

SCORESHEET

flight (round no.): 3

stage: III

room: B15

problem no.: 6

Juror's name & signature: HATSU BASHU

reviewer: HATSU BASHU

reporter: HATSU BASHU

opponent: HATSU BASHU

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4.5 + 0.0 - 0.5 = 7

REPORT

phenomenon explanation

theory/model

relevant experiments

comparison between theory and experiment

own contribution

task fulfillment

science communication

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

relevant arguments/responses

reporter's conduct at the discussion

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

concise and correct or no questions asked

some incorrect, inconclusive or too long

deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

=

7

1

4.5

0.0

-0.5

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5.5 + 2.5 - 4.5 = 8

fight (round no.): 5 stage: 3 room:

problem no.: 6

Juror's name & signature:

RAJESH

reporter: Bishal Ghosh

opponent: Venkatesh Kumar

STUB

reviewer: Lita

Pratibha

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	some	-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	
4 detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	
5 - 9	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proven deep understanding	overall efficient	

NOTES:

excellent while solving

Diff in theoretical solutions

30 overall

100 exp - 1000

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - 7 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 too few, mostly irrelevant
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritization	own opinions presented	time management
0 almost nothing	irrelevant	too few	poor
1 some main points	too few	some	reasonable
2 + main points	some	* some correct	fair
3 all relevant points	most	many correct	efficient
4 practically all points	well prioritized	* improvement suggestions	all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

relevant topics and prioritization	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion
0 irrelevant	too few	poor
1 too few	some	some aspects fine
2 some	* some correct	good
3 most	many correct	some aspects efficient
4 well prioritized	* improvement suggestions	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked
-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

theoretic

same force

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 1 + 1 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 too few, mostly irrelevant
1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritization
0 poor/wrong	irrelevant
1 partial	partially relevant
2 good	mostly correct, prioritized
3 detailed, complex	fully adequate, well prioritized

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritization
0 poor/wrong	irrelevant
1 too short/long	partially relevant
2 informative, apt	mostly correct, prioritized
3 condensed & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritized

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0 almost no	irrelevant
1 too short/long	some
2 accurate, conclusive	many
3 adequate	fully

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

-1 irrelevant
0 none
1 relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked
-1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
-2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 0 = 0.5 = 4

fight (round no.): 2nd stage: 2

rooms:

problem no.: 14

Juror's name & signature: *Lucy*

reporter: Adnan Deenwala

Patel's US

opponent:

Jakub Stepan

COH

reviewer:

Hafsa Ghannam SK

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number, results explained	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4 detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5 demonstrative	detailed, complex, correct	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	overall clear, demonstrative	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable							
7								

NOTES:

Experiments

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.75 + 2.75 + 7.5 = 0.5 = 6

Change of position & position of experiments

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, aimed at removing unclear points in the report
- 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management
0 almost nothing	irrelevant	too few	poor
1 some main points	too few	some	reasonable
2 main points	some	some correct	fair
3 all relevant points	most	many correct	efficient
4 practically all points	well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion
0 irrelevant	too few	poor
1 too few	some	some aspects fine
2 some	some correct	good
3 most	many correct	some aspects efficient
4 well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- 0 concise and correct or no questions asked
- 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

how was the experiment conducted?

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.25 + 1.25 + 0.5 = 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- 2 + suitably allocated to Rep & Opp, most time used
- 3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation
0 poor/wrong	irrelevant
1 partial	partially relevant
2 good	mostly correct, prioritised
3 detailed, complex	fully adequate, well prioritised

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation
0 poor/wrong	irrelevant
1 too short/long	partially relevant
2 informative, apt	mostly correct, prioritised
3 condensed & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0 almost no	irrelevant
1 too short/long	some
2 relevant parts	many
3 accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 1 irrelevant
- 1 none
- 1 relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

- 0 concise and correct or no questions asked
- 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 1 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.):

stage:

room:

problem no.:

Juror's name & signature:

reporter:

GCH

opponent:

STC

reviewer:

Post

Prescott

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 55 + 25 - 05 = 8

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 too few	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	average	1 some	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	some aspects above average	2 many	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	1 + data/theory supported	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
4 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained + errors analysed, + reproducible, convincing analysis	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	integrating solution	overall clear, demonstrative	2 proved deep understanding	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable		well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	greater extent than expected	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	3 overall efficient	

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 7 + 25 + 3 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

- too few, mostly irrelevant
- relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management
0 almost nothing	irrelevant	too few	poor
1 some main points	too few	some	reasonable
2 main points	some	some correct	fair
3 all relevant points	some	many correct	efficient
4 practically all points	well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion
0 irrelevant	too few	poor
1 too few	some	some aspects fine
2 some	some correct	good
3 many correct	many correct	some aspects efficient
4 well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- concise and correct or no questions asked
- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 45 + 2 + 7 - 4 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

- too few, mostly irrelevant
- relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- + suitably allocated to Rep & Opp.
- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

evaluation & understanding	pros & cons
0 poor/wrong	irrelevant
1 partial	partially relevant
2 good	mostly correct, prioritised
3 detailed, complex	fully adequate, well prioritised

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech evaluation	pros & cons
0 poor/wrong	irrelevant
1 too short/long	partially relevant
2 informative, apt	mostly correct, prioritised
3 condensed & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0 almost no	irrelevant
1 too short/long	some
2 relevant parts	many
3 accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

relevant, constructive
0 irrelevant
1 none
2 relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

- concise and correct or no questions asked
- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.):

stage:

room:

problem no.:

Juror's name & signature:

reporter:

B720

opponent:

Veronica

reviewer:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 3 - 0 = 9

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 misunderstood	0 unclear, chaotic	0 relevant arguments/responses	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 some	1 some	1 some	1 some	1 review of sources, cited	1 partly	1 average	1 too few	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 fair	2 fair	2 fair	2 not well fitting	2 some own input	2 average	2 average	2 many	2 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3	3	3 well performed, sufficient number of results explained	3 deviations qualitatively analysed + priority limits explained, conclusive	3 + some interesting results	3 some aspects above average	3 some aspects well done	3 + data/theory supported	3 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
4 detailed	4 quite detailed, correct	4 errors analysed, + reproducible, convincing analysis	4 well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	4 considerable experimental or theoretical	4 interesting solution	4 overall clear, demonstrative	4 proved deep understanding	4 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 detailed, complex, completely testable			5 well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 greater extent than expected	5 + complex concepts well communicated	5 overall efficient	5 deep misconceptions
6	6							
7	7							

NOTES:

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0 + 2 + 2 + 0 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 too few, mostly irrelevant	understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 almost nothing	1 irrelevant	1 too few	1 poor	1 irrelevant	1 too few	1 poor	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 some main points	2 some	2 some correct	2 reorganizable	2 some	2 some correct	2 some aspects fine	2 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
	3 all relevant points	3 most	3 many correct	3 efficient	3 most	3 many correct	3 some aspects efficient	3 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	4 practically all points	4 well prioritized	4 + improvement suggestions	4 all time used	4 well prioritized	4 + improvement suggestions	4 overall efficient	

NOTES:

Reporters?? major lesson? styleline on the answer can

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 2 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

REVIEW OF REPORT

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

ANSWERS TO JURY

0 too few, mostly irrelevant	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0 irrelevant	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 poor/wrong	1 partially relevant	1 too short/long	1 irrelevant	1 too short/long	1 some	1 none	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 partial	2 mostly correct, prioritized	2 informative, apt	2 mostly correct, prioritized	2 relevant points	2 many	2 relevant, constructive	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 detailed, complex	3 fully adequate, well prioritized	3 accurate	3 fully adequate, well prioritized	3 accurate	3 adequate		

NOTES:

Reporters??

