

DELEGATE EVALUATION CRITERIA

Harvard National Model United Nations 2024 *The Seventieth Session*





FROM YOUR UNDER-SECRETARY-GENERALS

Dear Delegates,

It is with great pleasure that we welcome you to Harvard National Model United Nations 2024! We – Vivian Yee, Bobby Degeratu, and Annabelle Krause – are ecstatic to serve as your substantive USGs for the seventieth iteration of the conference. From the digitization of healthcare to maritime security in the South China Sea to the 2008 financial crisis, delegates will be challenged to address pressing issues over the course of the conference weekend. As the oldest and most prestigious Model UN conference, older than the United Nations itself, HNMUN prides itself on upholding the highest standards for delegate experience.

Each year, HNMUN is proud to host 2000+ delegates from across ~30 different countries. However, we know that bringing together delegates from so many different circuits comes with clashes pertaining to Rules of Procedure and evaluation guidelines. To help foster constructive, inclusive, and collaborative debate, we have worked together to outline our evaluation criteria for delegates to reference in their preparations and throughout the conference.

We acknowledge that Model UN is inherently a competitive activity but emphasize that your success is not about being the loudest voice in the room or “steam-rolling” over your fellow delegates. The criteria for an excellent delegate is more nuanced than simply distilling debate to quantifiable metrics such as speeches given, clauses written, or directives passed. This document aims to provide more transparency as to how our conference staffers evaluate delegates for award considerations and the practices they hope to see from the highest level of debate fostered on the international stage.

That being said, we caution delegates from using these criteria as an end-all-be-all but more so as guidance to understand the values of HNMUN substantive committee directors. At the end of the day, our evaluation process is holistic and comprehensive – we implore our directors to apply their discretion beyond these guidelines when making awards decisions. With the greatest level of diligence, we hope to foster a constructive, collaborative, and exciting environment of debate for the HNMUN 2024 delegates.

We are incredibly excited to welcome you all to Boston for HNMUN 2024 come February. In the meantime, best of luck in your conference preparations. We hope that this is a memorable and transformative experience for all of you! Please do not hesitate to reach out to us or your committee directors if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Vivian Yee, Bobby Degeratu, and Annabelle Krause
Under-Secretary Generals for Substantive Committees
Harvard National Model United Nations 2024

GENERAL

Use of Parliamentary Procedure

1. Does the delegate follow the **correct Rules of Procedure** during committee proceedings?¹
2. Does the delegate effectively propose motions that steer the direction of debate to more constructive and nuanced topics?

Country or Position Representation

1. Does the delegate **clearly and accurately outline their position** on the issues and various subtopics being debated? Does the delegate sufficiently justify their decision-making and actions?
2. Does the delegate integrate their represented stance into the solutions that they are proposing?
3. Does the delegate seek reasonable compromise that **aligns with the previous actions and viewpoints of the position/country** that they are representing?
4. Does the delegate vote in accordance with the policy and position they are taking?

Speaking and Presentation

1. Does the delegate **speak frequently** and **across a variety of different topics** throughout the committee session?
2. Does the delegate present their ideas in a **compelling and logical manner** that captures the attention of the committee? Is the delegate an **engaging speaker** that committee members listen to?

¹ Given the novelty of HNMUN RoPs to many delegates, we merely expect that delegates make their best effort to adhere to RoP – we are human, we make mistakes!

3. Does the delegate demonstrate knowledge of the subject area and the committee debate in their speeches by **referencing relevant evidence and employing compelling rationale**?²
4. Does the delegate ensure an optimal balance of captivating delivery and robust content across all speeches?

Leadership and Diplomacy

1. Is the delegate collaborative and encouraging? Is the delegate **perceived as a bloc leader** by other members of the committee **inside and outside** of their bloc?³
2. Does the delegate have a substantive impact on the **policies and working dynamics** of their bloc?⁴
3. Does the delegate appear to be a leader during unmoderated caucuses? Are they facilitating discussion, ensuring others are included, and driving substantive actions taken by the bloc?
4. Does the delegate make attempts to collaborate with a wide array of committee members?

