

Category	Very Poor (1)	Poor (2)	Fair (3)	Good (4)	Very Good (5)
<u>Grammar</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Numerous grammatical errors throughout the paper, hindering readability and comprehension - Frequent misspellings, punctuation mistakes, and/or incorrect word usage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Several grammatical errors are present - Misspellings, punctuation errors, or incorrect word choices are noticeable - Sentences may be awkwardly constructed or lack clarity due to grammar issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Correct tense - Capitalization - Correct spelling - Incorrect Punctuation - Clunky/Does not flow well - Under 10 errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Correct tense - Capitalization - Correct spelling - Correct Punctuation - Flows Well - Under 5 errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Correct tense - Capitalization - Correct spelling - Correct Punctuation - Flows Well - Error-free
<u>History/ Background</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No history and no connection to the topic at hand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unclear description of the topic - Unclear history of the country's participation in it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some description of the topic - Some history of the country's participation in it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear description of the topic - Clear history of the country's participation in it - Relevant dates included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear description of the topic - Clear history of the country's participation in it - Relevant dates included - The main actors and victims included - Prior UN involvement if applicable
<u>Geography /Politics</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No geographic or information on the country's stances: resources, alliances, religion, or culture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Missing major details of geographic or information on the country's stances: resources, alliances, religion, or culture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Baseline information of the country's stances: resources, alliances, religion, and culture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear description of geographic location - Baseline information on the country's resources, alliances, religion, and culture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear description of geographic location - Facts and statistics of the country's stances - Clear alliances between other countries present in the committee

Category	Very Poor (1)	Poor (2)	Fair (3)	Good (4)	Very Good (5)
<u>Delegate Position</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Position is poorly understood and misrepresented. - Little to no evidence or past policy referenced to support recommendations - Recommendations lack coherence and/or relevance - Suggestions are unrealistic or impractical 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Position is somewhat understood but still misrepresented - Limited evidence or past policy referenced to support recommendations - Recommendations are vague or lack depth - Suggestions may not address the core aspects of the issue adequately 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Position is adequately understood and represented - Some evidence or past policy referenced to support recommendations, but lacking in depth or variety - Recommendations are somewhat clear but may lack specificity and/or feasibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Position is well-understood and accurately represented - A good understanding of relevant context is demonstrated - Recommendations are clear, specific, and relevant to the issue - Suggestions demonstrate a thoughtful consideration of potential impacts and are feasible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Position is accurately understood and represented - Position is backed by evidence / past policy - Recommendations are comprehensive, innovative, and well-developed - Suggestions are realistic, practical, and potentially impactful