



Introduction: Assessment as Mirror

*Noam Ebner, James Coben & Christopher Honeyman**

“When you know a thing, to hold that you know it; and when you do not know a thing, to allow that you do not know it – this is knowledge.”
(Confucius)

When negotiation teachers assess students, we might casually think that is all we are doing; but of course it is not. In assessing students, we define for them – intentionally or not – what we think is valuable; we downplay what we distrust; we suppress, perhaps unconsciously, what we ourselves don’t understand; and most troubling, we suggest in a larger sense what the negotiation and conflict management field really *is*, or at least, what we think it will be by the time our students are beyond our control.

Assessing students, for all of these reasons, is an act freighted on many levels. If we measure students’ achievements in ways that are uncreative, insufficient, illogical or inconsistent, we betray the aspirations which presumably led us to this field. We also set diminished expectations for the future. Meantime, the *aspects* of negotiation work that are measured are the aspects presented as worth measuring. The *methods* that are presented to students as valid are the methods students are implicitly being told to value. Say

* **Noam Ebner** is an assistant professor at the Werner Institute at Creighton University’s School of Law, where he chairs the online master’s program in Negotiation and Dispute Resolution. His email address is noamebner@creighton.edu. **James Coben** is a professor of law and senior fellow in the Dispute Resolution Institute at Hamline University School of Law, and co-director of the Rethinking Negotiation Teaching project. His email address is jcoben@hamline.edu. **Christopher Honeyman** is managing partner of Convenor Conflict Management, a consulting firm based in Washington, DC and Madison, Wisconsin. He has directed a 20-year series of major research-and-development projects in conflict management, including as co-director of the Rethinking Negotiation Teaching project. His e-mail address is honeyman@convenor.com.

what we will in class as to the value of the things we do not later assess; we have sent a different message by our practical conduct.

But when we set perceptive, high and creative goals, and demand that they be fulfilled in order to pass the course, we place on *ourselves* the onus to see to it that students are provided with the means to meet them honestly. This can help put steel not just in our students' backbones, but in our own. Assessment is thus central to the purpose of education. It is not ancillary.

What then does it mean that it has taken thirty years of widespread negotiation teaching, and successful marketing of courses (to the point of near-universal adoption, at least in U.S.-based law and business schools), for the subject of assessment in negotiation courses to draw enough interest that a book on the subject can be compiled? Does this mean that the most trenchant critiques from our more traditional law, business, planning, international relations and other colleagues were right in arguing that what we were teaching was a hodge-podge of pseudoscience, anecdotal evidence, half-baked theories and "Kumbaya"? Perhaps not. Perhaps it reflects, rather, the inevitable hesitancy of a new field, feeling its way among skills and knowledge drawn from many other fields with distinct traditions of scholarship and assessment, and one in which a central teaching is to respect multiple points of view. Yet the critique has not gone away. More rigorous approaches to evaluation ought to help answer it. In other words, now that the issue of assessment is fairly joined, it deserves the best answers we can provide.

A Bit of Background

Work on this project began in 2007 with the realization that a vast array of knowledge, brought forth from many disciplines and published together for the first time in *The Negotiator's Fieldbook* (Schneider and Honeyman 2006),¹ was relevant in many parts to even beginning negotiation students, while almost none of it was being taught to them. Hamline's Dispute Resolution Institute, ADR Center Foundation (Rome), the JAMS Foundation, and many of those who had contributed to the *Fieldbook* joined together in an ambitious attempt to re-think what is taught and how it is taught in basic negotiation courses.

We planned a series of international conferences moving from west to east, banking on the notion that the venues themselves would provide fresh perspectives to the diverse and accomplished scholars we needed to ensure a fresh and critical look at the aging canon of negotiation.

Round Three (Beijing)

We chose China as the ideal venue to conclude our project's inquiry, not only because of its own long history with negotiation, internal and external to the country, but because it is a nation with which, tensions or no tensions, every other nation *must* negotiate in the future. Yet China has been almost unrepresented in the modern literature – at least, in the literature that is *expressly* about “negotiation.” Chinese scholars and practitioners also have yet to assert much influence in the global negotiation training market. Our hope was that the conference would serve as a springboard for the entry into this field, at a sophisticated level, of Chinese and other Asian scholars whose deep experience in many related subjects has yet to be fully felt in their implications for the field of negotiation. We believe the contents of this volume, as well as the fourth and final volume in this teaching series – *Educating Negotiators for a Connected World* (Honeyman, Coben, and Lee 2012), suggest we may have succeeded in that particular goal.