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

1 + 2.5 + 0.5 = 4

fight (round no.): 3 stages: 11 room: 295 problem no.: 14

reporter: Ashan Thekuvilakam opponent: Subodh Sankar

reviewer:

REPORT

phenomenon	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4 detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, convincing analysis	+ reproducible, well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	greater extent than expected	greater extent than expected	overall clear, demonstrative	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6	completely testable							
7								

NOTES:

29

29

29

OPPONENT

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 1 = 6

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)				DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked	
1-5	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	almost nothing	irrelevant	too few	poor	irrelevant	too few	poor			
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	1 some main points	too few	some	reasonable	1, 1.5 some	some	some aspects fine	-1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	
		2, 3, 5 main points	some *	some correct *	fair	2 most	many correct	good			
		3 all relevant points *	most	many correct *	efficient	3	many correct	some aspects efficient			
		4 practically all points	well prioritised	* improvement suggestions	* *	4 well prioritised	* improvement suggestions	overall efficient	-2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
NOTES:											
0, *											

NOTES:

29

REVIEWER

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 0.5 = 5

Start from 1 and add/subtract

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	correct own opinions	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	1 partial	partially relevant	too short/long	relevant parts	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	2 good	mostly correct, prioritised	informative, apt	many	
	3 detailed, complex	fully adequate, well prioritized	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

fileht (round no.):

stare:

room:

problem no.:

Juror's name & signature:

2

Scat

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 25 = 26$$

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	too few	poor
some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly average	partly clear average	some many	partly fine good
fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative		
detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	greater extent than expected	complex concepts well communicated		
demonstrative		errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive					
deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis					proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 7 + 2 + 25 - 1 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)				DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked	
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	almost nothing	irrelevant	too few	poor	irrelevant	too few	poor	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	some main points	too few	some	reasonable	some	some correct	good	-1	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
		main points	some	some correct	fair	most	many correct	some aspects efficient			
		all relevant points	most	many correct	efficient			overall efficient			
				+ improvements suggestions	+ all time used	well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions		-2		
		practically all points	well prioritized								
NOTES:		4				4					

NOTES:

- tilted force

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 15 + 25 + 0.1 = 41.1 = 41$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT		REVIEW OF OPPOSITION		DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT		ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0	too few, mostly irrelevant relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	-1	irrelevant	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	almost no	irrelevant	0	none	-1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	0	relevant, constructive	-2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		good	mostly correct, prioritised	informative, apt	mostly correct, prioritised	relevant parts	many	-1			
		detailed, complex	fully adequate, well prioritized	condensed & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate				

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 1.5 - 0 = 6$$

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 - almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	0 - no questions asked
1 - some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 - fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	some	2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 - good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ some interesting results	same aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	
4 - detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	
5 - demonstrative	deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex, completely testable	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	
6 - shows physical insight		+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive					
7 -								

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 - too few, mostly irrelevant
1 - relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2 - short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

NOTES:

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management
0 - almost nothing	irrelevant	too few	poor
1 - some main points	too few	some	reasonable
2 - all relevant points	some	some correct	fair
3 - practically all points	most	many correct	efficient
4 -	well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion
0 - irrelevant	too few	poor
1 - too few	some	some aspects fine
2 - some	some correct	good
3 - most	many correct	some aspects efficient
4 - well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 - concise and correct or no questions asked
1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 1.5 + 1 \pm 0 - 0 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 - too few, mostly irrelevant
1 - relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
2 - suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
3 - short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

NOTES:

REVIEW OF REPORT

evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation
0 - poor/wrong	irrelevant
1 - partial	partially relevant
2 - good	mostly correct, prioritised
3 - detailed, complex	fully adequate, well prioritised

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation
0 - poor/wrong	irrelevant
1 - too short/long	partially relevant
2 - informative, apt	mostly correct, prioritised
3 - condensed & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0 - almost no	irrelevant
1 - too short/long	some
2 - relevant parts accurate, conclusive	many
3 -	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

0 - irrelevant	none
1 -	relevant, constructive
2 -	

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

0 - concise and correct or no questions asked
1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 5

stage: 1

room: 205

problem no.: 10

Juror's name & signature:

MATEJ BARON

reviewer: Michael Vozarovsky

reporter: Spolupracovník

opponent: Miroslav Vozarovsky

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 misunderstood	0 unclear, chaotic	0 relevant arguments/responses	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 some	1 some	1 some	1 some	1 review of sources, cited	1 partly	1 average	1 some	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 fair	2 fair	2 fair	2 not well fitting	2 some own input	2 average	2 some aspects above average	2 + data/theory supported	2 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3 good	3 good	3 well performed, sufficient number	3 deviations qualitatively analysed	3 + some interesting results	3 some aspects above average	3 well done overall clear, demonstrative	3 proved deep understanding	3 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4 detailed	4 quite detailed,	4 results explained	4 + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 considerable experimental or theoretical	4 interesting solution	4 overall clear, demonstrative	4 some aspects efficient	
5 demonstrative	5 correct	5 errors analysed	5 well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 considerable experimental and theoretical	5 greater extent than expected	5 + complex concepts well communicated	5 overall efficient	
6 deep and comprehensible,	6 detailed, complex,	6 + reproducible, convincing analysis						
7 shows physical insight	7 completely testable							

NOTES:

13/ → Full time? (4 → 15 minutes plus your time?)

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 too few, mostly irrelevant	understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	0 almost nothing	0 irrelevant	0 too few	0 poor	0 irrelevant	0 too few	0 poor	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	1 some main points	1 too few	1 some correct	1 reasonable	1 too few	1 some	1 some aspects fine	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
	2 main points	2 some	2 many correct	2 fair	2 some	2 some correct	2 good	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	3 all relevant points	3 most	3 + improvement suggestions	3 efficient	3 most	3 many correct	3 some aspects efficient	
	4 practically all points	4 well prioritized	4 + improvement suggestions	4 all time used	4 well prioritized	4 + improvement suggestions	4 overall efficient	

NOTES:

13/ → Full time? (4 → 15 minutes plus your time?)

