

# GECMUN VI Awards Criteria

AWARD	DESCRIPTION	TEAM POINTS	PLAQUES
<b>Best Delegate</b>	The highest achieving award in any given committee.	3	Awarded
<b>Outstanding Delegate</b>	The second highest achieving award in any given committee.	2	Awarded
<b>Honorable Mention</b>	The third highest achieving award in any given committee.	1	Awarded
<b>Verbal Commendation</b>	The fourth/fifth highest achieving award in any given committee.	0.5	Not Awarded

1. Committees with fewer than 21 delegates will have only one verbal commendation only.
2. The MS Committee (WHO) will have its own unique scoring system.
  - 1 point for Best Delegate
  - 0.5 points for Outstanding Delegate
  - 0 points for Honorable Mention
  - 0 points for Verbal Commendation

*Four standard committees: Seven points available (28 points total)*

*Five crisis committees: Six and a half points available (32.5 points total)*

*WHO: Two and a half points available (1.5 points total)*

**Sixty two possible points available**

**The team with the most points will win “Best Delegation”.**  
**The second best team will earn “Outstanding Delegation”.**  
**The third best team will earn “Honorable Delegation”**

The criteria to determine the Best Delegate includes the following:

<b>Participation in Committee</b>	
<b><u>DESCRIPTION</u></b>	<b><u>MEASUREMENT</u></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The delegate is an active participant throughout moderated caucuses and is actively working the room during unmoderated caucuses.</li> <li>• The delegate is actively writing notes to other delegates.</li> <li>• The delegate is actively asking questions during resolution presentations and is active when answering questions to his/her resolutions.</li> <li>• <b>(Crisis Only)</b> The delegate is consistently writing notes to the director and other delegates while also actively participating to advance his/her stance.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The number of meaningful and appropriate motions,</li> <li>2. The number of meaningful and appropriate points,</li> <li>3. The number of times the students spoke,</li> <li>4. A general observance of the delegate during the unmoderated caucus.</li> </ol> <p>*Crisis Only - the number of private and public directives.</p> <p><b><i>The chairs will provide delegates with a score from 1-10 in regards to participation, 10 being the most highly active participants, and 1 being the least.</i></b></p> <p><i>Please be mindful that this is not a 'numbers game'. We only document the above points as an objective indicator, which chairs can utilize when making final decisions.</i></p> <p><i>The chairs will take the quality of participation into account. For example, a delegate with five motions and twenty speeches does not necessarily mean they have participated more than a delegate with two motions and sixteen speeches. If any of the twenty speeches given by the first delegate had very little substance, and the student with sixteen speeches was giving extensive, meaningful talks, it is up to the discretion of the chair to decide in regards to which delegate was 'participating more..'</i></p>

<b>Quality of Speeches</b>	
<b><u>DESCRIPTION</u></b>	<b><u>MEASUREMENT</u></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When the delegate speaks, the speech is intact with the current topic being discussed in the committee.</li> <li>• The speech delivered generates debate among the delegates and can move the committee forward toward resolving the problem.</li> </ul>	<p>The Quality of Speeches will be evaluated on a 1-10 point scale.</p> <p><b>1-3: Needs Improvement</b>  Repeating information;  Filler speeches;  Unoriginal content;  Lack of being able to deliver original ideas on the spot.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The speeches made are not always prepared in advance, and the delegate can demonstrate the ability to perform speeches on an impromptu basis.</li> <li>• The speeches made maintains ‘diplomatic decorum’ and expresses ideas in a persuasive way.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4-6: Average quality</b> Speaks regularly during debate; Tries to contribute regularly; Has diplomatic debating skills.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7-10: High quality</b> Exemplary ability in speech delivery; well prepared and confident; Speeches are well constructed and provided in-depth analysis of the issues; Able to respond to questions on the spot in a considerate manner; Contributes to propelling the conversation at hand by helping advance the conversation forward for the committee.</p>
--	---

<b>Remaining in Character</b>	
<b><u>DESCRIPTION</u></b>	<b><u>MEASUREMENT</u></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The delegate’s actions and speeches are consistent with the nation or person they are representing in real life. The delegate must not deviate from their nation's policy in real life. For example, if the issue is in regards to denuclearization, it would be going against national policy if the delegate of the United States suggested that all countries in the world (including the US) should disarm themselves immediately.</li> <li>• In the crisis committee, delegates must remain within their character profile. Delegates are expected to be creative, however, that does not mean going beyond their character or limiting themselves. For example, if it is a crisis committee on the topic of the Cuban Missile Crisis, and the delegate is the Admiral of the US Navy, it would be going outside of the character profile if that delegate orders nuclear strikes alone as it requires authorization from the White House.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chairs will take notes if there are any significant discrepancies between a delegate’s speech and resolution in committee in comparison to that delegate’s country in real life.</li> <li>• Not following national policy is a serious issue, and if the delegate is not following their country’s policy, they will first receive a warning from the chairs. If they continue not to follow their country’s policies, they will not be eligible for awards.</li> </ul>

