







# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): round stage: 2 room: problem no.: 1/4

juror's name & signature: *BRUNNEN*

reporter: *Adam D. DeGarmo*

reviewer: *Hilari Glensiek*

|  |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|
| <b>REPORTER</b>  | Start from 1 and add/subtract |
| <b>1</b> + <b>2</b> + <b>1</b> - <b>0.5</b> = <b>4</b> |                               |

| 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 fulfilment science communication  |
| almost no                                       | almost no                              | almost no                           | almost no                                | misunderstood                                       | unclear, chaotic                       |
| same  | some                                   | some                                | some                                     | party   | partly clear                           |
| fair  | fair                                   | fair                                | not well fitting                         | # some own input                                    | # overuse                              |
| good  | good                                   | well performed, sufficient number   | deviations qualitatively analysed        | + some interesting results                          | # average                              |
| detailed  | quite detailed, correct                | + errors explained                  | + theory limits explained, conclusive    | considerable experimental solution                  | some aspects above average             |
| deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable | + reproducible, convincing analysis | well fitting, deviations and theoretical | GT theoretical solution                             | well done                              |
| NOTES:  |  |                                     |  | greater extent                                      | interesting                            |
|   |  |                                     |  | + complex concepts well communicated                | over all clear, demonstrative          |
|   |  |                                     |  | than expected                                       | deeply incorrect or show understanding |

NOTES:

*E X-pounding ✓*

*theological & farcical*

*Start from 1 and add/subtract*

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| <b>OPPONENT</b> | <b>1</b> + <b>1.75</b> + <b>2.75</b> + <b>1.75</b> - <b>0.5</b> = <b>6</b> |
|-----------------|--|

| QUESTIONS ASKED |   | 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                   | reporter's conduct of the discussion        |
| 1               | relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report | irrelevant                    | too few                            | too few                                  | 0 concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 2-6             | + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used   | almost nothing                | poor                               | poor                                     | -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long |
| 1               | some main points  | too few                       | reasonable                         | some aspects fine                        | -1  |
| 2               | # main points   | same                          | fair                               | some correct                             | -1  |
| 3               | all relevant points                                       | # most                        | # many correct                     | good                                     | -1  |
| 4               | practically all points                                    | well prioritised              | + improvement suggestions          | some aspects efficient                   | -2 deeply incorrect or show                 |
|                 |   |                               |                                    | overall efficient                        | deep misconceptions                         |

*1/4 up was 1/4 the report content concluded 2.*

|   |                               |
|---|-------------------------------|
| <b>REVIEWER</b>   | Start from 1 and add/subtract |
| <b>1</b> + <b>1</b> + <b>1.25</b> + <b>1.25</b> + <b>0.5</b> ± <b>0</b> - <b>0</b> = <b>5</b> |                               |

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

NOTES:

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

**REPORTER**  
 1 + **5,5** + **2,5** - **0,5** = **8**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**  
 1 + **7** + **2,5** + **3** - **1** = **12**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

| QUESTIONS ASKED   |   | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER      |                                    |                        |                 |                                    |                        | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS        |                                    |
|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| 0 too few, mostly irrelevant                              | 1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report | 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            | OPPONENT; and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |
| 0 almost nothing  | 1 some main points  | Irrelevant                    | too few                            | poor                   | 0 irrelevant    | too few                            | poor                   | 0 concise and correct or no questions asked     | REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS               |
| 0 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used | 1 main points   | too few                       | somewhat correct                   | reasonable             | 1 too few       | some                               | some aspects fine      | 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long      |                                    |
| 0 all relevant points                                     | 1 practically all points                                    | somewhat correct              | many correct                       | fair                   | 2 some          | some correct                       | good                   | -1 inconclusive or too long                     |                                    |
| 0   | 4 practically all points                                    | well prioritised              | + improvement suggestions          | efficient              | 3 more          | mostly correct                     | some aspects efficient | -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |                                    |
| 0   | 4   | well prioritised              | + improvement suggestions          | +                      | 4               | overall efficient                  | overall efficient      | overall efficient                               |                                    |

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**  
 1 + **4,5** + **2** + **7** - **1** = **17**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