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 too few, mostly irrelevant	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	correct own opinions	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	0 poor/wrong	0 irrelevant	0 poor/wrong	0 poor/wrong	0 irrelevant	0 irrelevant	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	1 partial	1 partially relevant	1 too short/long	1 too short/long	1 partially relevant	1 none	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
	2 good	2 mostly correct, prioritized	2 informative, apt	2 mostly correct, prioritized	2 mostly correct, prioritized	2 relevant, constructive	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	3 detailed, complex	3 fully adequate, well prioritized	3 condensed & accurate	3 fully adequate, well prioritized	3 accurate, conclusive		

NOTES:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.):

stage:

room:

problem no.:

Jury's name & signature:

reporter:

Spania

opponent:

reviewer:

Mark

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 - 4 = 5

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 relevant arguments/responses	0 correct and correct or no questions asked
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1 too few	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 fair	fair	fair	no, well-fitting	some own input	average	average	2 many + data/theory supported	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 good	good	good	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	3 proved deep understanding	
4 detailed	quite detailed, correct	well performed, efficient number	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative		
5 heuristic		errors analysed			greater extent	overall clear, demonstrative		
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive		than expected	complex concepts well communicated		
7								

NOTES:

R10 is winning
weirda phisika? - had a few a new
apud clarity
Balecive

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 too few, mostly irrelevant
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management
0 almost nothing	irrelevant	too few	poor
1 some main points	too few	some	reasonable
2 main points	some	some correct	fair
3 all relevant points	most	many correct	efficient
4 practically all points	well prioritized	+ improvement suggestions	all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion
0 irrelevant	too few	poor
1 some	some	some aspects fine
2 some	some correct	good
3 most	many correct	some aspects efficient
4 well prioritized	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

weirda phisika? - had a few a new
apud clarity
Balecive

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 3 + 2 + 0 + 0 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 too few, mostly irrelevant
1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation
0 poor/wrong	irrelevant
1 partial	partially relevant
2 good	mostly correct, prioritised
3 detailed, complex	fully adequate, well prioritized

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation
0 poor/wrong	irrelevant
1 too short/long	partially relevant
2 informative, apt	mostly correct, prioritised
3 condensed & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritized

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0 almost no	irrelevant
1 too short/long	some
2 accurate, relevant parts	many
3 conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

0 irrelevant	
1 none	
2 relevant, constructive	

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

weirda phisika?

SCORESHEET

flight (round no.):

stage:

room:

problem no.:

Juror's name & signature:

reporter:

STK

opponent:

Post

reviewer:

GSF

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 235 + 2 - 7 = 5

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, Oponent, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own about	average	average	some	partly fine
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4 detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	interesting	overall clear, demonstrative	+ deep theory supported	some aspects efficient
5 demotivative	detailed, complex, convincing analysis	+ reproducible, well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental	or theoretical	greater extent than expected	complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight								
7								

NOTES:

John Dita

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 25 + 2 - 7 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

- too few, mostly irrelevant
- relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management
0 almost nothing	irrelevant	too few	poor
1 some main points	too few	some	reusable
2 main points	some	some correct	fair
3 all relevant points	most	many correct	efficient
4 practically all points	well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion
0 irrelevant	too few	poor
1 too few	some	some aspects fine
2 some	some correct	good
3 most	many correct	some aspects efficient
4 well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- concise and correct or no questions asked
- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3 + 3 + 05 + 8 = 8

Nasiriyi

QUESTIONS ASKED

- too few, mostly irrelevant
- relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation
0 poor/wrong	irrelevant
1 partial	partially relevant
2 good	mostly correct, prioritised
3 detailed, complex	fully adequate, well prioritised

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation
0 poor/wrong	irrelevant
1 too short/long	partially relevant
2 informative, apt	mostly correct, prioritised
3 comprehensive & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0 almost no	irrelevant
1 no short/long	some
2 relevant parts	many
3 accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- irrelevant
- none
- relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

- concise and correct or no questions asked
- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

REPORTER
 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 4

Spencer - Bullseye

5534

GS4 - 6 (Barb's handwriting)
 Rose - 14 (Barb's handwriting)
 Figures - 10 (Barb's handwriting)

REPORT							DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion		
0 almost no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 misunderstood	0 unclear, chaotic	0 too few	0 poor	0 condise and correct or no questions asked	
1 some	1 almost no	1 some	1 some	1 some own input	1 partly average	1 partly clear	1 some many	1 partly fine	1 some incorrect,	
2 fair	2 fair	2 fair	2 not well fitting	2 some own input	2 some aspects above average	2 some aspects well done	2 + data/theory supported	2 some aspects efficient	2 inconclusive or too long	
3 good	3 good	3 well performed, sufficient number	3 deviations qualitatively analysed	3 + some interesting results	3 interesting solution	3 overall clear, demonstrative	3 proved deep understanding	3 overall efficient	3 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
4 detailed	4 quite detailed, correct	4 results explained + errors analysed	4 + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 considerable experimental	4 greater extent than expected	4 + complex concepts well communicated				
5 demonstrative	5 detailed, complex, correct	5 reproducible, convincing analysis	5 well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 for theoretical						
6 deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	6 completely testable									
7										

NOTES:

NOTES:

OPONENT
 1 + 1 + 2.5 + 5 - 0 = 8

GS4 - Witzke

7788

QUESTIONS ASKED		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	concise and correct or no questions asked	
1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	almost nothing	too few	poor	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	
2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	some main points	too few	some aspects fine	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
	main points	some	good		
	all relevant points	most	some aspects efficient		
			overall efficient		
	practically all points	well prioritized			

NOTES:

REVIEWER
 1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2 + 1.5 + 0 - 0 = 8

Porter - Witzke

6688

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT		REVIEW OF OPPOSITION		DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT		ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	irrelevant	none	irrelevant	0 — no questions asked	
1 — relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	too short/long	irrelevant	some	relevant, constructive	1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long		
2 — partially allotted to Reps & Opp, most time used	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	partially relevant	informative, apt	many fully adequate	relevant parts accurate, conclusive	relevant, constructive	2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions		
3 — short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	good	mostly correct, prioritised	informative, apt condensed & accurate	mostly correct, prioritised	mostly correct, prioritised	fully adequate, well prioritised	1 — none	relevant, constructive	3 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long		
	2 — detailed, complex	fully adequate, well prioritised					2 — none	relevant, constructive	4 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 12.5 + 1.5 = 14.5 = 5

