

Overall, this was a very good class. The practical exercises were an invaluable teaching tool, and the supportive environment allowed us to learn from our mistakes and receive constructive criticism without a real client's interests on the line.

Along the lines of constructive criticism, I have a number of thoughts that may be helpful:

- A number of the exercises lacked sufficient information to play the roles convincingly without additional research. For instance:
 - I'm American and know nothing about horse racing. I have no idea how jockeys are paid, if they contract for all three triple-crown races, etc.
 - How big is an olive tree? If they're big trimming them would likely be sufficient. If not, insurgents can't really hide behind them.
 - In this vein, the line on the one exercise asking us to stay in role and feel free to make up facts as necessary was quite helpful.
- It seemed toward the beginning of the course that extraordinarily creative and unrealistic pie expanding options were prized above reality. As a pragmatist I often thought of and decided not to suggest ideas that simply had no basis in reality, which it seems worked to my detriment. It was also shocking when later in the semester unrealistic ideas were suddenly critiqued on that basis as it seemed like an about-turn in the way that we were supposed to think.
- The arbitration section at the end of the semester felt artificial. We had spent all semester in a practical class and the switch to substantial amounts of reading and being on call was annoying in that the section in no meaningful way related to our final grade. As such, there was not much motivation to do the reading or pay attention.
- Something that I think might have helped would be submitting a short paper about our preparation for a negotiation/mediation. Also some more guidance on how to prepare would have been nice. I spent a fair amount of time thinking about BATNAs, WATNAs, bargaining chips, pie-expanding options etc. before walking into the exercises and I felt that a number of my classmates were largely just winging things.

- Another concern of mine is that for a class that focused so much on interests and objective criteria in the beginning, I don't feel that we in any way have a good idea as to what exactly we are being graded on. Certainly a lot of the Getting to Yes methodology is subjective, however it was frustrating that in a result-oriented world the results did not seem to factor into the grading in a meaningful way. Our written work was graded highly subjectively and it would have been very helpful to have some objective criteria as to what points we had to hit on or what other things factor into grading.
- Having 10% of the grade depend on a negotiation taking place at the very beginning of class - the horse negotiation - seems unfair. We haven't had enough time to internalize the content, so it seems like the grade is really evaluating our ability before the class, which seems like it shouldn't really matter as our grades should reflect what we have learned and the effort that we have put in *during the class*.
- I often felt rushed in the in-class exercises, which lead to cutting some corners. It might make sense moving forward to allow us to do the exercise out of class and start class late – say 40 minutes late for an exercise that can be done in 40 min.
- I would have like to work with more total strangers. While I grouped with people that I know at least loosely due to our existing rapport, it would have been beneficial to be forced to work with some true unknowns.
- Lastly, judging by the size of the class we will be on the curve, which potentially magnifies the grading issues identified above.