The Sage Handbook of European Union Politics*, Cromwell Press, pp.31-55

Bailer, Stefanie (2011), “Structural, Domestic and Strategic Interests in the European Union: Negotiation Positions in the Council of Ministers”, *Negotiation Journal* 27 (4): 447 – 475

Elgström, Ole, and Christer Jönsson. 2000. “Negotiation in the European Union: Bargaining or ProblemSolving?” *Journal of European Public Policy* 7 (5): 684-704.

Session 3: The Building Blocks of EU Negotiations: Tactics in EU Negotiations – Coalition

Building, Issue linkage, Side Payments.

PART 1: LECTURE

The lecture in session 3 will review the following issues

- The key differentiating characteristics of confrontational vs Integrative negotiations.
- The key negotiation tactics employed in EU negotiations (e.g. Coalition Building, Issue linkage, Side Payments)

PART 2: PRACTICAL SESSION

In the practical session 3, students will simulate negotiations around:

ISSUE 2A: THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO THE COMMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY;
ISSUE 2B: THE APPLICATION OF CONDITIONALITY TO THE COMMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY.

The issues are elaborated on in the preparatory document, “A budget for Europe 2021-2027” – available on aula global.

DELIVERABLE 2:

In preparation for the practical session, students are asked to deliver (on day of class) a one side A4 page document in accordance with the criteria established above for:

ISSUE 2A: THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO THE COMMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY;
ISSUE 2B: THE APPLICATION OF CONDITIONALITY TO THE COMMON AGRICULTURAL POLICY.

The issues are elaborated on in the preparatory document, “A budget for Europe 2021-2027” – available on aula global.

Principal Readings for lecture:

Brunazzo, M & Pierpaolo Settembri. 2013. “Tips for Effective Negotiations”, in Experiencing the European Union: Learning how EU negotiations work through simulation games, pp 78-90

Suggested readings to prepare deliverables:

Arregui, Javier. 2015. Dossier: Multi-Annual Financial Framework 2021-2027

Kölling, Mario and Serrano Leal, Cristina. 2012b. “The negotiation of the Multiannual Financial Framework – Budgeting Europe 2020 or Business as usual?”

IMPORTANT: Further readings in folder on aula global

Further Reading:

Pfetsch, R.F. 2007. “The Instruments of Negotiation”, in Negotiating Political Conflicts, MacMillan pp. 67-88

Session 4: The principal determinants of bargaining success in EU negotiations

PART 1: LECTURE

The lecture in session 4 will review the following issues

- The concept of “power” in negotiations.
- Some of the principal determinants of bargaining success in EU negotiations.

PART 2: PRACTICAL SESSION

In the practical session 4, students will simulate negotiations around:

ISSUE 3A: THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO THE COHESION AND STRUCTURAL FUNDS

The issues are elaborated on in the preparatory document, “A budget for Europe 2021-2027” – available on aula global.

DELIVERABLE 3:

In preparation for the practical session, students are asked to deliver (on day of class) a one side A4 page document in accordance with the criteria established above for:

ISSUE 3A: THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO THE COHESION AND STRUCTURAL FUNDS

The issues are elaborated on in the preparatory document, “A budget for Europe 2021-2027” – available on aula global.

Principal Readings for lecture:

Arregui, Javier. 2016. Determinants of Bargaining Satisfaction across Policy Domains in the European Union Council of Ministers. *Journal of Common Market Studies*,

Suggested readings to prepare deliverables:

Arregui, Javier. 2015. Dossier: Multi-Annual Financial Framework 2021-2027

Kölling, Mario and Serrano Leal, Cristina. 2012b. “The negotiation of the Multiannual Financial Framework – Budgeting Europe 2020 or Business as usual?”

IMPORTANT: Further readings in folder on aula global

Further Reading:

Dür, Andreas, and Gemma Mateo. 2010. “Bargaining Power and Negotiation Tactics: The Negotiations on the EU’s Financial Perspective, 2007–13.” *Journal of Common Market Studies* 48 (3): 557-578

Session 5: Cognitive barriers in negotiations

PART 1: LECTURE

The lecture in session 5 will review the following issues

- The role of cognitive barriers in negotiations.