STK Filip Bumbuly 4 Ace

LUICKY

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 — almost no	0 — almost no	0 — almost no	0 — almost no	0 — almost no	0 — misunderstanding	0 — unclear, chaotic	0 — relevant arguments/responses	0 — reporter's conduct at the discussion
1 — some	1 — some	1 — some	1 — some	1 — review of sources, cited	1 — partly	1 — average	1 — some	1 — poor
2 — fair	2 — fair	2 — fair	2 — not well fitting	2 — some own input	2 — average	2 — some aspects	2 — many	2 — partly fine
3 — good	3 — good	3 — well performed, sufficient number	3 — deviations qualitatively analysed	3 — + some interesting results	3 — some aspects above average	3 — some aspects well done	3 — + data/theory supported	3 — good
4 — detailed	4 — quite detailed, correct	4 — + results explained	4 — + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 — considerable experimental or theoretical	4 — interesting solution	4 — overall clear, demonstrative	4 — proved deep understanding	4 — some aspects efficient
5 — demonstrative	5 — detailed, complex, + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 — errors analysed	5 — well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 —	5 — greater extent than expected	5 — + complex concepts well communicated	5 —	5 — overall efficient
6 — deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	6 —	6 —	6 —	6 —	6 —	6 —	6 —	6 —
7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —

NOTES:

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 = 7

BDH Michael Vordian

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management
0 — almost nothing	0 — irrelevant	0 — too few	0 — poor
1 — some main points	1 — too few	1 — some	1 — reasonable
2 — main points	2 — some	2 — some correct	2 — fair
3 — all relevant points	3 — most	3 — many correct	3 — efficient
4 — practically all points	4 — well prioritised	4 — + improvement suggestions	4 — all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion
0 — irrelevant	0 — too few	0 — poor
1 — too few	1 — some	1 — some aspects fine
2 — some	2 — some correct	2 — good
3 — most	3 — many correct	3 — some aspects efficient
4 — well prioritised	4 — + improvement suggestions	4 — overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- 0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
- 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

power supply 2

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 2 + 1.5 = 6

Postbox Hovos Medev

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 — relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- 2 — + suitably allocated to Rep & Opp, most time used
- 3 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritised, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation
0 — poor/wrong	0 — irrelevant
1 — partial	1 — partially relevant
2 — good	2 — mostly correct, prioritised
3 — detailed, complex	3 — fully adequate, well prioritised

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation
0 — poor/wrong	0 — irrelevant
1 — too short/long	1 — partially relevant
2 — informative, apt	2 — mostly correct, prioritised
3 — condensed & accurate	3 — fully adequate, well prioritised

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0 — almost no	0 — irrelevant
1 — too short/long	1 — some
2 — relevant parts	2 — many
3 — accurate, conclusive	3 — fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 0 — irrelevant
- 1 — none
- 2 — relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

- 0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
- 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

Wag 25 CF

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 15 + 0.5 - 0 = 3$$

Problem 4

Maria

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 — almost no 1 — some 2 — fair 3 — good 4 — detailed 5 — demonstrative 6 — deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	0 — almost no 1 — some 2 — fair 3 — good 4 — quite detailed, correct 5 — detailed, complex, convincingly testable	0 — almost no 1 — some 2 — fair 3 — well performed, sufficient number 4 — + results explained 5 — errors analyzed 6 — + reproducible, convincing analysis	0 — almost no 1 — some 2 — not well fitting 3 — deviations 4 — qualitatively analyzed 5 — + theory limits explained, conclusive 6 — well fitting, deviations analyzed, conclusive	0 — almost no 1 — review of sources, cited 2 — some own input 3 — + some interesting results 4 — considerable experimental or theoretical 5 — considerable experimental and theoretical	0 — misunderstood 1 — partly 2 — average 3 — some aspects above average 4 — interesting solution 5 — greater extent than expected	0 — unclear, chaotic 1 — partly clear 2 — average 3 — some aspects well done 4 — overall clear, demonstrative, + complex concepts well communicated	0 — too few 1 — some 2 — many 3 — + facts/theory supported 4 — proved deep understanding	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked 1 — partly fine 2 — good 3 — some aspects efficient 4 — overall efficient

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 8 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 8$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management
0 — almost nothing 1 — some main points 2 — main points 3 — all relevant points 4 — practically all points	0 — irrelevant 1 — too few 2 — some 3 — most 4 — well prioritised	0 — too few 1 — some 2 — some correct 3 — many correct 4 — + improvement suggestions	0 — poor 1 — reasonable 2 — fair 3 — efficient 4 — all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion
0 — irrelevant 1 — too few 2 — some 3 — most 4 — well prioritised	0 — too few 1 — some 2 — some correct 3 — many correct 4 — + improvement suggestions	0 — poor 1 — some aspects fine 2 — good 3 — some aspects efficient 4 — overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- 0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
- 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 = 8$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 — relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- 2 — + succinctly allocated to Rep & Opp, most time used
- 3 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation
0 — poor/wrong 1 — partial 2 — good 3 — detailed, complex	0 — irrelevant 1 — partially relevant 2 — mostly correct, prioritised 3 — fully adequate, well prioritised

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation
0 — poor/wrong 1 — too short/long 2 — informative, apt 3 — condensed & accurate	0 — irrelevant 1 — partially relevant 2 — mostly correct, prioritised 3 — fully adequate, well prioritised

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own options
0 — almost no 1 — too short/long 2 — relevant parts accurate, conclusive	0 — irrelevant 1 — some 2 — many 3 — fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 0 — irrelevant
- 1 — none
- 2 — relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

- 0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
- 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1..10] range.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 15 - (-7) = 5$$

STK

Batony

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	too few	poor	0 - concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	partly fine	1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	1	good	2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	2	1	
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	3	2	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, convincing analysis	errors analysed, reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated		3	

NOTES:

Grade 13 - 5 (16)

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 25 + 27 - 0 = 7$$

GH

Vasavi

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS ASKED	understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 - too few, mostly irrelevant	almost nothing	irrelevant	too few	poor	irrelevant	too few	poor	0 - concise and correct or no questions asked
1 - relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	too few	some	reasonable	some	some	some aspects fine	1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used	2	some	many correct	efficient	2	many correct	some aspects efficient	2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	3	all relevant points	+ improvement suggestions		3		overall efficient	
	4	practically all points	well prioritised	all time used	4	well prioritised		

NOTES:

Chinakis

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 38 + 15 + 2 + 15 + 0 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

REVIEW OF REPORT

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

QUESTIONS ASKED	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 - too few, mostly irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	almost no	irrelevant	0 - irrelevant	0 - concise and correct or no questions asked
1 - relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	1 - none	1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritised, time managed efficiently	2	mostly correct, prioritised	2	mostly correct, prioritised	2	fully adequate, well prioritised	2	2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 2

10m 16 Zuhair

Pauline (AS)