The same, however, cannot be said for the ambitious goals articulated for the Rethinking Negotiation Teaching (RNT) project as a whole. Over the series of four books in which this volume appears, we have realized that our initial goals were, in different parts, too easily achievable, more or less do-able, completely impossible at least for the time being – or, to a significant degree, seriously wrong-headed. In the introduction to *Educating Negotiators for a Connected World* (Honeyman, Coben, and Lee 2012), we discuss the resulting reformulations in detail. Here, to avoid redundancy, such ruminations will be largely implicit rather than explicit, and where they are articulated in detail they will be focused on the immediate problem: How do we define what “good” means in a student?

What's in an Assessment?

While there are a variety of definitions of “assessment” across different contexts, its original use in the context of this book was simple enough: we set out to explore the ways in which teachers of academic courses on negotiation grade their students. Even a rudimentary dipping of toes into the voluminous literature on assessment more generally, or a few conversations with colleagues teaching in the same area of study, will show that this was an oversimplification of a very complex task. In the abstract, assessment is about awarding a number (or a written judgment) to a certain level of performance. The moment any particular context is introduced, however, assessment turns out to be a very challenging notion to explore fully.

To begin with, assessment is carried out for quite different reasons, with the grade having different (and overlapping) implications:

progress toward mastering learning objectives, student ranking, professional acceptance, and academic oversight are just four of the common motivators for engaging in assessment, yet even within these four, the same methods or results are not necessarily appropriate to all. Then, there are dozens of approaches to conducting assessment, some of which are well grounded in educational literature and some of which are, at best, highly intuitive. At the same time, teachers have different objectives in teaching negotiation, and also need to satisfy a range of distinct institutional or reputational requirements.

One result is that there is no general, well-accepted approach to assessment. In fact, even across courses being taught in a similar context and in what might be considered a similar cultural environment – teaching of negotiation in U.S. law schools – a survey of courses showed wide variance in approaches (Williams and Geis 2000). As Noam Ebner, Yael Efron and Kimberlee Kovach put it in *Evaluating Our Evaluation*, the second chapter of this volume:

The first finding that stands out in Williams and Geis' survey of various issues in negotiation teaching is that they found grading criteria and grading methods to be *the area of greatest variation* among negotiation teachers (2000: 210). This, in itself, provides justification for exploring this topic at length.

And indeed, the degree of variation is itself reason enough to utilize the RNT Project's network to explore assessment across a broad disciplinary and geographic swath of our field. But there are other compelling reasons. Evaluation is not just a static, end-of-course tool serving institutional, academic or professional goals. Evaluation, as we have already observed but cannot stress too highly, is at the heart of our teaching. It is always under way, at least by implication, affecting relationships, communication, motivation and learning.

The effect that assessment has on directing students' learning may, in fact, be quite scary. As John Wade has put it:

Teachers, researchers, and students often comment that the system conspires against students achieving any deep learning or real understanding. "[T]he longer most undergraduate students (not all . . .) stay in most tertiary institutions, the less deep and the more surface oriented they tend to become, and the more their understanding is assessment related. The tendency is almost universal." (2009: 176, citing Biggs 1999: 34-35)

Could this student focus on that which is “assessment related” be *used* to foster deeper learning, rather than merely lamented? Wade has suggested that

[t]eachers and organizers of courses often have deep – some might say delusional – aspirational goals, while students have culturally acceptable shallow goals, both in aspiration and reality. Student goals, sometimes referred to as “the hidden curriculum,” will always overcome the formal curriculum, despite the anguish and delusions of the organizers and teachers. (2009: 176)

We take the point; but we also are uncomfortably aware that *teachers* set the goals that students are required to meet. Professionals at negotiation, more than other kinds of professionals, are supposed to perceive ways to align what needs to be done with what the other party wants, whether the other party is wise or “miswanting” (see Korobkin and Guthrie 2006.) If as teachers of negotiation we cannot negotiate our way through this, professionally we have nowhere to hide.