PART 2: PRACTICAL SESSION

In the practical session 5, students will simulate negotiations around:

ISSUE 3B: THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO RESEARCH AND INNOVATION WITHIN THE COHESION AND STRUCTURAL FUNDS

ISSUE 3C: THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDING FOR CONNECTING EUROPE WITHIN THE COHESION AND STRUCTURAL FUNDS.

The issues are elaborated on in the preparatory document, "A budget for Europe 2021-2027" – available on aula global.

DELIVERABLE 4:

In preparation for the practical session, students are asked to deliver (on day of class) a one side A4 page document in accordance with the criteria established above for:

ISSUE 3B: THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO RESEARCH AND INNOVATION WITHIN THE COHESION AND STRUCTURAL FUNDS

ISSUE 3C: THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDING FOR CONNECTING EUROPE WITHIN THE COHESION AND STRUCTURAL FUNDS.

The issues are elaborated on in the preparatory document, "A budget for Europe 2021-2027" – available on aula global.

Principal Readings for lecture:

Rhode, Alexander and Avo Schönbohm. 2014. "The Tactical Use of Cognitive Biases in Negotiations", Working Papers of the Institute of Management Berlin at the Berlin School of Economics and Law (HWR Berlin) 80

Suggested readings to prepare deliverables:

Arregui, Javier. 2015. Dossier: Multi-Annual Financial Framework 2021-2027

Kölling, Mario and Serrano Leal, Cristina. 2012. "The negotiation of the Multiannual Financial Framework – Budgeting Europe 2020 or Business as usual?"

IMPORTANT: Further readings in folder on aula global

Further Reading:

Caputo, A. (2013), "A Literature Review of Cognitive Biases in Negotiation Processes", *International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 24 No. 4, pp. 274–398.

Foster, C., Jane, M., & Cathie, J. M. (2013). "Negotiation Myopia." In *Negotiating Agreements in Politics*, eds. Cathie Jo Martin and Jane Mansbridge. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.

Session 6: Rhetoric, persuasion & diplomatic language in EU negotiations

PART 1: LECTURE

The lecture in session 6 will review the following issues

- The role of persuasion and argument in EU negotiations.
- The use of diplomatic language in negotiations.

PART 2: PRACTICAL SESSION

In the practical session 6, students will simulate negotiations around the following issues:

ISSUE 4: THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO ADMINISTRATION
ISSUE 5: THE MAINTAINANCE (OR NOT) OF THE CORRECTION SYSTEMS.

The issues are elaborated on in the preparatory document, "A budget for Europe 2021-2027" – available on aula global

DELIVERABLE 5:

In preparation for the practical session, students are asked to deliver (on day of class) a one side A4 page document in accordance with the criteria established above for:

ISSUE 4: THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO ADMINISTRATION
ISSUE 5: THE MAINTAINANCE (OR NOT) OF THE CORRECTION SYSTEMS.

The issues are elaborated on in the preparatory document, "A budget for Europe 2021-2027" – available on aula global.

Principal Readings for lecture:

Jasinski, J. 2001. "Stock Issues in Policy Disputes", in [Sourcebook on Rhetoric: Key Concepts in Contemporary Rhetorical Studies](#), Sage. pp.531-536

Risse, Thomas. 2004. Global governance and communicative action. *Government and Opposition*, 39, 288–313

Readings to prepare deliverables:

Arregui, Javier. 2015. Dossier: Multi-Annual Financial Framework 2021-2027

Kölling, Mario and Serrano Leal, Cristina. 2012b. "The negotiation of the Multiannual Financial Framework – Budgeting Europe 2020 or Business as usual?"

IMPORTANT: Further readings in folder on aula global

Further Reading:

Oglesby, D. 2016. "Diplomatic Language", in Sage Handbook of Diplomacy, Sage, pp. 242-254

Payne RA (2001) Persuasion, frames and norm construction. European Journal of International Relations 7(1): 37–61.

Risse, Thomas. 2000. Let's argue!: communicative action in world politics. International Organization, 54, 1–39.