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no	1 almost no	1 almost no	1 almost no	1 almost no	1 almost no	1 almost no	1 almost no	0 concisely and correct or no questions asked
1 some	2 some	2 some	2 some	2 some	2 some	2 some	2 some	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 fair	3 fair	3 fair	3 fair	3 fair	3 fair	3 fair	3 fair	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 good	4 good	4 good	4 good	4 good	4 good	4 good	4 good	
4 detailed	5 detailed	5 detailed	5 detailed	5 detailed	5 detailed	5 detailed	5 detailed	
5 demonstrative	6 demonstrative	6 demonstrative	6 demonstrative	6 demonstrative	6 demonstrative	6 demonstrative	6 demonstrative	
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	7 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	7 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	7 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	7 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	7 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	7 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	7 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

STAG KE

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management
0 almost nothing	1 too few	1 too few	1 poor
1 some main points	2 some	2 some	2 fair
2 main points	3 most	3 many correct	3 efficient
3 all relevant points	4 well prioritised	4 + improvement suggestions	4 all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion
0 irrelevant	1 too few	1 poor
1 too few	2 some	2 some aspects fine
2 some	3 some correct	3 good
3 most	4 many correct	4 some aspects efficient
4 well prioritised	5 + improvement suggestions	5 overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- 0 concisely and correct or no questions asked
- 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 6.5 + 4.5 + 1 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- 2 + suitably selected no Rep & Opp, most time used
- 3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation
0 poor/wrong	1 irrelevant
1 partial	2 partially relevant
2 good	3 mostly correct, prioritised
3 detailed, complex	4 fully adequate, well prioritised

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation
0 poor/wrong	1 irrelevant
1 too short/long	2 partially relevant
2 informative, apt	3 mostly correct, prioritised
3 condensed & accurate	4 fully adequate, well prioritised

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0 almost no	1 irrelevant
1 too short/long	2 some
2 relevant parts	3 many
3 accurate, conclusive	4 fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 0 irrelevant
- 1 none
- 2 relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

- 0 concisely and correct or no questions asked
- 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

Please, statefully adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + 0 - 0 = 3

Town
 Babin
 Nite

REPORT								DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	0	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
1	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	undecar, chaotic	1	too few	poor	0
2	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly average	partly clear	2	some	partly fine	1
3	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	3	many	good	2
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	considerable experimental or theoretical	overall clear, demonstrative	4	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	3
5	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	5	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	4
6	demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical			6			5
7	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, convincing analysis						7			6

P.S. ... before my home

1.5 mm

Plate: Tel

OPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 0 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	almost nothing	too few	poor	irrelevant	too few	poor
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	some main points	some	reasonable	1	some	some aspects fine
		main points	some correct	fair	2	some	good
		all relevant points	many correct	efficient	3	many correct	some aspects efficient
		well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	all time used	4	well prioritised	overall efficient

actual size, experiments ... P.S.

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 0 + 2 + 0 + 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT		REVIEW OF OPPOSITION		DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT		ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	-1	irrelevant	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	almost no	irrelevant	0	none	-1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	+ suitably allocated to Rep & Opp, most time used	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	0	none	-1	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
2		good	mostly correct, prioritised	informative, apt	mostly correct, prioritised	relevant parts	many	1	relevant, constructive	-2	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate, well prioritised	condensed & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	1			
3											

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 14.5 + 17.8 - 1 = 3$$

Polmer

22.6

5

Prescott

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 — almost no	0 — almost no	0 — almost no	0 — almost no	0 — almost no	0 — misunderstanding	0 — unclear, chaotic	0 — relevant arguments/responses	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
1 — some	1 — some	1 — some	1 — some	1 — review of sources, cited	1 — partly	1 — partly clear	1 — some	1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 — fair	2 — fair	2 — fair	2 — not well fitting	2 — some own input	2 — average	2 — average	2 — many	2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 — good	3 — good	3 — well performed, sufficient number	3 — deviations	3 — + some interesting results	3 — some aspects above average	3 — some aspects well done	3 — + data/theory supported	
4 — detailed	4 — quite detailed, correct	4 — + results explained	4 — + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 — considerable experimental or theoretical	4 — interesting solution	4 — overall clear, demonstrative	4 — proved deep understanding	
5 — demonstrative	5 — detailed, complex, convincing analysis	5 — + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 — well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 — + some interesting results	5 — greater extent than expected	5 — + complex concepts well communicated	5 — some aspects efficient	
6 — deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	6 — completely testable	6 —	6 —	6 —	6 —	6 —	6 —	
7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 2.8 + 2.5 - 1 = 6$$

Stk

1.5

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management
0 — almost nothing	0 — irrelevant	0 — too few	0 — poor
1 — some main points	1 — too few	1 — some	1 — reasonable
2 — main points	2 — some	2 — some correct	2 — efficient
3 — all relevant points	3 — most	3 — many correct	3 — + improvement suggestions
4 — practically all points	4 — well prioritised	4 —	4 — all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion
0 — irrelevant	0 — too few	0 — poor
1 — too few	1 — some	1 — some aspects fine
2 — some	2 — some correct	2 — good
3 — most	3 — many correct	3 — some aspects efficient
4 — well prioritized	4 — + improvement suggestions	4 — overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- 0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
- 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 = 5$$

Gst

SEDINA

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 — relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- 2 — + suitably allocated to Rep & Opp, most time used
- 3 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation
0 — poor/wrong	0 — irrelevant
1 — partial	1 — partially relevant
2 — good	2 — mostly correct, prioritised
3 — detailed, complex	3 — fully adequate, well prioritised

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation
0 — poor/wrong	0 — irrelevant
1 — too short/long	1 — partially relevant
2 — informative, apt	2 — mostly correct, prioritised
3 — accurate	3 — fully adequate, well prioritised

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0 — almost no	0 — irrelevant
1 — too short/long	1 — some
2 — relevant parts	2 — many
3 — accurate, conclusive	3 — fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 0 — irrelevant
- 1 — none
- 2 — relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

- 0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
- 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

Please, carefully adjust your grades taking into regard the [1..10] range.

675

KUNDRACK

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 misunderstood	0 unclear, chaotic	0 relevant arguments/responses	0 reporter's conduct at the discussion
1 some	1 some	1 some	1 some	1 review of sources, cited	1 partly average	1 average	1 some	1 poor
2 fair	2 fair	2 fair	2 not very fitting	2 some own input	2 some aspects above average	2 some aspects well demonstrated	2 many + theory supported	2 partly fine
3 good	3 good	3 well performed, sufficient number results explained	3 deviations	3 + some interesting results	3 some aspects above average	3 overall clear, demonstrative	3 some	3 good
4 detailed	4 quite detailed, correct	4 correct	4 qualitatively analysed + theory limits	4 considerable experimental or theoretical	4 greater extent	4 complex concepts well communicated	4	4
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 detailed, complex, completely testable	5 + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5	5	5	5	5

NOTES:

Portonville - Lascaux 4465

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

GJH - Waini

7667

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	0 understanding of presentation almost nothing	0 relevant topics and prioritisation	0
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 some main points	1 irrelevant	1 concise and correct or no questions asked
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 main points relevant points	2 too few	2 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
	3	3	3
	4 practically all points	4 well prioritised	4 deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 + 1 + 0 - 0 = 7