Our colleagues’ emerging train of thought suggests, however, that the situation may not be as bleak as Wade suggests. In the next chapter (Ebner, Efron, and Kovach, *Evaluating Our Evaluation*), the understanding that choice and application of assessment methods can have tangible effect on student learning is translated into an operational principle: intentional use of adroitly chosen assessment methods can lead to precise, applicable and even “deep” learning. The following chapters suggest, in a variety of ways, how.

It is not enough to design assessment to encourage learning. The assessment process itself must be designed such that its formative messages are communicated to students in a clear fashion. If teachers’ indications of areas needing improvement or areas of student excellence are not understood by students, important effects of assessment will be lost; indeed, there will be outright motivational and formative damage.

At the same time, other priorities assert themselves. How is one to assess fairly, and communicate perfectly, while knowing that evaluation methods are not equal-opportunity tools, that each one will inevitably provide some kind of an advantage to one student over another, and will likely trigger negative reactions by students thus underprivileged? This might be alleviated, according to Ebner, Efron, and Kovach, by diversifying our methods. And indeed, succeeding chapters outline a wide range of methods from which a teacher can pick and choose, in order to select a package of methods suited to the context and culture of her particular course.

Inherent in this concept is an equivalency between assessment methods and this project's evolution of many new approaches to teaching, with its inherent finding that there is no "one way to do it" (itself an acknowledgement of the poverty of one of our original goals, i.e., of establishing a "version 2.0 standard executive course"). So long as fundamental issues of reliability, validity and credibility are satisfied, assessment can and should be conducted in many ways. Ebner, Efron, and Kovach suggest that we might be able to zoom in on necessary elements or combinations of elements to incorporate in any particular package – for example, formative and summative elements; or subjective and objective measures – but these are only intended as help, or as guidelines, for putting individually-tailored packages together.

The Evolution of a Discussion

The ideas in this book began with an intent to develop just one article. As what became chapter two of this volume began to develop, its authors realized that a birds-eye overview of evaluation in negotiation courses needed to be accompanied by a much more detailed discussion of individual methods and new ideas. What is more, they realized, such thinking needed to be conducted by a larger group of people. When this suggestion was raised at the final (Beijing) conference of the project, the response was overwhelmingly positive, as well as creative. This engendered a combination of group and individual efforts, represented by the other chapters in this volume.

While the following chapters in this book were each written independently, a group session at the Beijing meeting, involving many of those who became contributors, led to the notion that a balance between personal writing style and thematic guidance would be helpful, in order to provide teachers reading these offerings with a broadly comparable set of methods to explore as they rethink their own assessment methods. The contributors agreed to keep the following topics in mind as they approached their writing:

- Describe the method. How is it employed, practically speaking?
- What is the context you use it in?
- What is the goal of the method? If you use it in a particular course, how does this fit in with the overall goals of your course? How might it fit with the goals of a "generic" negotiation course?
- Why do you consider this method an important/necessary element of your evaluation?
- What challenges does the method incur – operational challenges, motivational challenges, etc., for students and for teachers?
- What creative applications of this method have you tried?

- Can you imagine use of this method raising cultural issues, if used in frameworks/countries other than those you have used it in?
- How does this method promote *learning*, as opposed to merely serving as an assessment tool?

The resulting writings are presented not as a closed list of evaluation methods, but as a half-filled toolbox. Teachers are invited to consider and try out a mixture of these methods – and to view the creativity they involve as an invitation to create (and share) their own tools. This, we hope, will allow a new generation of negotiation teachers to develop and apply a new, and increasingly sophisticated, generation of evaluation methods.

A Mirror Half Silvered: The Implications of Assessment

A half-silvered mirror, or one-way mirror, is a classic device to allow close observation of what is happening in an adjoining room, without disturbing it. A favorite device of psychologists (and spies), it is literally designed to facilitate assessment by close observation.

There is an analogy to our own field, which may be revealing. Teachers might think of themselves as working on the darkened side of the mirror, more or less objectively observing and assessing students who work on the well-lit side. But is that really the side of the mirror we are on? The reflective practitioner of teaching can hardly ignore the implications of the chapters which follow, one collective result of which is a perhaps uncomfortably-bright light on some doubtful choices we have been making. Our collective performance as teachers is implicated.

