

# SEAMUN I Award System

The SEAMUN I Award System is designed to recognise diplomatic excellence, academic rigour, and exceptional leadership. We believe in celebrating not just the final performance in debate, but the extensive research and collaboration that occurs behind the scenes.

## Conference-Wide Awards (Overall)

These prestigious trophies are awarded to delegates who demonstrate the highest level of performance across the entire conference, regardless of their committee assignment.

- **Best Delegate**: Awarded to the individual who consistently leads diplomatic efforts, demonstrates a mastery of the Rules of Procedure, and spearheads the creation of comprehensive resolutions.
- **Best Position Paper**: Awarded to the delegate who submits the most exceptional pre-conference research, demonstrating a nuanced understanding of their country's foreign policy and the agenda at hand.

## Collective & Chair Awards

Recognising the dedication of our student leadership and the collective dynamic of the councils.

- **Best Chair**: Granted to the chairperson who demonstrates impeccable impartiality, firm control over the house, and a commitment to nurturing delegate growth.
- **Honourable Mention Chair**: Awarded for outstanding support and execution of duties within the Dais.
- **Best Committee**: Awarded to the council that displays the highest level of engagement, productivity, and collaborative spirit.
- **Best Chair Report**: Recognises the Chair or Dais team that produced the most comprehensive, accessible, and academically sound Study Guide (Chair Report).
- **Best Resolution**: Awarded to the delegation that demonstrates an exceptional balance between efficiency and diplomacy

## Committee-Level Awards

Determined by the Chairs of each committee to recognise outstanding performance within their specific debate floor.

- **Best Delegate**: The top-performing representative within the committee who drove the debate forward and brokered key compromises.

- **Honourable Mention**: Recognising delegates who showed significant initiative, contributed meaningfully to the resolution, and remained active throughout all sessions. (*Up to 2, based on committee size and difficulty*)
- **Best Position Paper**: Awarded to the delegate within the committee whose pre-conference research was the most detailed and policy-accurate.

# SEAMUN I: The Awards Process

At SEAMUN I, our awards system is designed to be a transparent, multi-tiered process that values objective data, peer feedback, and Secretariat oversight. We move away from subjective "favourites" by utilising a rigorous scoring framework combined with checks and balances.

---

## 1. The Scoring Framework

All evaluations are guided by the official SEAMUN I Rubrics. These rubrics serve as the **academic baseline** for every award.

- **Quantitative Data:** Chairs and delegates are assigned numerical values (1–8) across specific categories (e.g., Diplomacy, Empathy, Research Depth).
  - **Weighted Averages:** While high scores are essential, they are balanced against the difficulty of the committee and the consistency of performance across all sessions.
- 

## 2. The Evaluation Loop

Our system ensures that every participant is evaluated from multiple perspectives to ensure fairness.

### Chairs Evaluating Delegates

- **Statement of Confirmation:** A high score alone is not enough to win an award. Chairs must provide a written **Statement of Confirmation** for their top candidates.
- **Evidence-Based:** This statement must cite specific "on-the-floor" evidence—such as a specific clause drafted, a successful mediation between blocs, or a particularly insightful technical rebuttal.

### Delegates Evaluating Chairs

- **Anonymous Scorecards:** In the middle of day 2, all delegates will receive an **Anonymous Chair Evaluation Form**.
  - **Performance Feedback:** Delegates rate their Chairs on empathy, fairness, and procedural knowledge. This ensures that the "Best Chair" award is not just based on Secretariat observation, but on the actual experience of the delegates being led.
- 

## 3. The "Guide, Not Decision" Principle

It is important to note that while the rubrics and scores provide a definitive **guide**, they do not automatically trigger a win.

- **The Rubric as a Compass:** The rubric identifies the strongest contenders and provides a technical justification for their ranking.
  - **Human Nuance:** The scores highlight who performed best on paper, but the final selection accounts for the "spirit of the conference" and purposeful diplomacy.
- 

#### 4. Final Decisions & Secretariat Oversight

The final authority for all awards rests with the **Secretary-Generals**.