Spiegel - David 6667

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	0 evaluation & understanding poor/wrong	0 pros & cons prioritisation irrelevant	0 speech evaluation poor/wrong	0 correct own opinions irrelevant	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 partly	1 partially relevant	1 too short/long	1 irrelevant	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	2 good detailed, complex	2 mostly correct, prioritised	2 informative, apt	2 partially relevant	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	3	3	3	3	3

NOTES:

ST KE
Reporter
Start from 1 and add/subtract

8

LAUCKY

1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 5

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY
0 — almost no	0 — almost no	0 — almost no	0 — almost no	0 — almost no	0 — misunderstood	0 — unclear, chaotic	0 — relevant arguments/responses	0 — reporter's conduct at the discussion
1 — some	1 — some	1 — some	1 — some	1 — review of sources, cited	1 — partly average	1 — partly clear	1 — some	1 — poor
2 — fair	2 — fair	2 — fair	2 — not well fitting	2 — some own input	2 — some aspects above average	2 — some aspects well done	2 — many	2 — partly fine
3 — good	3 — good	3 — well performed, sufficient number	3 — deviations qualitatively analysed	3 — some interesting results	3 — interesting solution	3 — overall clear, demonstrative	3 — data/theory supported	3 — good
4 — detailed	4 — quite detailed, correct	4 — + results explained	4 — + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 — considerable experimental or theoretical	4 — greater extent than expected	4 — well done overall clear, demonstrative	4 — proved deep understanding	4 — some aspects efficient
5 — demonstrative	5 — detailed, complex, completely testable	5 — errors analysed, reproducible, convincing analysis	5 — well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 —	5 —	5 —	5 —	5 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
6 — deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	6 —	6 —	6 —	6 —	6 —	6 —	6 —	6 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —

NOTES:

→ Substantive wheel can
Wissenschaftler
Wissenschaftler
own work
12-5 weeks
easily

OPONENT

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management
0 — almost nothing	0 — irrelevant	0 — too few	0 — poor
1 — some main points	1 — too few	1 — some	1 — reasonable
2 — main points	2 — some	2 — some correct	2 — fair
3 — all relevant points	3 — most	3 — many correct	3 — efficient
4 — practically all points	4 — well prioritized	4 — improvement suggestions	4 — all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion
0 — irrelevant	0 — too few	0 — poor
1 — too few	1 — some	1 — some aspects fine
2 — some	2 — some correct	2 — good
3 — most	3 — many correct	3 — some aspects efficient
4 — well prioritized	4 — improvement suggestions	4 — overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- 0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
- 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

6.34

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 — relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- 2 — + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
- 3 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation
0 — poor/wrong	0 — irrelevant
1 — partial	1 — partially relevant
2 — good	2 — mostly correct, prioritised
3 — detailed, complex	3 — fully adequate, well prioritised

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation
0 — poor/wrong	0 — irrelevant
1 — too short/long	1 — partially relevant
2 — informative, apt	2 — mostly correct, prioritised
3 — condensed & accurate	3 — fully adequate, well prioritised

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0 — almost no	0 — irrelevant
1 — too short/long	1 — some
2 — relevant parts	2 — many
3 — accurate, conclusive	3 — fully adequate

POINTED OUT

- 0 — irrelevant
- 1 — none
- 2 — relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY

- 0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
- 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 1 - (-1) = 4$$

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood partly	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	average	partly clear	too few	poor
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	some aspects above average	average	some	partly fine
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	some aspects well done	many	good
4 detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	greater extent than expected	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5 demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	GC theoretical and theoretical	well prioritised	many correct	proved deep understanding	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, convincing analysis	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive					deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
7								

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 25 + 2 - 0 = 28$$

GS4

Vashti

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood partly	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	average	partly clear	too few	poor
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	some aspects above average	average	some	partly fine
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	some aspects well done	many	good
4 detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	greater extent than expected	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5 demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	GC theoretical and theoretical	well prioritised	many correct	proved deep understanding	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, convincing analysis	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive					deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
7								

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 1 + 98 + 0 - 0 = 102$$

STC

Daniel

Gies

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood partly	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	average	partly clear	too few	poor
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	some aspects above average	average	some	partly fine
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	some aspects well done	many	good
4 detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental	greater extent than expected	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5 demonstrative	correct	errors analysed	explained, conclusive	GC theoretical and theoretical	well prioritised	many correct	proved deep understanding	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, convincing analysis	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive					deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
7								

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 too few, mostly irrelevant
1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp.
3 most time used
4 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation
0 poor/wrong	irrelevant
1 partial	partially relevant
2 good	mostly correct, prioritised
3 detailed, complex	fully adequate, well prioritised

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation
0 poor/wrong	irrelevant
1 too short/long	partially relevant
2 informative, apt	mostly correct, prioritised
3 condensed & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0 almost no	irrelevant
1 too short/long	partially relevant
2 relevant parts	many
3 accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

relevant	relevant
0 none	irrelevant
1 relevant	relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

concise and correct or no questions asked	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
0	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

8
 Stephen KE
 Vranika Velajovic
 5566
 KUNDANEK

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 2 - 0 = 6

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTION
0 almost no explanation	0 almost no theory/model	0 almost no experiments	0 almost no comparison	0 almost no own contribution	0 misunderstood task fulfillment	0 unclear, chaotic science communication	0 relevant arguments/responses	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 some explanation	1 some theory/model	1 some experiments	1 some comparison	1 some own contribution	1 partly understood task fulfillment	1 partly clear science communication	1 many arguments/responses	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 good explanation	2 good theory/model	2 good experiments	2 good comparison	2 some interesting results	2 average task fulfillment	2 some aspects clear	2 + satisfactory supported	2 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3 detailed explanation	3 quite detailed, correct	3 well performed, sufficient number	3 + theory limits explained, conclusive	3 considerable experimental or theoretical	3 interesting solution	3 some aspects clear	3 + satisfactory supported	3 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
4 demonstrative	4 quite detailed, correct	4 results explained	4 + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 considerable experimental or theoretical	4 interesting solution	4 some aspects clear	4 + satisfactory supported	4 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
5 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	5 detailed, complex, completely testable	5 errors analysed + reproducible, convincing analysis	5 well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 considerable experimental or theoretical	5 greater extent than expected	5 complex concepts well communicated	5 proved deep understanding	5 overall efficient
6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7

NOTES:

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 too few, mostly irrelevant
 1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
 2 short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management
0 almost nothing	0 irrelevant	0 too few	0 poor
1 some main points	1 too few	1 some	1 reasonable
2 main points	2 some	2 some correct	2 fair
3 all relevant points	3 most	3 pretty correct	3 efficient
4 practically all points	4 well prioritized	4 + improvement suggestions	4 all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion
0 irrelevant	0 too few	0 poor
1 too few	1 some	1 some aspects fine
2 some	2 some correct	2 good
3 most	3 many correct	3 some aspects efficient
4 well prioritized	4 + improvement suggestions	4 overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked
 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
 2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1 + 1 + 0 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

