

AWARDS RUBRIC

(To be used by Student Officers)

Note: You may only choose one (1) recipient per award (Note: for double delegations, it is still only one delegate that gets the award). Final decisions must be sent to the Secretary Generals by Saturday, April 29 at 11:00 via email.

Any signs of bias or unethical behavior when choosing the recipients will not be tolerated and will result in disciplinary action.

Email: secretariat@british.edu.uy

Most Improved

Criteria	Scale (Left to right, best to worst)		
<p>Resolution Submission</p> <p>Has the delegate sent at least one (1) resolution to the committee email on Thursday, April 27 (inclusive), containing at least 3 PCs and 3 OCs?</p>	<p>Yes, the delegate has submitted at least one resolution by the time agreed with all requirements</p>	<p>No, the delegate has not met at least one of the stipulated requirements</p> <p>NOT ELIGIBLE FOR THIS AWARD</p>	
<p>Past Experience & Initial Participation</p> <p>Does the delegate show a strong understanding of committee matters and actively participates from the beginning?</p>	<p>The delegate shows some understanding of procedure and tries to participate.</p>	<p>The delegate shows little to no understanding of procedure or does not participate enough to make an adequate evaluation.</p>	<p>Yes, the delegate actively participates and understands procedure from the start.</p> <p>NOT ELIGIBLE FOR THIS AWARD</p>
<p>Lobbying Participation Comparison</p> <p>Has the delegate improved their participation during lobbying time since first impressions, now actively working with their peers and providing insightful contributions?</p> <p>Note: This may be seen during the same lobbying period or between the two instances.</p>	<p>Yes, the delegate shows significant improvement and feels more comfortable during lobbying time than before.</p>	<p>The delegate shows some improvement in their participation, but still secludes themselves from their peers or does not significantly contribute to discussions.</p>	<p>The delegate shows little to no improvement or does not participate enough to make an adequate evaluation.</p>
<p>Debate Participation Comparison</p> <p>Has the delegate improved their participation during debate time since first impressions, now actively participating and following MUN procedure?</p> <p>Note: This may be seen during the same debate period or between different instances.</p>	<p>Yes, the delegate shows significant improvement and participates often, always (or almost always) following procedure.</p>	<p>The delegate shows some improvement in their participation, but still does not significantly contribute to discussions. They still have some mishaps regarding procedure.</p>	<p>The delegate shows little to no improvement or does not participate enough to make an adequate evaluation.</p>

Research

Criteria	Scale (Left to right, best to worst)		
<p>Resolution Submission</p> <p>Has the delegate sent at least one (1) resolution to the committee email by Thursday, April 27 (inclusive), containing at least 3 PCs and 3 OCs?</p>	<p>Yes, the delegate has submitted at least one resolution by the time agreed with all requirements</p>	<p>No, the delegate has not met at least one of the stipulated requirements</p> <p>NOT ELIGIBLE FOR THIS AWARD</p>	
<p>Resolution Content</p> <p>Does the resolution(s) submitted show understanding of the issue at hand, written using the correct format and using issue-related terms?</p>	<p>The resolution shows a deep understanding of the issue at hand and proposes well-thought, creative, and insightful solutions. There are little or no format issues, and the resolution uses eloquent, issue-related language</p>	<p>The resolution shows a mild understanding of the issue at hand and proposes mostly insightful solutions. There are some format issues, and the resolution uses some issue-related language</p>	<p>The resolution shows little to no understanding of the issue at hand and proposes repeated or basic solutions. There are several format issues and little to no issue-related language, or significant grammatical errors.</p>
<p>Lobbying Participation</p> <p>Does the delegate use their issue research to actively participate during lobbying time, giving thoughtful justifications for their work and convincing delegates with valid arguments?</p>	<p>The delegate actively participates during lobbying time, giving well-reasoned, justified arguments for their work.</p>	<p>The delegate participates somewhat actively during lobbying time, giving some arguments backed by evidence.</p>	<p>The delegate rarely participates during lobbying time, and their arguments show little to no knowledge of the issue at hand.</p>
<p>Debate Participation</p> <p>Does the delegate use their issue research to actively participate during debate time, giving thoughtful justifications for their work and convincing delegates with valid arguments?</p>	<p>The delegate actively participates during debate time, giving well-reasoned, justified arguments for their work.</p>	<p>The delegate participates somewhat actively during debate time, giving some arguments backed by evidence.</p>	<p>The delegate rarely participates during debate time, and their arguments show little to no knowledge of the issue at hand.</p>