<b>Resolution Writing or Public Directives</b>
--

<u><b>DESCRIPTION</b></u>	<u><b>MEASUREMENT</b></u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not mandatory that a delegate is the main submitter of a resolution in order to win Best Delegate in a GA-style committee. However, it is highly encouraged that delegates become the main submitter of their resolution in order to be considered for most awards.</li> <li>Even if a delegate may not be the main submitter, if the delegate is part of the questions and answers during the draft resolution phase, and plays a crucial role in regards to answering questions by other delegates, they are still eligible for award consideration.</li> <li>(Crisis only) The delegate is actively passing public directives to help move forward the committee and address the problems at hand. The directives are comprehensive and detailed, and delivered in a timely fashion.</li> </ul>	<p>The Resolution/PD will be evaluated on a 1-10 point scale.</p> <p><b>1-3 Needs Improvement:</b> The resolution/PD lacks clarity, and the solutions are very vague, and not descriptive. Clause, sub-clause, and sub-sub-clauses are not outlined in a sequential manner.</p> <p><b>4-6 Average:</b> The resolution/PD is sufficient to address the main agenda of the committee. However, the solutions are not comprehensive and may have minor deficiencies, and the formulation/organization of the resolution is adequate.</p> <p><b>7-10 High Quality:</b> The resolution/PD has excellent details, and contains creative solutions with the specific course of action to be taken by the committee. This resolution/PD, in most circumstances, is able to reach to all the delegates in the conference room. The resolution fills in all necessary gaps of the problem at hand, and mentions specifics in regards to funding for the resolution.</p>

<b>Position Paper</b>	
<u><b>DESCRIPTION</b></u>	<u><b>MEASUREMENT</b></u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The position paper submitted clearly shows the stance of the delegate towards the topic or the crisis of the committee.</li> <li>(Crisis only) The position paper suggests appropriate solutions to the crisis, while reinforcing his or her stance and position strategically.</li> <li>The paper is submitted prior to the deadline. <b>January 22nd (10:00AM EST)</b> to the chairs CCing their advisers. Late papers will be accepted up until , but will be deducted 5 points (out of the 10 possible).</li> <li>If a delegate fails to submit a position paper on time, it will affect the delegates the opportunity to win an award. Furthermore, if a delegate fails to submit the position paper completely, then the delegate does not have an opportunity to win an award, nor</li> </ul>	<p><b>A position paper submitted on time is a requirement to be considered for one of the top three awards in the committee.</b></p> <p>The Position Paper will be evaluated on a 1-10 point scale.</p> <p><b>1-3 Needs Improvement:</b> The position paper does not match up with the position of the country they represent (or a person in a crisis committee), and demonstrates a serious lack of research. The delegate does not include any answers to the questions asked in the background guide.</p> <p><b>4-6 Average:</b> The position paper shows adequate research, and the delegate demonstrates that he/she has read and understood the background guide. The delegate provides adequate solutions, but very little innovation and originality when it comes to potential solutions.</p> <p><b>7-10 High Quality:</b></p>

verbal commendations.	The position paper shows/demonstrates above and beyond research, and the delegate understands and knows the inter-relations between other countries and his/her own.
-----------------------	--

**Leadership**

<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>MEASUREMENT</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The delegate leads and opens new discussions in moderated and unmoderated caucuses that are necessary for moving the committee forwards toward a solution.</li> <li>• The delegate demonstrates leadership in an unmoderated caucus (subjective under the discretion of the chair) in a way that is not artificial (only speaking when the chairs are present). The delegate attempts to help lead the debate forward through providing valuable information/insight, or motivating the delegates during an unmoderated caucus.</li> <li>• The delegate is willing to help other delegates (whether that is guidance in the Rules of Procedure, or helping delegates speak up about different matters of the agenda).</li> <li>• (Crisis only) The delegate remains focused on solving the entire crisis, and urges other delegates to do so. The delegate does not distract the committee’s progress just to speak frequently or submit directives frequently.</li> </ul>	<p>There will be no numerical score given to delegates in regards to leadership in particular.</p> <p>However, chairs will take into account the various points which would be considered as excellent or poor leadership, and consider those factors when deciding the ‘Best Delegate’.</p> <p>It is the chairs’ responsibility to be observing the delegates and taking notes of their behavior/contributions to the debate, as it may be subjective.</p>

**Etiquette**

<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>MEASUREMENT</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The delegate uses appropriate words for the setting. The delegate respects the other delegates’ words and actions, and does not distract other delegates.</li> <li>• The delegate in an unmoderated caucus listens attentively to other delegates, and does not cut</li> </ul>	<p>There will be no numerical score given to delegates in regards to etiquette in particular.</p> <p>However, chairs will take into account the various points which would be considered as appropriate or poor etiquette, and consider those factors when deciding the “Best Delegate”.</p>

<p>off or disrespect other delegates in any way. This includes non-verbal cues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• During the moderated caucuses, the delegate speaks only when he/she is recognized by the chair.</li><li>• The delegate is able to recognize excluded and timid delegates and include them in the discussion. The delegate supports the other delegates in feeling comfortable sharing opinions in the discussions.</li><li>• (Crisis only) The delegate respects the chairs'/directors' updates and decisions, and focuses on moving the committee forward.</li><li>• The delegate respects the staff, and that the staff is in service for the delegate. The delegate is not rude to the staff in any way. The chairs and directors are required to consult with the staff when evaluating the etiquette of the delegates.</li></ul>	
---	--