0 too few, mostly irrelevant
 1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
 2 suitably allotted to Rep & Opo, most time used
 3 short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation
0 poor/wrong	0 irrelevant
1 partial	1 partially relevant
2 good	2 mostly correct, prioritised
3 detailed, complex	3 fully adequate, well prioritized

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation
0 poor/wrong	0 irrelevant
1 too short/long	1 partially relevant
2 informative, apt	2 mostly correct, prioritised
3 condensed & accurate	3 fully adequate, well prioritized

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0 almost no	0 irrelevant
1 too short/long	1 some
2 different parts	2 many
3 accurate, conclusive	3 fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

0 irrelevant
 1 none
 2 relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

0 concise and correct or no questions asked
 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
 2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 1 - 0 = 6

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTION
0 almost no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 almost no	0 misunderstood	0 unclear, theoretic	0 relevant arguments/responses	0 reporter's conduct at the discussion
1 some	1 some	1 some	1 some	1 review of sources, cited	1 partly	1 partly clear	1 some	1 poor
2 fair	2 fair	2 fair	2 not well fitting	2 some own input	2 average	2 average	2 many	2 partly fine
3 good	3 good	3 well performed, sufficient number	3 deviations	3 * some interesting results	3 some aspects above average	3 some aspects well done	3 * data/theory supported	3 good
4 detailed	4 quite detailed, correct	4 + results explained	4 + theory limits explained, conclusive	4 * considerable experimental or theoretical	4 interesting solution	4 overall clear, demonstrative	4 proved deep understanding	4 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
5 demonstrative	5 detailed, complex, convincing analysis	5 errors analysed	5 well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	5 considerable experimental and theoretical	5 greater extent than expected	5 + complex concepts well communicated	5	5
6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 7 + 3 + 23 - 0 = 33

QUESTIONS ASKED

- too few, mostly irrelevant
- relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used

NOTES:

understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management
0 almost nothing	0 irrelevant	0 too few	0 poor
1 some main points	1 too few	1 some	1 reasonable
2 main points	2 some	2 some correct	2 fair
3 all relevant points	3 most	3 many correct	3 efficient
4 practically all points	4 well prioritised	4 + improvement suggestions	4

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion
0 irrelevant	0 too few	0 poor
1 too few	1 some	1 some aspects fine
2 some	2 some correct	2 good
3 most	3 many correct	3 some aspects efficient
4 well prioritised	4 + improvement suggestions	4 overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- concise and correct or no questions asked
- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

- too few, mostly irrelevant
- relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- suitably allocated to Rep & Opp, most time used
- short, apt and clear, well prioritised, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation
0 poor/wrong	0 irrelevant
1 partial	1 partially relevant
2 good	2 mostly correct, prioritised
3 detailed, complex	3 fully adequate, well prioritised

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation
0 poor/wrong	0 irrelevant
1 too short/long	1 partially relevant
2 informative, apt	2 mostly correct, prioritised
3 condensed & accurate	3 fully adequate, well prioritised

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0 almost no	0 irrelevant
1 too short/long	1 some
2 relevant parts	2 many
3 accurate, conclusive	3 fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- irrelevant
- none
- relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

- concise and correct or no questions asked
- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 25 + 25 - 1 = 50$$

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4 detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5 demonstrative	detailed, complex	errors analysed	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	overall clear, demonstrative	proved deep understanding	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
6 deep and comprehensible	completely testable	+ reproducible						1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
7 shows physical insight		convincing analysis						2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 15 + 25 + 3 - 1 = 53$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- too few, mostly irrelevant
- relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management
0 almost nothing	irrelevant	too few	poor
1 some main points	too few	some	reasonable
2 main points	some	some correct	fair
3 all relevant points	most	many correct	efficient
4 practically all points	well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 irrelevant	too few	poor	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 too few	some	some aspects fine	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 some	some correct	good	2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 most	many correct	some aspects efficient	
4 well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1 + 15 + 0.5 + 0 = 18$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- too few, mostly irrelevant
- relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- most time used
- short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation
0 poor/wrong	irrelevant
1 partial	partially relevant
2 good	mostly correct, prioritised
3 detailed, complex	fully adequate, well prioritised

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation
0 poor/wrong	irrelevant
1 too short/long	partially relevant
2 informative, apt	mostly correct, prioritised
3 condensed & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT
0 almost no	irrelevant	0 irrelevant
1 too short/long	some	1 none
2 relevant parts	many	2 relevant, constructive
3 accurate, conclusive	adequate	

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

- concise and correct or no questions asked
- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 6 + 6.5 - 0 = 9$$

634 - Jakob Stravina 99109

9

KORBRÄU

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly average	partly clear	too few	poor
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	some aspects	some	partly fine
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analyzed	* some interesting results	above average	well done	many	good
4 <u>excellent</u>	quite detailed, <u>correct</u>	+ results explained, errors analysed, + theoretical, convincing analysis	+ theoretical aspects explained, convincing analysis	considerable experimental or theoretical work, convincing analysis, conclusive	interesting solution, <u>practical</u> <u>well-expected</u>	overall clear, <u>demonstrative</u>	+ data/theory supported, <u>proved deep understanding</u>	some aspects <u>efficient</u>
5 <u>excellent</u>	quite detailed, <u>correct</u>	+ results explained, errors analysed, + theoretical, convincing analysis	+ theoretical aspects explained, convincing analysis	considerable experimental or theoretical work, convincing analysis, conclusive	interesting solution, <u>practical</u> <u>well-expected</u>	overall clear, <u>demonstrative</u>	+ data/theory supported, <u>proved deep understanding</u>	some aspects <u>efficient</u>
6 <u>excellent</u>	quite detailed, <u>correct</u>	+ results explained, errors analysed, + theoretical, convincing analysis	+ theoretical aspects explained, convincing analysis	considerable experimental or theoretical work, convincing analysis, conclusive	interesting solution, <u>practical</u> <u>well-expected</u>	overall clear, <u>demonstrative</u>	+ data/theory supported, <u>proved deep understanding</u>	some aspects <u>efficient</u>

NOTES:

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6$$

Sapirj'CE - Martin Gherik 6766

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

- 0 understanding of presentation
1 almost nothing
2 some main points
3 main points
4 all relevant points
5 practically all points

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

- 0 relevant topics and prioritization
1 irrelevant
2 too few
3 some correct
4 well prioritized

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- 0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2 + 1.5 + 1 + 0 - 0 = 7$$

Polina'CE - Lucas Weiler 7687

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 too few, mostly irrelevant
1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
2 + suitably allocated to Rep & Opp, most time used
3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