## SCORESHEET

flight (round no): stage: room: problem no.: 6 Juror's name & signature: reviewer: 654

reporter: GJH

opponent: STC

reviewer: 654

6

Juror's name & signature:

reviewer: 654

**REPORTER**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + **5** + **3** - **1** = **9**

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

NOTES:

| REVIEWER  |   | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER                 |  |                   |   |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-------------------|---|--|--|
| 1   | + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 ± 2 - 1 = 8                   | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |  |                   |   |  |  |
| QUESTIONS ASKED   | OPPOSITION (SPEECH)                           | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER                 | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |                   |   |  |  |
| 0 too few, mostly irrelevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report | understanding of presentation                 | relevant topics and prioritisation       | relevant topics and prioritisation       | the discussion    |   |  |  |
| 1 * short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used                     | almost nothing, some main points, main points | too few irrelevant                       | too few irrelevant                       | poor              | 6 concise and correct or no questions asked     |  |  |
| 2 all relevant points   | some  | some                                     | some                                     | good              | -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long     |  |  |
| 3 practically all points  | most  | many correct                             | some correct                             | good              | -1 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |  |  |
| 4   | well prioritised                              | + improvement suggestions                | + improvement suggestions                | overall efficient | -2  |  |  |

| REVIEWER  |                             | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER                 |                                  |                          |  |   |  |
|---|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|
| 1   | + 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 ± 2 - 1 = 8 | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |                                  |                          |  |   |  |
| QUESTIONS ASKED   | REVIEW OF REPORT            | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION                     | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS              | MISSED POINTS            | ANSWERS TO JURY  |   |  |
| 0 too few, mostly irrelevant, meant to clarify unclear points in the report | evaluation & understanding  | pros & cons prioritisation               | pros & cons prioritisation       | POINTED OUT              | QUESTIONS  |   |  |
| 1 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used                          | poor/wrong                  | irrelevant                               | irrelevant                       | incorrect own opinions   | no questions asked   |   |  |
| 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently        | partial                     | partially relevant                       | too short/long                   | almost no irrelevant     | -1 concise and correct or some incorrect, inconclusive or too long |   |  |
| 3   | good                        | mostly correct, prioritised              | informative, <b>good</b>         | some relevant parts many | 1 relevant, constructive   | -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |  |
|   | fully adequate, complex     | condemned                                | fully adequate, well prioritised | many                     |  |   |  |

*Arganbi 2.2 Münzhausen? Biglietini online*

*Anwesen waren*

*Jahra 22.*

|                 |   |                               |
|-----------------|---|-------------------------------|
| <b>REPORTER</b> | $\frac{1}{5}$   | Start from 1 and add/subtract |
| <b>1</b>        | $\frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{5} - \square = \square$ | <b>4</b>                      |

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

NOTES:

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| <b>OPPONENT</b> | Start from 1 and add/subtract   |
| <b>1</b>        | $\frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{5} - \square = \square$ |

| <b>QUESTIONS ASKED</b>                                    |                               | <b>DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER</b>    |                        |                    |                                    |                        |                                      | <b>ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS</b> |                      |
|---|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 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     | REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |
| 1 $\frac{1}{5}$ unclear points in the report              | almost nothing                | irrelevant                         | too few                | poor               | 0 irrelevant                       | too few                | poor                                 | 0   |                      |
| 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used | some main points              | too few                            | some                   | reasonable         | 1 $\frac{1}{5}$ too few            | some                   | some aspects fine                    | 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long      |                      |
| 3 + practical, all relevant points                        | main points                   | some *                             | some correct           | fair               | 2 some                             | some correct           | good                                 | -1  |                      |
| 4 practically all points                                  | most                          | many correct *                     | efficient              | 3 most             | 3 many correct                     | some aspects efficient |                                      | -1  |                      |
| *   |                               |                                    |                        | 4 well prioritised | 4 improvement suggestions          | overall efficient      |                                      | -2  |                      |