- **Verification of Evidence:** The Sec-Gens review the Chairs' Statements of Confirmation and cross-reference them with the Delegate Scorecards.
- **Experience-Driven Judgement:** Drawing on their extensive MUN experience, the Sec-Gens evaluate the "evidence of impact." They look for delegates and chairs who didn't just follow the rules, but who actively furthered the SEAMUN mission of purposeful policy and collaborative problem-solving.
- **Final Vetting:** In cases of statistical ties, the Sec-Gens conduct a final review of Position Papers and session notes to determine the winner.

## Position Paper Criteria

Delegates are scored out of **40 points** (graded on a scale of 1–8 across five categories) to determine the "Best Position Paper".

- **Research Depth:** Looks for niche legal loopholes, specific funding gaps, and historical context rather than just basic treaty mentions.
- **Country Stance Alignment:** Evaluates how accurately a delegate reflects their nation's "red lines" and regional geopolitical interests.
- **Policy Accuracy & Solutions:** Assesses the technical understanding of the mandate and the feasibility/originality of proposed implementation plans.
- **Formatting, Style & Citations:** Requires a professional UN academic tone and flawless citation of all sources.

Criteria	1–2 (Beginning)	3–4 (Developing)	5–6 (Proficient)	7–8 (Exemplary)
<b>Research Depth</b>	Minimal data; lacks specific UN resolutions, treaty citations, or historical context.	Basic data provided; mentions well-known treaties but lacks specific localised evidence.	Strong research; includes relevant stats, past UN actions, and committee-specific history.	<b>Exceptional depth; identifies niche legal loopholes, specific funding gaps, or rare data points.</b>
<b>Country Stance Alignment</b>	Frequently contradicts the assigned country's real-world geopolitical interests or voting history.	Generally follows policy but lacks clarity on sensitive or controversial national stances.	Consistently accurate; clearly reflects the nation's strategic regional and global interests.	<b>Highly nuanced; addresses complex regional dynamics and clearly defines national "red lines."</b>
<b>Policy Accuracy</b>	Fundamental misunderstanding of the topic's legal framework or the committee's mandate.	Understands the general topic but misses technical or legal complexities within current policy.	Solid grasp of complex policy issues (e.g., specific clauses in international law).	<b>Expert-level accuracy; integrates technical facts to build a sophisticated policy argument.</b>
<b>Proposed Solutions</b>	Vague or non-actionable (e.g., "countries should talk more"). No implementation plan.	Generic solutions; lack details on funding, specific UN agencies, or feasibility.	Innovative and actionable; proposes specific mechanisms, task forces, or monitoring bodies.	<b>Sophisticated and holistic, solutions are original, feasible, and legally sound with clear timelines.</b>

<b>Formatting, Style &amp; Citations</b>	Significant errors in UN citation style (e.g., Chicago/APA); unprofessional tone.	Standard formatting, but contains several grammatical gaps or inconsistent citation styles.	Professional UN academic formatting; clear, concise, and persuasive diplomatic language.	<b>Flawless UN academic style; compelling narrative and perfect citation of all sources.</b>
--	---	---	--	--

Research Depth: \_\_/8

Country Stance Alignment: \_\_/8

Policy Accuracy: \_\_/8

Proposed Solutions: \_\_/8

Formatting, Style and Citations: \_\_/8

**Total Score : \_\_/40**

### Section for Evidence & Written Confirmation

*Chairs must complete this section to justify the award for the SMT and Secretariat records.*

**Delegate Full Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Committee & Allocation:** \_\_\_\_\_

**1. Primary Evidence of Excellence:** *(Please list specific instances: e.g., "Led the drafting of Working Paper 1.1," "Provided a rebuttal citing the 1997 Ottawa Treaty," "Brokered compromise between Bloc A and Bloc B during Unmod 2")*

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**2. Justification for Final Score:** *(Summary of why this delegate outperformed the runner-up in their respective category.)*

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**Head Chair Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

## Delegate Criteria

This rubric outlines the **48-point** system used to assess live diplomacy during committee sessions.