- 0 evaluation & understanding
1 poor/wrong
2 partial
3 good
4 excellent

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

- 0 speech
1 poor/wrong
2 too short/long
3 alternative, apt
4 well prioritized

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

- 0 discussion
1 almost no
2 too short/long
3 relevant points
4 adequate

MISSED POINTS

- 0 none
1 irrelevant
2 relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

- 0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 6 + 3 - 0 = 10$$

REPORT

phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 — almost no	0 — almost no	0 — almost no	0 — almost no	0 — almost no	0 — misunderstood	0 — unclear, chaotic	0 — relevant arguments/responses	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
1 — some	1 — some	1 — some	1 — some	1 — review of sources, cited	1 — partly	1 — average	1 — too few	1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 — fair	2 — fair	2 — fair	2 — not well fitting	2 — some own input	2 — average	2 — some aspects	2 — some	2 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3 — good	3 — good	3 — well performed, sufficient number	3 — deviations	3 — + some interesting results	3 — some aspects	3 — overall clear, demonstrative	3 — many	3 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
4 — detailed	4 — quite detailed, correct	4 — + results explained	4 — qualitatively analysed	4 — considerable experimental or theoretical	4 — interesting solution	4 — well done	4 — * data/theory supported	4 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
5 — demonstrative	5 — correct	5 — errors analysed	5 — + theory limits explained, conclusive	5 — well fitting, deviations	5 — greater extent	5 — + complex concepts well communicated	5 — proved deep understanding	5 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
6 — deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	6 — detailed, complex, completely testable	6 — + reproducible, convincing analysis	6 — well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	6 — considerable experimental and theoretical	6 — + complex concepts well communicated	6 — + complex concepts well communicated	6 — overall efficient	6 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —	7 —

NOTES:

Jack Stühne

W. H. H.

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 1 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
- 2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management
0 — almost nothing	0 — irrelevant	0 — too few	0 — poor
1 — some main points	1 — too few	1 — some	1 — reasonable
2 — main points	2 — some	2 — some correct	2 — fair
3 — all relevant points	3 — most	3 — many correct	3 — efficient
4 — practically all points	4 — well prioritised	4 — + improvement suggestions	4 — all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion
0 — irrelevant	0 — too few	0 — poor
1 — too few	1 — some	1 — some aspects fine
2 — some	2 — some correct	2 — good
3 — most	3 — many correct	3 — some aspects efficient
4 — well prioritised	4 — + improvement suggestions	4 — overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

- 0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
- 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

Shane Natis

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 8$$

QUESTIONS ASKED

- 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant
- 1 — relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
- 2 — + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
- 3 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation
0 — poor/wrong	0 — irrelevant
1 — partial	1 — partially relevant
2 — good	2 — mostly correct, prioritised
3 — detailed, complex	3 — fully adequate, well prioritised

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation
0 — poor/wrong	0 — irrelevant
1 — too short/long	1 — partially relevant
2 — informative, apt	2 — mostly correct, prioritised
3 — condensed & accurate	3 — fully adequate, well prioritised

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0 — almost no	0 — irrelevant
1 — too short/long	1 — some
2 — accurate, relevant parts	2 — many
3 — conclusive	3 — fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- 0 — none
- 1 — relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

- 0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
- 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- 2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

Mario Hölzer

NOTES:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

CSH Salvo Staine

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 8

Kaukey

Key

REPORT				DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT				ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 — almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 — too few	poor	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
1 — some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	average	partly clear	1 — some	partly fine	1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 — fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	some aspects above average	average	2 — many	good	2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 — good	good	well performed, sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	some aspects well done	3 — + data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	
4 — detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained	+ theory limits	considerable experimental or theoretical	greater extent than expected	overall clear, demonstrative		overall efficient	
5 — demonstrative		% errors analysed	explained, conclusive						
6 — deep and comprehensible	detailed, complex, shows physical insight	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive						
7 —									

NOTES:

ST LE OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.25 + 4.25 + 1.5 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)		DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER		ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant	understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked	
1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	0 — almost nothing	irrelevant	too few	0 — irrelevant	too few	1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	
2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	1 — some main points	too few	some correct	1 — too few	some correct	2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
	2 — main points	some	many correct	2 — some	many correct		
	3 — all relevant points	most	improvement suggestions	3 — most	improvement suggestions		
	4 — practically all points	well prioritized		4 — well prioritized			

NOTES:

Pos: 1.25 Neg: 0.25 Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.25 + 0.25 + 4.5 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT		REVIEW OF OPPOSITION		DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT		ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0 — irrelevant	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked		0 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	
1 — relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	0 — poor/wrong	irrelevant	too short/long	0 — too short/long	1 — relevant parts	some	1 — none	1 — relevant, constructive		1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	
2 — + suitably allocated to Rep & Opp, most time used	1 — partial	partially relevant	informative, apt	2 — informative, apt	2 — mostly correct, prioritized	many	2 — relevant	2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions		2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
3 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	2 — good	mostly correct, prioritized	condensed & accurate	3 — condensed & accurate	3 — fully adequate, well prioritized	adequate	3 — relevant, constructive				

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5.5 + 3 - \square = 9$$

Frank

654

PUSC44

REPORT									
phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfillment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 — almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
1 — some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor	— some incorrect,
2 — fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	— inconclusive or too long
3 — good	good	well performed, sufficient number, + results explained	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	— deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4 — detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed + reproducible	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental at theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	2 — + data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	
5 — demonstrative	detailed, correct						3 — proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
6 — deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, convincing analysis				greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated			
7 —									

NOTES:

OPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - \square = 7$$

Stk

Ratys

Garvik

DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT									
QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant	understanding of presentation	almost nothing	too few	poor	irrelevant	too few	poor	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked	
1 — relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	too few	some	reasonable	too few	some	some aspects fine	— some incorrect,	
2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	scope correct many correct	fair	some	many correct	some aspects efficient	— inconclusive or too long	
	all relevant points	most		efficient	most		overall efficient	— deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
	practically all points	well prioritized	+ improvement suggestions	all time used	well prioritized	+ improvement suggestions			

NOTES:

fonten, to need to have a fonten to be 17

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 - \square = 6$$

Postings

Nesley

REVIEW OF REPORT									
QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 — too few, mostly irrelevant	evaluation & understanding	poor/wrong	irrelevant	speech evaluation	poor/wrong	irrelevant	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0 — concise and correct or no questions asked
1 — relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	partial	partial	partially relevant	too short/long	partially relevant	partially relevant	almost no	irrelevant	— some incorrect,
2 — + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	partial	partial	mostly correct, prioritised	informative, apt	mostly correct, prioritised	mostly correct, prioritised	relevant parts	many	— inconclusive or too long
3 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	partial	partial	fully adequate, well prioritised	condensed & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, conclusive	adequate	— deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

Topsh