NOTES:

| <b>REVIEWER</b> |  | <b>REVIEW OF REPORT</b>     |                             |                   |                             |                       |                      | <b>REVIEW OF OPPOSITION</b>    |                            |                          |         |                          |       | <b>REVIEW ANALYSIS</b> |   |   |   |                    |   | <b>MISSING POINTS</b> |   |                    |   |                    |   | <b>ANSWERS TO JURY</b> |   |                    |   |   |   |
|-----------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------------------------|-------|------------------------|---|---|---|--------------------|---|-----------------------|---|--------------------|---|--------------------|---|------------------------|---|--------------------|---|---|---|
|                 |  |                             |                             |                   |                             |                       |                      |                                |                            |                          |         |                          |       |                        |   |   |   |                    |   |                       |   |                    |   |                    |   |                        |   |                    |   |   |   |
| 0               | too few, mostly irrelevant   | evaluation & prioritisation | pros & cons                 | speech evaluation | press & cons prioritisation | discussion evaluation | correct own opinions | 0                              | almost no                  | irrelevant               | -1      | irrelevant               | 0     | no questions asked     | 0 | concise and correct or no questions asked | 0 | no questions asked | 0 | no questions asked    | 0 | no questions asked | 0 | no questions asked | 0 | no questions asked     | 0 | no questions asked |   |   |   |
| 1               | + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used                   | poor/wrong                  | irrelevant                  | 0 poor/wrong      | 0 irrelevant                | 0 almost no           | irrelevant           | 1 $\frac{1}{5}$ too short/long | 1 some                     | 1 relevant parts         | 1 many  | 1 relevant               | 1 non | 1                      | 1 | 1   | 1 | 1                  | 1 | 1                     | 1 | 1                  | 1 | 1                  | 1 | 1                      | 1 | 1                  | 1 |   |   |
| 2               | + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently | good                        | mostly correct, prioritised | informative, apt  | mostly correct, prioritised | 1 relevant parts      | many                 | 2 fully adequate, accurate     | 2 fully adequate, accurate | 2 relevant, constructive | 2 fully | 2 relevant, constructive | 2 non | 2                      | 2 | 2   | 2 | 2                  | 2 | 2                     | 2 | 2                  | 2 | 2                  | 2 | 2                      | 2 | 2                  | 2 | 2 |   |
| 3               | complex  | complex                     | condensed &                 | condensed &       | condensed &                 | 3 relevant parts      | many                 | 3 well prioritised             | 3 well prioritised         | 3 relevant, constructive | 3 fully | 3 relevant, constructive | 3 non | 3                      | 3 | 3   | 3 | 3                  | 3 | 3                     | 3 | 3                  | 3 | 3                  | 3 | 3                      | 3 | 3                  | 3 | 3 | 3 |

NOTES:

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

# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): reporter:

stage:

room:

problem no.:

Juror's name & signature:  
Pia Sch

reviewer:

$$\text{REPORTER} \quad \boxed{1} + \boxed{25} + \boxed{1} - \boxed{-15} = \boxed{3}$$

Start from 1 and add/subtract

| ANSWERS TO JURY,<br>OPPONENT, and<br>REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |
|---|
| 0 — concise and correct or<br>no questions asked          |
| -1 some incorrect,<br>inconclusive or too long            |
| -2 deeply incorrect or show<br>deep misconceptions        |
| 0 — no questions asked                                    |
| 1 some aspects<br>well done                               |
| 2 supported   |
| 3 proved deep<br>understanding                            |
| overall efficient   |

| REPORT                 |   | DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT           |   |                            |                                    |                                      |                                      |
|------------------------|---|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| phenomenon explanation | theory/model  | relevant experiments               | comparison between theory and experiment      | own contribution           | task fulfillment                   | science communication                | reporter's conduct at the discussion |
| almost no              | almost no   | almost no                          | almost no                                     | misunderstood              | unclear, chaotic                   | arguments/responses                  | relevant                             |
| some                   | some  | some                               | some  | partly                     | partly clear                       | too few                              | poor                                 |
| fair                   | fair  | not self fitting                   | deviations                                    | average                    | average                            | many                                 | fine                                 |
| good                   | good  | well performed, sufficient number, | qualitatively analysed                        | some aspects above average | + some interesting results         | good                                 | good                                 |
| detailed               | quite detailed, correct                                     | + results explained                | + theory limits explained, conclusive         | interesting                | considerable experimental solution | some aspects efficient               | -1                                   |
| demonstrative          | detailed, complex, completely testable, convincing analysis | + reproducible, errors analysed    | well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive | demonstrative              | greater extent than expected       | + complex concepts well communicated | -2                                   |