- **Diplomacy & Collaboration:** Rewards "statesmanship"—the ability to build rapport, bridge clashing blocs, and ensure all members of a group have a voice.
- **Leadership & Participation:** Looks for "visionary leaders" who take initiative in caucuses and maintain a consistent, necessary presence from start to finish.
- **Creativity & Knowledge:** Evaluates the use of deep research to debunk false info and the development of "game-changing" compromises.

Criteria	1–2 (Beginning)	3–4 (Developing)	5–6 (Proficient)	7–8 (Exemplary)
<b>Creativity</b>	Proposes repetitive or standard solutions; rarely thinks outside the existing framework.	Offers some original ideas but struggles to adapt them to changing committee dynamics.	Frequently suggests innovative solutions and unique clauses for draft resolutions.	<b>Highly creative; develops "game-changing" compromises that bridge clashing blocs.</b>
<b>Diplomacy</b>	Lacks professional decorum; occasionally dismissive of other delegates' viewpoints.	Respectful but unremarkable; maintains a neutral presence without building rapport.	Consistently professional; actively seeks to understand and incorporate opposing views.	<b>Exemplifies true statesmanship; commands respect while remaining humble and inclusive.</b>
<b>Collaboration</b>	Works in isolation or refuses to compromise on minor details; disrupts group work.	Contributes to a bloc but does not take an active role in drafting or merging ideas.	A strong team player; helps merge resolutions and ensures all bloc members have a voice.	<b>The "glue" of the committee brings disparate groups together and facilitates consensus.</b>
<b>Leadership</b>	Passive; waits for others to initiate motions or start discussions during caucuses.	Shows leadership in small groups but is hesitant to lead the house or present for the bloc.	Takes clear initiative; leads unmoderated caucuses and manages the drafting process.	<b>Visionary leader; sets the tone for the room and inspires others through action and guidance.</b>

<b>Knowledge &amp; Research</b>	Frequently confused by the topic; relies on generalities rather than specific facts.	Has a basic understanding of the agenda but misses technical or legal nuances.	Demonstrates strong command of the topic; cites relevant stats and UN past actions.	<b>Expert-level mastery; uses deep research to navigate technical debates and debunk false info.</b>
<b>Participation</b>	Rarely speaks; frequently absent during caucusing or inactive during voting.	Speaks occasionally in moderated caucuses; participates only when prompted.	Consistently active in all sessions; frequently raises motions and contributes to the floor.	<b>Necessary and consistent presence; engages in every aspect of the debate from start to finish.</b>

Creativity: \_\_/8

Diplomacy: \_\_/8

Collaboration: \_\_/8

Leadership: \_\_/8

Knowledge and Research: \_\_/8

Participation: \_\_/8

**Total Score: \_\_/48**

---

## Section for Evidence & Written Confirmation

*Chairs must complete this section to justify the award for the SMT and Secretariat records.*

**Delegate Full Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Committee & Allocation:** \_\_\_\_\_

**1. Primary Evidence of Excellence:** *(Please list specific instances: e.g., "Led the drafting of Working Paper 1.1," "Provided a rebuttal citing the 1997 Ottawa Treaty," "Brokered compromise between Bloc A and Bloc B during Unmod 2.")*

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**2. Justification for Final Score:** *(Summary of why this delegate outperformed the runner-up in their respective category.)*

---

---

**Head Chair Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

## Chair Criteria

This rubric evaluates the quality of the leadership and the collective environment of the council.

- **Chair Performance:** Scored on **Empathy** (anticipating delegate stress), **Flexibility** (pivoting during crises), and **Synergy** with co-chairs.