For the future, however, the picture is more cheery. The suggestions for evaluation made in this volume are evenly matched to the new suggestions for teaching methods and content, the main output of the RNT project, assembled in the other volumes in this series. For any teacher who accepts the challenge inherent in our colleagues' critique, there is more than enough here to work with toward addressing it.

In structuring this book, we originally intended to introduce the pieces along an organizing continuum or spectrum. However, in practice, this turned out to be a much more difficult task than we anticipated. Many spectra were considered, including:

- Student-Centered assessment ⇔ Teacher-Centered assessment
- Innovative, original tools ⇔ Rethinking familiar tools
- Labor intensive tools ⇔ “Walk in the park” methods (in terms of teachers' efforts)
- Comprehensive assessment methods ⇔ Partial methods, designed to be used together with other methods

- Narrow focus ⇨ Broad focus (in terms of measuring very specific skills or themes)
- Objective ⇨ Subjective

No matter what continuum (or hybrid continua) we attempted, we wound up stymied. In discussing the process amongst ourselves, we identified three factors challenging our attempts. First, quite simply, there was a shortage of pre-existing writing on this topic within our field, which might have provided us with a helpful framework, if not ready-made models. Second, the ambiguity of evaluation *intentions* became more and more evident, such that any continuum seemed to privilege some ways of looking at the problems at the expense of other, equally valid ways. Finally, the innovative nature of the pieces themselves defied easy placement along a continuum.

Ultimately, we decided to abandon the “continuum” structure, and instead, for clarity, break the chapters down into five themes:

- 1) The Big Picture;
- 2) Looking Harder at the “Tried and True”;
- 3) New Roles for Teachers, New Roles For Students;
- 4) Special Tools for Special Contexts; and
- 5) Comprehensive Approaches.

We will describe the contents briefly in chapter order.

The Big Picture

Evaluating our Evaluation:

Rethinking Student Assessment in Negotiation Courses

Noam Ebner, Yael Efron & Kimberlee K. Kovach

Surveying the history of the first thirty years of assessment of negotiation students, the authors find a great deal of creativity, but also a great deal of illogic. To set the stage for the detailed chapters which follow, the authors analyze the multiple purposes behind assessment, and outline a range of possibilities. They also identify seven criteria which any responsible evaluation system should try to satisfy, and discuss a key distinction: the different purposes of formative and summative assessment. It is essential, they contend, that modern systems of assessment address both.

Looking Harder at the “Tried and True”

Pop Quiz: Do You Use This Evaluation Method?

Noam Ebner & Yael Efron

Some things should never go out of style. In the midst of an impressive array of new tools, Ebner and Efron argue that there is still a role for a surprisingly basic tool which has been underused in our field. The quiz

is a device to which most students have been subjected many times before they take a course in negotiation. Few other tools are so well adapted to the basic educational need to find out quickly if the student *knows* something that has been presented as fact. Surprisingly, however, Ebner and Efron find few teachers of negotiation using this tool. They examine why this might be, and suggest strategies suited to our field.

Reflective Journal Assignments in Teaching Negotiation

Bobbi McAdoo

In contrast to quizzes, student journals are widely used in teaching negotiation, and are one of the most common methods of assessment. However, precisely how teachers use this versatile assessment tool varies widely. In support of her argument that journals have particular value in formative assessment, McAdoo outlines some of the different uses made of this tool by teachers from disciplines as diverse as law, psychology, and political science. The author also analyzes and answers key challenges to using journals for assessment.

The Black Box of Student Evaluation: Course Participation

Noam Ebner & Yael Efron

Course participation is definitely at the subjective end of the subjective-to-objective scale of possible assessment methods. It may be surprising, therefore, that so subjective a measure is almost universally a part of negotiation teachers' assessment methods. Ebner and Efron conclude, however, that just because a method is widely used does not mean it is used effectively. Indeed they find, in surveying colleagues, a startling vagueness at the heart of current use. Picking apart their own prior practice, they discover that they themselves have used course participation in grading in ways that do not survive close examination. From these discoveries they proceed to analyze problems that seem inherent in the method, some of which appear daunting. They modestly conclude that to define "best practices" would be premature. As a step toward greater intellectual rigor and future development, however, Ebner and Efron propose five questions which any teacher interested in rethinking the use of course participation might profitably ask.