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$\boxed{1} + \boxed{7} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{25} - \boxed{1} = \boxed{6}$$

| QUESTIONS ASKED   |                               | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER           |                        |                    |                                    |                        |                                      |
|---|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 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 |
| 1 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 | some main points              | too few                            | some                   | reasonable         | too few                            | some                   | some aspects fine                    |
| 3 all relevant points                                     | main points                   | some                               | some correct           | fair               | some                               | some correct           | good                                 |
| 4 practically all points                                  | most                          | many                               | many correct           | high               | many                               | many correct           | some aspects efficient               |
| NOTES:  |                               | + improvement suggestions          | all time used          | 4 well prioritised | + improvement suggestions          | overall efficient      | -2                                   |

- 12 sec force

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$\boxed{1} + \boxed{1} + \boxed{15} + \boxed{15} + \boxed{0,5} = \boxed{5}$$

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

NOTES:

## REPORTER

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | + | 1 | + | 1 | - | 0 | = | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

REPORT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

|   |                        |   |                                 |  |   |                              |                                      |   |
|---|------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| 0 | phenomenon explanation | theory/model                                | relevant experiments            | comparison between theory and experiment | own contribution                            | task fulfillment             | science communication                | ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |
| 1 | almost no              | almost no                                   | almost no                       | almost no                                | almost no                                   | misunderstood                | unclear/chaotic                      | reporter's conduct at the discussion                |
| 2 | some                   | some  | some                            | some                                     | review of sources, cited some own input     | partly                       | partly clear/average                 | poor  |
| 3 | fair                   | Fair  | fair                            | fair                                     | + Some interesting results                  | average                      | average                              | concrete and correct or no questions asked          |
| 4 | good                   | Good  | sufficient number               | qualitatively analysed                   | + Some interesting results                  | same aspects above average   | some aspects well done               | 0   |
| 5 | detailed               | quite detailed, correct                     | + results explained             | + theory limits                          | + considerable experimental or theoretical  | interesting solution         | + data/theory supported              | -1  |
| 6 | demonstrative          | deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex, | + reproducible, errors analysed | + well fitting, deviations               | + considerable experimental and theoretical | greater extent than expected | + complex concepts well communicated | -2  |
| 7 | shows physical insight | completely testable convincing analysis     |                                 |  |   |                              | overall efficient                    | deep misconceptions                                 |

NOTES:

|  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| 1  | + | 1 | + | 2 | + | 2 | - | 0 = 6 |
| <b>QUESTIONS ASKED</b>   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |
| 0 too few, mostly irrelevant relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |
| 1 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used                              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |
| 2 + all relevant points  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |
| 3 practically all points   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |

NOTES:

|   |   |   |   |   |   |       |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| 1 | + | 1 | + | 1 | - | 0 = 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|

Start from 1 and add/subtract

|   |  |                             |                             |                      |
|---|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| 0 | too few, mostly irrelevant relevant, meant to clarify unclear points | pros & cons prioritisation  | pros & cons prioritisation  | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION |
| 1 | + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used                     | irrelevant                  | irrelevant                  | speech evaluation    |
| 2 | + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently   | partially relevant          | partially relevant          | poor/wrong           |
| 3 |  | mostly correct, prioritised | mostly correct, prioritised | too short/long       |

NOTES:

|   |   |   |   |   |   |       |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| 1 | + | 1 | + | 1 | - | 0 = 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|

Start from 1 and add/subtract

|   |  |                            |                             |                                 |                |                           |
|---|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| 0 | too few, mostly irrelevant relevant                                | evaluation & understanding | REVIEW OF REPORT            | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS             | MISSING POINTS | ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS |
| 1 | + suitable allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used                   | poor/wrong                 | irrelevant                  | correct own opinions irrelevant | -1             | irrelevant                |
| 2 | + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently | partial                    | partially relevant          | almost/no                       | 0              | none                      |
| 3 |  | good                       | mostly correct, prioritised | too short/long                  | 1              | relevant, constructive    |