Criteria	1–2 (Beginning)	3–4 (Developing)	5–6 (Proficient)	7–8 (Exemplary)
<b>Pre-Conference Support</b>	Study Guide was late or incomplete; minimal communication with SMT/USGs.	The study guide met basic requirements but lacked deep analysis or clear formatting.	Comprehensive Study Guide; proactive in answering delegate emails and prep.	<b>Exceptional Study Guide; provided extra resources and early feedback on position papers.</b>
<b>Empathy</b>	Dismissive of delegate anxieties; fails to notice when a delegate is struggling or excluded.	Professional but clinical; provides support only when explicitly asked by a delegate.	Actively checks in on quiet delegates; creates a safe space for beginners to participate.	<b>High emotional intelligence; anticipates delegate stress, manages heated conflicts with care, and ensures every voice feels valued.</b>
<b>Collaboration with Co-Chair</b>	One chair dominates; lack of communication results in inconsistent rulings.	Work is split but chairs operate in silos; minimal consultation on award decisions.	Balanced partnership; clear communication and mutual support during sessions.	<b>Seamless synergy; chairs anticipate each other's needs and provide a unified, professional front.</b>
<b>MUN Knowledge</b>	Frequent errors in Rules of Procedure (RoP); relies heavily on the Secretariat for help.	Basic RoP knowledge; can run a standard moderated caucus but misses nuances of motions.	Strong command of RoP; manages the floor efficiently and fairly with minimal errors.	<b>Absolute mastery; uses RoP to enhance debate flow and handles complex procedural</b>

				situations with ease.
<b>Country Stances &amp; Topic Knowledge</b>	Unable to identify if a delegate is speaking "out of character"; ignores policy accuracy.	Generally aware of major power stances but misses shifts in smaller delegation policies.	Actively monitors policy accuracy; guides delegates back to character when necessary.	<b>Deeply researched in all allocations; provides precise feedback on geopolitical nuances during debate.</b>
<b>Flexibility</b>	Rigid adherence to the schedule even when debate is stagnant; resistant to SMT feedback.	Adapts only when prompted by the Secretariat; struggles with sudden changes in bloc dynamics.	Responds well to committee shifts; adjusts speaking times or motions to benefit the debate flow.	<b>Highly adaptive; pivots seamlessly during crises or unexpected debate turns while maintaining order.</b>
<b>Professionalism</b>	Unprofessional attire or tone shows clear bias toward specific delegates or schools.	Professional but lacks authority; occasional lapses in diplomatic decorum.	Consistently professional; maintains impartiality and commands respect from the house.	<b>Exemplifies the Secretariat standard; flawless decorum, impartial, and serves as a role model.</b>
<b>Engagement</b>	Appears bored or distracted; minimal feedback given to delegates during caucusing.	Attentive but passive; does not actively encourage quieter delegates to participate.	High energy; provides constructive feedback and keeps the committee motivated throughout.	<b>Inspiring presence; actively mentors delegates, fosters an inclusive environment, and drives high-level debate.</b>

Pre-Conference Support: \_\_/8

Understanding: \_\_/8

Collaboration with Co-Chair: \_\_/8

MUN Knowledge: \_\_/8

Country Stances & Topic Knowledge: \_\_/8

Flexibility: \_\_/8

Professionalism: \_\_/8

Engagement: \_\_/8

**Total Score: \_\_/64**

## Chair Report Criteria

These rubrics evaluate the quality of the leadership and the collective environment of the council.

- **Chair Report:** Evaluated on **Academic Depth**, **Mandate Clarity**, and **Resource Quality** to ensure delegates were provided an expert-level foundation for debate.

### OVERALL

Criteria	1–2 (Beginning)	3–4 (Developing)	5–6 (Proficient)	7–8 (Exemplary)
<b>Academic Depth</b>	Surface-level summary; lacks historical context or data.	Good overview but misses complex legal or technical nuances.	Strong analysis; includes specific past actions and regional data.	<b>Expert-level scholarship; identifies unique angles for debate.</b>
<b>Mandate Clarity</b>	Vague "Questions to Consider"; unclear committee powers.	Standard questions; general guidance on the scope of the debate.	Clear, focused questions that guide delegates toward specific solutions.	<b>Precision-engineered prompts that prevent stagnant or off-topic debate.</b>
<b>Accessibility</b>	Overly dense or disorganized; difficult for beginners to navigate.	Clean layout but lacks visual aids or a glossary of terms.	Well-structured; includes helpful links, maps, and a clear glossary.	<b>Masterfully designed; balances high-level academia with intuitive navigation.</b>
<b>Resource Quality</b>	Few or outdated links provided for delegate research.	Standard UN links provided; covers the basics for most nations.	Diverse and curated bibliography including NGOs, treaties, and data sets.	<b>Comprehensive toolkit; provides delegates with "hidden" data and niche sources.</b>