Björkdahl, Annika (2008) 'Norm Advocacy: a Small State Strategy to Influence the EU', Journal of European Public Policy 15: 135–54

Session 7: Preparation of Position Papers

IN SESSION 7 THERE IS NO LECTURE, INSTEAD THE CLASS IS USED AS A SESSION TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK AND COMMENTS ON THE PRACTICAL SESSIONS AND DELIVERABLES SO FAR AND AN OPPORTUNITY FOR STUDENTS TO CLARIFY SPECIFIC QUESTIONS IN RELATION TO THEIR POSITION PAPERS & NEGOTIATION PERFORMANCE.

Session 8 & Session 9 Simulation game

- Simulation of Council Negotiations over the Multi-Annual Financial Framework

Session 10: Review, analysis, & Feedback

- The final session is a debrief of the simulation negotiations with feedback regarding the performance of the participants.

Sustainable Development Goals

#ODS 16 Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions

#ODS 17 Partnerships for the goals

Evaluation and grading system

1. Participation in practical session and deliverables (15%)

- *Attendance*: Attendance at class is compulsory. Absences due to reasons other than illness or family emergency are strongly discouraged and will result in a reduction in your class participation grade.
- *Class Discussion & Active Participation*: you will be evaluated on your preparation for and the quality of your contribution to class discussions. The evaluation of class discussion will be based on the rubric included in this guide.
- *Class deliverables*: Each session with the exception of session 1 students are asked to deliver a 1 A4 page document conforming to the outline elaborated on below. These deliverables are compulsory and evaluated.

2. Position Paper (35%)

- You will be asked to deliver a preparatory document for your assigned Member State which establish your country's position on a number of key issues that will be debated in the simulation game along with justifications as to why your country adopts this position.
- Position papers must include the content elaborated upon below in this guide.
- Position papers will be evaluated according to the rubric included in this guide.

3. Evaluation of Participation in the simulation game (50%)

- Evaluation of active participation in the final simulation game.
- Participation will be evaluated according to the rubric included in this guide.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR IN-CLASS PARTICIPATION

GRADE	CRITERIA
FAIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not participate
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present, not disruptive. • Tries to respond when called on but does not offer much. • Demonstrates very infrequent involvement in discussion.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates adequate preparation: knows basic course material or reading facts, but does not show evidence of trying to interpret or analyze them. • Offers straightforward information (e.g., straight from the case or reading), without elaboration or very infrequently (perhaps once a class). • Does not offer to contribute to discussion, but contributes to a moderate degree when called on. Demonstrates sporadic involvement.
BEST GRADES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates good preparation: knows course material or reading facts well, has thought through implications of them. • Offers interpretations and analysis of case material (more than just facts) to class. • Contributes well to discussion in an ongoing way: responds to other students' points, thinks through own points, questions others in a constructive way, offers and supports suggestions that may be counter to the majority opinion. • Demonstrates consistent ongoing involvement.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates excellent preparation: has analyzed course material exceptionally well, relating it to readings and other material (e.g., readings, course material, discussions, experiences, etc.). • Offers analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of course material, e.g., puts together pieces of the discussion to develop the class discussion further. • Contributes in a very significant way to ongoing discussion: keeps analysis focused, responds very thoughtfully to other students' comments, contributes to the cooperative argument-building, suggests alternative ways of approaching material and helps class analyze which approaches are appropriate, etc. • Demonstrates ongoing very active involvement.

2. EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR POSITION PAPER

The evaluation criteria for the position paper will be based on the following rubric:

1. CLARITY, PERSUASIVENESS, RELEVANCY OF ARGUMENTATION		
<i>WEAKER ANSWERS</i>	<i>AVERAGE ANSWERS</i>	<i>BETTER ANSWERS</i>
Your country's position on	A clear statement of your	A clear statement of your

<p>each topic is not clear.</p> <p>Unclear & unpersuasive arguments to support your country position.</p> <p>Few or no real arguments given, or all arguments given had significant problems</p> <p>Limited and or inconsistent knowledge and understanding of key principles and concepts and knowledge of negotiation issues</p> <p>Omission of some relevant material</p>	<p>country's position on each topic.</p> <p>Many good clear and persuasive arguments, with only minor problems.</p> <p>Knowledge and sound understanding of the key principles and concepts as well as sound knowledge of negotiation issues</p>	<p>country's position on each topic.</p> <p>Excellent, clear and very persuasive arguments supporting your country's position.</p> <p>Excellent knowledge and depth of understanding of principles and concepts of issues under discussion as well as detailed knowledge of negotiation issues</p>
--	--	--