Miscellaneous

1. Is the delegate **respectful** to the Dais, Secretariat members, and other delegates?⁵
2. Does the delegate demonstrate **good stamina** to stay highly-involved in committee debate throughout the course of the conference?

² MUN speeches are very short, so we encourage that delegates make the best use of their time by including sufficient content in their speech. Delegates should not sacrifice good content for flowery presentation.

³ HNMUN values soft, inclusive leadership in which delegates clearly and explicitly establish themselves as leaders within committee but in a non-toxic, overbearing manner.

⁴ It is not merely sufficient that delegates optically appear to be a leader but they must also contribute significantly to the work product of their bloc.

⁵ HNMUN values smooth, strategic maneuvers in committee and frowns upon the use of unethical, underhanded tactics.

RESOLUTION COMMITTEES

Resolution Writing

1. Does the delegate contribute significantly to the **writing of the resolution operative clauses**?
2. Does the delegate have a firm **understanding of all of the content** within their working paper/draft resolution even beyond the scope of the clauses that they contributed?
3. Are the clauses that the delegate has written **high-quality, comprehensive, and central** to the written document? How well are these clauses branded in the context of committee debate?

Bloc Building

1. Does the delegate build a bloc that fosters a collaborative, non-toxic environment; represents diverse viewpoints; produces high-quality work-products; and effectively contributes to committee debate?
2. Does the delegate choose to **partake in a challenging but also strategic merge** to create a more comprehensive and complete draft resolution?
3. Does the delegate participate in the working paper and draft resolution author's panel? Does the delegate participate in the **working paper and draft resolution Q&A**?⁶

CRISIS COMMITTEES

Directive Writing

1. Does the delegate actively participate and sponsor documents in **all directive cycles**? Are they **leading and contributing significantly** to the authorship of directives?
2. Does the delegate propose **innovative, nuanced, and relevant solutions** to the crisis breaks presented to the committee?
3. Are clauses written by the delegate **relevant, comprehensive, actionable, and detailed**?
4. Does the delegate effectively collaborate with other committee members to **merge ideas** within directives and **debate potential points of contention**?

Backroom Engagements and Crisis Notes

1. Is the delegate actively engaged with the backroom via crisis notes in **all note collection cycles**?
2. Does the delegate have an **exciting, well-substantiated, and relevant** crisis arc? Is the crisis arc timed well and effectively **influence the debate/focus** of the committee?
3. Is the delegate's arc justified within the purview of their **character's aims and portfolio powers**?
4. Does the delegate **respond sufficiently to push-back** from the backroom for more information and/or justification?
5. Are crisis notes **well-organized, interesting to read, and provide sufficient rationale and detail** for the actions that are being requested?

⁶ Author's panel is an important heuristic for use in awards consideration given that it is a demonstration of bloc leadership, knowledge of written documents, and speaking abilities. That being said, our Directors employ insightful chairing and will consider this within the greater committee context.

⁷ Each Crisis Director will have their own subjective preferences – we encourage that delegates regularly seek feedback from their backroom staff regarding their crisis arc and implement feedback to pivot if necessary.

DOUBLE DELEGATION COMMITTEES

Partner Dynamics and Balance

1. Are the delegates within a partnership **on the same page** with respect to committee strategy?
2. Are both partners contributing to committee debate – whether that be distribution of responsibilities or switching between roles? Are the partners accomplishing **two-people’s worth of work** throughout the committee session?⁸
3. Is there **mutual respect and collaboration** between delegates within a partnership and equitable say in decision-making?

⁸ HNMUN understands that there are multiple ways double delegations may distribute responsibilities. We do not have a preference for one over another. As long as there is a clear balance of contribution between both members, this suffices.