Academic Depth: \_\_/8

Mandate Clarity: \_\_/8

Accessibility: \_\_/8

Resource Quality: \_\_/8

**Total Score: \_\_/32**

**SECTION SPECIFIC:**

Section	1–2 (Beginning)	3–4 (Developing)	5–6 (Proficient)	7–8 (Exemplary)
<b>Committee Introduction</b>	Provides only a generic definition of the committee's name.	Lists the mandate but fails to explain the committee's specific powers or limitations.	Clearly outlines the committee's history, scope of authority, and role within the UN system.	<b>Masterfully connects the committee's specific legal "teeth" to the current agenda items.</b>
<b>Topic Introduction</b>	Vague or overly broad; fails to define the core problem.	Provides a general summary but lacks current data or recent developments.	Comprehensive overview; defines technical terms and the current global status of the issue.	<b>A compelling narrative that identifies specific "blind spots" in international policy.</b>
<b>Timeline</b>	Missing major historical milestones or treaties.	Lists basic dates but fails to explain the significance of past actions.	Accurate chronological flow; explains how past resolutions led to the current situation.	<b>Strategic timeline that highlights failed vs. successful interventions to guide future debate.</b>
<b>Key Stances</b>	Only mentions P5 nations; ignores regional blocs or minor stakeholders.	Groups countries broadly (e.g., "The West") without nuanced policy differences.	Details the specific priorities of major interest groups and key regional players.	<b>Sophisticated analysis of clashing "red lines" and potential spoilers in the negotiation process.</b>
<b>Possible Solutions</b>	Generic or repetitive (e.g., "more funding," "awareness").	Suggests logical steps but lacks details on implementation or oversight.	Proposes innovative, multi-dimensional frameworks aligned with the committee's mandate.	<b>High-level "Purposeful Policy" solutions that address root causes and technical feasibility.</b>

Committee Introduction: \_\_/8

Topic Introduction: \_\_/8

Timeline: \_\_/8

Key Stances: \_\_/8

Possible Solutions: \_\_/8

**Total Score: \_\_/40**

**TOTAL COMBINED SCORE: \_\_/72**

## Committee Criteria

This rubric evaluates the quality of the leadership and the collective environment of the council.

- **Best Committee:** Awarded based on **Debate Productivity** (moving quickly to substantive solutions) and **Collaborative Spirit** (inclusive atmosphere where larger blocs seek input from minor nations).

Criteria	1–2 (Beginning)	3–4 (Developing)	5–6 (Proficient)	7–8 (Exemplary)
<b>Debate Productivity</b>	Frequent lulls in debate; circular arguments with no progress.	Steady debate but struggles to move beyond "Topic A" generalities.	High-level discourse; delegates move quickly into substantive solutions.	<b>Dynamic and evolving debate; the house stays engaged and intellectually sharp.</b>
<b>Collaborative Spirit</b>	Highly toxic or cliquey; minor blocs refuse to speak to one another.	Standard diplomatic behavior; basic cooperation during caucusing.	Inclusive atmosphere; larger blocs actively seek input from minor nations.	<b>Exemplary diplomacy; high "purposeful policy" alignment and consensus-building.</b>
<b>Resolution Quality</b>	Shallow resolutions; "vague encouragement" rather than action.	Standard clauses; addresses the symptoms but not the root causes.	Technically sound resolutions with clear funding and oversight mechanisms.	<b>Sophisticated, innovative, and actionable documents that reflect real UN standards.</b>

<b>Chair-Delegate Synergy</b>	Chairs struggle to manage the room; low respect for the Dais.	Functional relationship; chairs follow the schedule but don't "lead."	Positive energy; chairs mentor delegates while maintaining firm order.	<b>Seamless synergy; the Dais inspires a professional and high-stakes environment.</b>
-------------------------------	---	---	--	--

Debate Productivity: \_\_/8

Collaborative Spirit: \_\_/8

Resolution Quality: \_\_/8

Chair-Delegate Synergy: \_\_/8

**Total Score: \_\_/32**

## Resolution Criteria

This rubric prioritises a council environment where progress is driven by substance rather than stalling tactics.