Using Video Recordings:

A Mirror and a Window on Student Negotiation

Melissa Manwaring & Kimberlee Kovach

Technological progress may have made both Sergei Eisenstein's and Richard Nixon's methods of recording obsolete, but it is still easy for a teacher to imagine that recording students at work will either become a Herculean endeavor, or somehow intrusive, if not both. That is not necessary. The cost and labor of using videorecordings has declined

dramatically in recent years; in many countries, students not only bring the necessary equipment to class with them routinely, but have free access to the necessary software to process the raw recordings. Meanwhile, the nervousness that recording has classically inspired may be declining, as a result of the sheer volume of student-inspired YouTube and other videos made every day. Yet the utility of the recordings has not been diminished by this familiarity. Indeed, it has been enhanced, as well as made more transparent. The authors review a significant variety of the recent research, and place videorecording squarely at the heart of efforts to make assessment more meaningful, more reliable, and more responsive to students' needs.

New Roles for Teachers, New Roles for Students

Negotiating the Assessment Criteria

Joel Lee

A series of authors in the Rethinking Negotiation Teaching project have argued for greater autonomy and responsibility to be given to students, in a variety of ways. Lee takes this trend a step further, reviewing the history of student disbelief in the rightness or appropriateness of various evaluation criteria, and experimenting with making an explicit negotiation over those criteria a key part of the educational experience. The negotiation is conducted among the students themselves, with the instructor agreeing in advance to accept the chosen criteria, provided that a specified (and high) percentage of the students have agreed on it. But there is a twist, which we will not divulge here . . . and students' outraged responses to the twist have led to one of their best lessons of all.

Simulation Design for Learning and Assessment

Noam Ebner & Daniel Druckman

In previous work in this series, Ebner and Druckman have analyzed the widely assumed (but surprisingly unproven) benefits of role-plays, and concluded that students learn more from designing role-plays than from playing them out. Now, they take the logical next step – explicit assessment of students' performance in simulation design. Ebner and Druckman have found it both valuable and practical to assess the concepts that students weave into the simulation instructions, the relationships constructed between them, the way the simulation design provides opportunities for integrative or distributive behavior, and the way it encourages particular communication behavior. While they find that *skill development* may be better demonstrated during acting out the role-plays resulting from the de-

sign exercise, assessment of the design phase itself proves particularly useful for assessing and increasing, students' *understanding of concepts*.

Interviews as an Assessment Tool

Boyd Fuller

Some assessment methods constitute a kind of blunt instrument, in which the subtleties of students' understanding or lack of it may be evaluated only approximately, with no granular detail. The author finds this problematic. If a focus of rethinking teaching in our field has been, and must be, on improving the responsiveness of teaching to students' individual needs, some form of individuation in finding out just where a given student is weak is essential. Fuller argues for using interviews. In a series of experiments, he finds that three distinct kinds of interview support assessment of different skills, different methods of testing those skills, and different lessons drawn from the experience by the student. One of the three, the author concludes, largely failed his goals for it; but the other two are more promising.

Empowerment and Recognition:

Students Grade Each Other's Negotiation Outcomes

James Coben

Negotiating a settlement that satisfies a client's non-monetary interests is immensely empowering for students. But all too often, student excitement about creative solutions to non-monetary problems blinds them to an abject failure to negotiate money effectively for payments or benefits that their client needs, and that the other side was willing to offer. Or, conversely, they pay out far too much, often by not fully recognizing the time/value of money. How to make these points so they "take"? Coben here describes one solution – a form of peer assessment. After negotiating in pairs and recording settlement summaries which are standardized in format by the instructor (including discounting of all future monetary payments to present value), students rank the quality of all settlements reached other than their own. The student's grade for the exercise depends on the average rank their settlement earned from the class as a whole. An added benefit arises when (almost inevitably) a number of settlements result in high grades for *both* negotiators in a competing pair – providing a powerful and very concrete illustration of Pareto efficiency.