Best Position Paper

Criteria	Scale (Left to right, best to worst)		
<p>Position Paper Submission</p> <p>Has the delegate sent at least one (1) position paper to the committee email by Thursday, April 27 (inclusive), with the correct format? (See Delegate’s Handbook)</p>	<p>Yes, the delegate has submitted at least one position paper by the time agreed with all requirements</p>	<p>No, the delegate has not met at least one of the stipulated requirements</p> <p>NOT ELIGIBLE FOR THIS AWARD</p>	
<p>Content</p> <p>Does the position paper cover all relevant aspects of the issue and aligns with the delegation’s position on the matter?</p>	<p>The position paper covers all aspects of the issue at hand in-depth but still concisely. The delegation’s position is clearly indicated and justified with reliable documents and sources.</p>	<p>The position paper covers most aspects of the issue at hand in some detail, still using reliable sources and relevant information. The delegation’s position is explored, but either does not show significant backing or is not clearly explained.</p>	<p>The position paper covers some if not few key aspects of the issue at hand in little detail and few/no reliable sources. The delegation’s position is not explored in any relevant way.</p>
<p>Language and Delivery</p> <p>Does the delegate use sophisticated and issue-related language, and transmits their ideas in a concise yet insightful manner?</p>	<p>The delegate constantly uses sophisticated, diverse language, with significant mentions of issue-related terms. The paper goes in depth but still manages to remain concise and understandable.</p>	<p>The delegate uses some sophisticated language, but this is not consistent, and there are some mentions of issue-related terms. The paper mentions most aspects clearly, but some parts are confusing or complicated for the reader.</p>	<p>The delegate uses basic language and has little to no issue-related terms. Most of the paper is confusing and overly long.</p>

Best Delegate

Criteria	Scale (Left to right, best to worst)		
<p>Resolution Submission</p> <p>Has the delegate sent at least one (1) resolution to the committee email by Thursday, April 27 (inclusive), containing at least 3 PCs and 3 OCs?</p>	<p>Yes, the delegate has submitted at least one resolution by the time agreed with all requirements</p>	<p>No, the delegate has not met at least one of the stipulated requirements</p> <p>NOT ELIGIBLE FOR THIS AWARD</p>	
<p>Resolution Content</p> <p>Does the resolution(s) submitted show understanding of the issue at hand, written using the correct format and using issue-related terms?</p>	<p>The resolution shows a deep understanding of the issue at hand, and proposes well-thought, creative, and insightful solutions. There are little or no format issues, and the resolution uses eloquent, issue-related language</p>	<p>The resolution shows a mild understanding of the issue at hand, and proposes mostly insightful solutions. There are some format issues, and the resolution uses some issue-related language</p>	<p>The resolution shows little to no understanding of the issue at hand, and proposes repeated or basic solutions. There are several format issues and little to no issue-related language, or significant grammatical errors.</p>
<p>Lobbying Participation</p> <p>Does the delegate use their issue research to actively participate during lobbying time, giving thoughtful justifications for their work and convincing delegates with valid arguments?</p>	<p>The delegate actively participates during lobbying time, giving well-reasoned, justified arguments for their work.</p>	<p>The delegate participates somewhat actively during lobbying time, giving some arguments backed by evidence.</p>	<p>The delegate rarely participates during lobbying time, and their arguments show little to no knowledge of the issue at hand.</p>
<p>Debate Participation</p> <p>Does the delegate use their issue research to actively participate during debate time, giving thoughtful justifications for their work and convincing delegates with valid arguments?</p>	<p>The delegate actively participates during debate time, giving well-reasoned, justified arguments for their work.</p>	<p>The delegate participates somewhat actively during debate time, giving some arguments backed by evidence.</p>	<p>The delegate rarely participates during debate time, and their arguments show little to no knowledge of the issue at hand.</p>
<p>Language and Delivery</p> <p>Does the delegate use sophisticated and issue-related language, and transmits their ideas in a concise yet insightful manner?</p>	<p>The delegate constantly uses sophisticated, diverse language, with significant mentions of issue-related terms. The delegate's speeches allow their ideas to be delivered in a concise yet passionate manner.</p>	<p>The delegate uses some sophisticated language, but this is not consistent, and there are some mentions of issue-related terms. The delegate's speeches are mostly concise and insightful, but can sometimes be confusing.</p>	<p>The position paper uses basic language and has little to no issue-related terms. Most of the delegate's speeches are confusing and overly long, or not insightful enough.</p>