- **Best Resolution:** Awarded to the delegations (main submitters) that demonstrate an exceptional balance between efficiency and diplomacy.

Criteria	1–2 (Beginning)	3–4 (Developing)	5–6 (Proficient)	7–8 (Exemplary)
<b>Technical Precision &amp; Formatting</b>  SCORE : __/8	Major formatting errors; incorrect use of preambulatory/operative phrases; lacks proper signatories.	Follows basic MUN formatting; occasional grammatical errors or repetitive operative verbs.	Professional layout; precise legal language; clearly defined sub-clauses and formatting excellence.	<b>Flawless UN-standard formatting; sophisticated vocabulary; structured logically to build a comprehensive legal framework.</b>
<b>Actionability &amp; Feasibility</b>  SCORE : __/8	Vague suggestions (e.g., "encourages peace"); lacks any clear plan for implementation or enforcement.	Suggests specific actions but fails to mention funding, timelines, or responsible agencies/bodies.	Highly realistic; identifies specific UN organs for oversight and proposes viable funding/logistics models.	<b>Exceptionally pragmatic; accounts for sovereignty concerns while providing innovative, "ready-to-implement" solutions.</b>
<b>Global Scope &amp; Inclusivity</b>  SCORE : __/8	Extremely narrow focus; favors only one bloc's interests while ignoring the needs of the rest of the world.	Standard Western or regional bias; attempts to be global but lacks specific protections for vulnerable nations.	Balanced document; incorporates diverse perspectives and includes specific "per-region" or	<b>Masterful consensus-building; effectively bridges the gap between conflicting ideologies</b>

			"per-economic-tier" nuances.	to create a truly universal policy.
<b>Creative Problem Solving</b>  SCORE: ___/8	"Copy-paste" solutions; relies entirely on existing real-world UN resolutions without adding new ideas.	Standard solutions (e.g., "create a database" or "increase awareness") that lack a modern or unique edge.	Innovative approach; applies modern technology or new economic theories to solve old problems.	<b>Visionary thinking; introduces groundbreaking mechanisms or legal precedents that solve the root cause of the issue in a way the committee hadn't previously considered.</b>

Technical Precision & Formatting: \_\_\_/8

Actionability & Feasibility: \_\_\_/8

Global Scope & Inclusivity: \_\_\_/8

Creative Problem Solving: \_\_\_/8

**Total Score: \_\_\_/32**

## Chair Training Guide: Master the Rubric & Evaluation Loop

To ensure the awards system is effective, all Chairs must be calibrated to the same standards. This training ensures that a "7" in one committee means the same as a "7" in another.

### 1. Applying the 1–8 Scale (No "Grade Inflation")

- **1–2 (Beginning):** The delegate is present but passive or disruptive.
- **3–4 (Developing):** The delegate follows the flow but does not influence it.
- **5–6 (Proficient):** This is your **Standard Excellence**. The delegate is active, researched, and diplomatic.
- **7–8 (Exemplary):** Reserved for "Game Changers"—delegates who solve deadlocks or provide expert-level technical insights.

### 2. The Evidence Requirement

- **Note-Taking:** Chairs must keep a "Session Log" to track specific actions. You cannot write a **Statement of Confirmation** from memory.
- **Specifics Matter:** Instead of "They were a good leader," write "They brokered a compromise between the EU and ASEAN blocs regarding Clause 4 of Resolution 1.1".

### 3. Managing the Evaluation Loop

- **Impartiality:** Your score for a delegate must not be influenced by their school or previous reputation.
- **Empathy & Professionalism:** You are being graded by the delegates on Day 2. If you are dismissive or disorganized, it will reflect in your own "Best Chair" scores.
- **AI Scoring:** You will also be required to upload both the position paper and rubric to Gemini or the LLM (large language model) of your choice – please prompt it with the following:

*"Please score this MUN position paper using the provided rubric" + rubric.pdf + positionpaper\_sweden.pdf*

- **AI Comparison:** You will then use the score AI gave you to compare results and ensure your implicit biases are not passed forward into the decision-making process. Include the AI score with visual evidence when submitting the Best Position Paper of the committee.