Making Reputation Salient: The Reputation Index

Nancy A. Welsh

Would negotiation students act the way they do in simulations, if they knew this might come back to haunt them? Analyzing the consequences of basing part of students' final grades on objective results they

achieve in negotiation simulations, Welsh found a need for something to counterbalance the expected incentives to engage in distributive tactics and “sharp practice.” She settled on an explicit focus on reputation. While the “reputation index” compiled for each student is only a small fraction of the student’s grade, it is based on recent thinking about the value of negotiators’ reputations even in the short term, and gives some reason for pause to any student who contemplates “defecting,” in classic game theory terms. What’s more, it supports the trend toward giving greater autonomy and responsibility to students themselves – because the reputation that counts here is not the student’s reputation with the teacher, but her reputation with *other students*.

Special Tools for Special Contexts

Assessing the Adventure

Sharon Press, Noam Ebner & Lynn Cohn

A significant series of prior writings in the Rethinking Negotiation Teaching project has focused on adventure learning. Here, the authors tackle a knotty series of assessment problems which adventure learning creates. Experiments at four different universities show that the practical problems are significant, but that they can be overcome. The authors offer a series of tools respectively suited to evaluation of the adventure learning experience itself, its outcomes, or a resulting but separate assignment.

Evaluating Email Negotiation

Melissa Nelken

Recent developments in the art of teaching negotiation via email, including contributions from this project, have created the need for robust methods of evaluating students’ success at using this medium. Negotiating via email provides an important learning experience which, Nelken points out, can include points poorly addressed in other negotiation assignment contexts, including students’ discovery for themselves of the limitations of multitasking, and the importance of nuance. The author reviews the relative strengths, for particular purposes, of a variety of both direct and indirect methods of assessing the process and results of student negotiations conducted by email.

Assessing Negotiation Competitions

Nuno Delicado, Horatio Falcão, Ellen Deason, Sharon Press, Shahla Ali, Eric Blanchot & Habib Chamoun-Nicolas

For many students, the first moment when “the rubber hits the road” in their learning is when they themselves hit the road, for a multi-institution competition. Across a remarkable array of institu-

tions and cultures, the authors assess what has been learned about assessing students in competition environments. Noting that by definition, a competition requires winners (or does it? See next chapter) they suggest that students might be judged by the *outcome* of the negotiation, or, either in combination with outcome or exclusively, by criteria more related to *style and process*, in the way that competitions in gymnastics, figure skating and diving are judged.

A Competition Without Winners or Losers?

The Ontogeny of a New Negotiation Event Format

Horacio Falcão

Falcão examines the conduct of students in negotiation competitions, and finds much going on that contravenes key lessons we have been trying to teach. Typical incentives in typical competitions, it turns out, are antithetical to much of what we believe is most important for students to learn. Can anything be done about this? Falcão concludes that if the concept of “competition” is central, perhaps not; but if that concept is replaced by “challenge,” possibilities emerge for creative responses that might be equally exciting for students, but have stronger educational value all round. He outlines a series of distinct approaches with different likely advantages, and offers a preliminary assessment as to which might work best for what purpose.

Comprehensive Approaches

A Benchmarking System for Assessment:

An Experiment in Creating More Transparency in Grading

Boyd Fuller & Sohni Kaur

After analyzing a tendency for existing systems of assessment to imply something that is obviously not true – that all topics taught in a negotiation course are equally important – and realizing that typical systems of grading tend to conflate data in such a way as to obscure which particular subtopics a given student may need more help with, the authors decided to try something new. Their “benchmark” approach provides for two different kinds of benchmarks, absolute and accumulative. Absolute benchmarks determine whether a student has demonstrated understanding of certain concepts or skills, and set the bar for achievement up to a certain grade. Accumulative benchmarks are used for the higher grades, and allow a degree of student choice as to what a given student seeks to focus on. Fuller and Kaur report on initial use of this system, and find that while it requires further development to be effective in encouraging students to prioritize and excel, it already works well for distinguish-

ing which particular concepts students have learned well, and which ones demand either more coaching, or more subtle teaching.

Portfolio Evaluation:

Kaleidoscopic Insights into Effectiveness and Change

Michelle LeBaron

Like the benchmark approach, portfolio evaluation seeks to distinguish particular elements that have been learned well from those which will require more work from the student, or from the teacher. Unlike the benchmark approach, portfolio evaluation welcomes, indeed encourages, affective and sensory reflection, rather than an exclusive focus on the cognitive. The author has a strong commitment to a broad view of the field, and her particular use of portfolios gives some room to cultural, physical and even aesthetic elements which, she argues, are often underappreciated in our field. Even in more conventional practice, however, LeBaron contends that portfolio evaluation addresses a series of formative and summative assessment needs – particularly fostering double-loop learning – better than standard approaches have.