2. USE OF SUPPORTING DATA & SOURCE MATERIAL		
<i>WEAKER ANSWERS</i>	<i>AVERAGE ANSWERS</i>	<i>BETTER ANSWERS</i>
<p>Moves from idea to idea without substantial development; lacks depth.</p> <p>Lacks support for arguments or claims.</p> <p>Evidence of minimal reading only</p>	<p>Achieves some depth and specificity of discussion.</p> <p>Provides specific detail in some places.</p> <p>Source materials are cited, though not always consistently.</p> <p>Evidence of directed reading and some supplementary sources</p>	<p>Evidence of reading a wide range of appropriate supplementary sources</p> <p>Source materials are introduced, contextualized, and made relevant to the purpose of the paper.</p> <p>Source materials are conventionally documented according to academic style</p>

3. ORGANISATION AND STYLE		
<i>WEAKER ANSWERS</i>	<i>AVERAGE ANSWERS</i>	<i>BETTER ANSWERS</i>
<p>Poor presentation and structure; random or weak organization.</p> <p>Rudimentary organisation of material and use of examples to illustrate points and arguments.</p> <p>Requires the reader to backtrack to make sense.</p>	<p>The work has been approached and/or executed/performed in a comprehensive and appropriate way</p> <p>The organisation, structure and standard of presentation of the work, including referencing where appropriate, are throughout albeit with some lapses in focus or coherence.</p>	<p>In-depth understanding, exploration, insight and/or research expressed through careful and suitable organization.</p> <p>Establishes clear pattern of development in supporting arguments, the paper feels organized and orderly from beginning to end.</p>

3. EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PARTICIPATION IN FINAL SIMULATION

The evaluation criteria for the final simulation will be based on the following rubric. Students will be evaluated across FOUR categories: (1) GLOBAL PARTICIPATION; (2) QUALITY & PERSUASIVENESS OF ARGUMENTATION; (3) DELIVERY; (4) KNOWLEDGE OF KEY TOPICS.

CRITERIA	EVALUATION CRITERIA DETAILS
<p>1. PARTICIPATION</p>	<p>Participants will be evaluated on engagement in all elements of debate, including table negotiations as well as during unmoderated caucusing, side-meetings and informal discussions.</p> <p>Key elements for evaluation will include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well the participant works and engages with other participants • How well the participant contributes in a very significant way to ongoing discussions and negotiations • How well the participant effectively engages in using strategies to reach agreement on negotiation issues, e.g. building coalition, engaging in issue-linkage and log rolling.
<p>2. ARGUMENTATION</p>	
<p>a. Relevancy</p>	<p>To what extent arguments are totally relevant and are pertinent to the topic under discussion and their Member State’s preferences over these topics</p>
<p>b. Persuasiveness</p>	<p>To what extent arguments are communicated clearly and persuasively</p>
<p>c. Organization and clarity</p>	<p>To what extent main arguments and responses are outlined in a clear and orderly way</p>
<p>d. Engagement with counter arguments</p>	<p>To what extent the participant engages with counter arguments in negotiations. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent s/he identified and responded to the most relevant and pressing concerns of the opposition; • To what extent s/he used a variety of evidence and arguments designed to persuade an oppositional audience; • To what extent s/he effectively used a variety of supporting materials that would be judged as credible by an oppositional audience
<p>3. DELIVERY STYLE</p>	<p>To what extent the participant :</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses language that increased the persuasiveness of the argument • Speaks confidently and with appropriate use of notes • Cites supporting material effectively and appropriately • Always acts in a diplomatic manner during speeches, negotiations and committee proceedings, and uses sophisticated language.
<p>4. KNOWLEDGE OF MATERIAL</p>	<p>To what extent participants demonstrate quality and depth of knowledge with the topics and their countries' policies in the issues under negotiation.</p>