Epilogue

Assessing Ourselves

Noam Ebner, James Coben & Christopher Honeyman

In most educational settings, carefully calibrated, multi-modal assessments are reduced to a single letter or numerical grade at term's end. In an unblinking assessment of their own effort to determine best practices in assessing negotiation students, the editors conclude they deserve an "I" for incomplete. They console themselves on the ground that they would have deserved an "F" had they followed the original project plan – and failed to deliver this much-needed volume.

Conclusion: The State of an Emerging Art

An inevitable consequence either of first attempts to codify intuitive practice, or of outright innovations, is an inability to be sure they will work – or more to the point, work accurately, repeatedly and over multiple teacher personalities, institutional personalities, and cultures – and all, of course, at reasonable cost in time and in cash. Many of the suggestions put forth in the chapters which follow are admittedly *so* innovative as to have been implemented only by individual teachers, or indeed not yet tried in practice by any teacher at all.

While all of the assertions and ideas in this volume can be tested over time – by repeated "gut checks" as well as by more rigorous or even scientific examination – the first indicator that teachers can

probably access, as to the efficacy of any given method or approach, will be by more critically reviewing our students' achievements as a measure of our own pedagogical choices, and of our own proficiency in implementing them.

Toward this purpose, at a minimum and as a beginning, we believe our colleagues have made major progress. For the rest – for the necessary accuracy, repeatability, robustness, cost-effectiveness – time will tell. Our own belief is that our contributors have made, at the least, an excellent start. We invite the reader to experiment, to correct our and our colleagues' errors, and to develop these themes further.

Notes

¹ Published by the American Bar Association, the *Negotiator's Fieldbook* (Schneider and Honeyman 2006) includes eighty chapters authored by social psychologists, urban planners, police and military officers, and scholars of management, law, business, genetics, and international relations, as well as judges and experienced conflict resolution practitioners whose contributions directly relate theory to practice.

References

- Biggs, J. 1999. *Teaching for quality learning: What the student does*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Coben, J., C. Honeyman, and S. Press. 2010. Straight off the deep end in adventure learning. In *Venturing beyond the classroom: Volume 2 in the rethinking negotiation teaching series*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. De Palo. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Honeyman, C., J. Coben, and G. De Palo (eds). 2009a. *Rethinking negotiation teaching: Innovations for context and culture*. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Honeyman, C., J. Coben, and G. De Palo (guest eds). 2009b. Special section of eight articles: Second generation global negotiation education. *Negotiation Journal* 25(2): 141-266.
- Honeyman, C., J. Coben, and G. De Palo (eds). 2010. *Venturing beyond the classroom: Volume 2 in the rethinking negotiation teaching series*. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Honeyman, C., J. Coben, and A. W-M. Lee (eds). 2012. *Educating negotiators for a connected world: Volume 4 in the rethinking negotiation teaching series*. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Honeyman, C. and J. Coben. 2010. Navigating wickedness: A new frontier in teaching negotiation. In *Venturing beyond the classroom: Volume 2 in the rethinking negotiation teaching series*, edited by C. Honeyman, J. Coben, and G. De Palo. St. Paul, MN: DRI Press.
- Korobkin, R. and C. Guthrie. 2006. Heuristics and biases at the bargaining table. In *The negotiator's fieldbook: The desk reference for the experienced negotiator*, edited by A. K. Schneider and C. Honeyman. Washington, DC: American Bar Association.

- Schneider, A. K. and C. Honeyman (eds). 2006. *The negotiator's fieldbook: The desk reference for the experienced negotiator*. Washington, DC: American Bar Association.
- Wade, J. 2009. Defining success in negotiation and other dispute resolution training. *Negotiation Journal* 25(2): 171-180.
- Williams, G. R. and J. Geis, J. 2000. Negotiation skills training in the law school curriculum. In *Teaching negotiation: Ideas and innovations*, edited by M. Wheeler. Cambridge, MA: PON books.