NOTES:

|   |                        |   |                                 |  |   |                              |                                      |   |
|---|------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| 0 | phenomenon explanation | theory/model                                | relevant experiments            | comparison between theory and experiment | own contribution                            | task fulfillment             | science communication                | ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |
| 1 | almost no              | almost no                                   | almost no                       | almost no                                | almost no                                   | misunderstood                | unclear/chaotic                      | reporter's conduct at the discussion                |
| 2 | some                   | some  | some                            | some                                     | review of sources, cited some own input     | partly                       | partly clear/average                 | poor  |
| 3 | fair                   | Fair  | fair                            | fair                                     | + Some interesting results                  | average                      | average                              | concrete and correct or no questions asked          |
| 4 | good                   | Good  | sufficient number               | qualitatively analysed                   | + Some interesting results                  | same aspects above average   | some aspects well done               | 0   |
| 5 | detailed               | quite detailed, correct                     | + results explained             | + theory limits                          | + considerable experimental or theoretical  | interesting solution         | + data/theory supported              | -1  |
| 6 | demonstrative          | deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex, | + reproducible, errors analysed | + well fitting, deviations               | + considerable experimental and theoretical | greater extent than expected | + complex concepts well communicated | -2  |
| 7 | shows physical insight | completely testable convincing analysis     |                                 |  |   |                              | overall efficient                    | deep misconceptions                                 |

|   |                        |   |                                 |  |   |                              |                                      |   |
|---|------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| 0 | phenomenon explanation | theory/model                                | relevant experiments            | comparison between theory and experiment | own contribution                            | task fulfillment             | science communication                | ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |
| 1 | almost no              | almost no                                   | almost no                       | almost no                                | almost no                                   | misunderstood                | unclear/chaotic                      | reporter's conduct at the discussion                |
| 2 | some                   | some  | some                            | some                                     | review of sources, cited some own input     | partly                       | partly clear/average                 | poor  |
| 3 | fair                   | Fair  | fair                            | fair                                     | + Some interesting results                  | average                      | average                              | concrete and correct or no questions asked          |
| 4 | good                   | Good  | sufficient number               | qualitatively analysed                   | + Some interesting results                  | same aspects above average   | some aspects well done               | 0   |
| 5 | detailed               | quite detailed, correct                     | + results explained             | + theory limits                          | + considerable experimental or theoretical  | interesting solution         | + data/theory supported              | -1  |
| 6 | demonstrative          | deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex, | + reproducible, errors analysed | + well fitting, deviations               | + considerable experimental and theoretical | greater extent than expected | + complex concepts well communicated | -2  |
| 7 | shows physical insight | completely testable convincing analysis     |                                 |  |   |                              | overall efficient                    | deep misconceptions                                 |

|  |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|
| <b>REPORTER</b>  | Start from 1 and add/subtract |
| $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ + 2.76 \\ + 1.05 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $= 0.75 = 6.5$                |

SCORESHEET

reporter: *E* [redacted] B [redacted] V [redacted] I [redacted] S [redacted] K [redacted] E [redacted] room:

problem no.: ⑩ Juror's name & signature:

REMEMBER: *It's*

| REPORT   |                                    | DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT             |   |   | ANSWERS TO JURY,<br>OPPONENT, and<br>REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |  |
|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| phenomenon<br>explanation                          | theory/model                       | relevant<br>experiments              | comparison between<br>theory and experiment | own contribution  | task fulfillment  | reporter's<br>conduct at the<br>discussion     |
| almost no  | almost no                          | almost no                            | almost no                                   | almost no   | misunderstood   | unclear, chaotic                               |
| some   | some                               | some                                 | some  | review of sources, cited                                | partly  | 0  |
| fair   | fair                               | fair                                 | not well fitting                            | + some own input  | partly clear  | too few  |
| good   | good                               | well performed,<br>sufficient number | deviations,<br>qualitatively analysed       | + some interesting results                              | average   | poor   |
| detailed   | quite detailed,<br>errors analysed | + results explained                  | + theory limits,<br>explained, conclusive   | considerable experimental<br>or theoretical<br>solution | some aspects<br>above average                             | 0  |
| demonstrative                                      | correct                            | + reproducible,                      | + well fitting, deviations                  | interesting<br>solution                                 | many  | - concise and correct or<br>no questions asked |
| deep and comprehensible,<br>shows physical insight | completely testable                | commencing analysis                  | analysed, conclusive<br>and theoretical     | demonstrative<br>solution                               | some aspects<br>well done                                 | 1  |
|  |                                    |                                      |   |   | some aspects<br>overall clear,<br>supported               | Good   |
|  |                                    |                                      |   |   | some aspects<br>efficient                                 | -1   |
|  |                                    |                                      |   |   | inconclusive or too long<br>-2                            | some incorrect,<br>deep misconceptions         |
|  |                                    |                                      |   |   | overall efficient   | -3   |
|  |                                    |                                      |   |   | proved deep<br>understanding                              | deeply incorrect or show                       |

NOIES

→ *L*<sub>1</sub>,*L*<sub>2</sub>,*L*<sub>3</sub>,*L*<sub>4</sub>

Equality → trend:

11

| OPPONENT  |   | Start from 1 and add/subtract             |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1   | + 1   | + 2,5                                     | + 2,5                                     | - 4,0                                     | = 4,7                                     |
| <b>QUESTIONS ASKED</b>                          |   |   |   |   |   |
| Start from 1 and add/subtract                   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 0   | too few, mostly irrelevant                                | understanding of presentation             | relevant topics and prioritisation        | own opinions presented                    | time management                           |
| 1   | relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report | irrelevant                                | too few                                   | poor                                      | 0   |
| 2   | + short, acc. acc. clear, well prioritized, all time used | some main points                          | some                                      | reasonable                                | 1   |
| 3   | all relevant points                                       | too few                                   | some correct                              | fair                                      | 2   |
| 4   | practically all points                                    | main points                               | many correct                              | efficient                                 | 3   |
| NOTES:  |   | well prioritised                          | + improvement suggestions                 | + improvement suggestions                 | 4   |
| <b>OPPOSITION (SPEECH)</b>                      |   |   |   |   |   |
| Start from 1 and add/subtract                   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 0   | almost nothing  | too few                                   | too few                                   | too few                                   | poor                                      |
| 1   | some main points  | some                                      | some                                      | some                                      | some aspects fine                         |
| 2   | main points   | some correct                              | fair                                      | some                                      | good                                      |
| 3   | all relevant points                                       | many correct                              | efficient                                 | many correct                              | some aspects efficient                    |
| 4   | practically all points                                    | well prioritised                          | + improvement suggestions                 | + improvement suggestions                 | overall efficient                         |
| <b>DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER</b>                 |   |   |   |   |   |
| Start from 1 and add/subtract                   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 0   | irrelevant  | irrelevant                                | irrelevant                                | irrelevant                                | poor                                      |
| 1   | too few   | too few                                   | too few                                   | too few                                   | poor                                      |
| 2   | some  | some                                      | some                                      | some                                      | some aspects fine                         |
| 3   | some correct  | some correct                              | some correct                              | some correct                              | good                                      |
| 4   | many correct  | many correct                              | many correct                              | many correct                              | very good                                 |
| <b>ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS</b> |   |   |   |   |   |
| Start from 1 and add/subtract                   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 0   | no questions asked  | concise and correct or no questions asked | concise and correct or no questions asked | concise and correct or no questions asked | concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 1   | some incorrect  | some incorrect                            | some incorrect                            | some incorrect                            | some incorrect                            |
| 2   | inconclusive or too long                                  | inconclusive or too long                  | inconclusive or too long                  | inconclusive or too long                  | inconclusive or too long                  |
| 3   | deeply incorrect or show                                  | deeply incorrect or show                  | deeply incorrect or show                  | deeply incorrect or show                  | deeply incorrect or show                  |
| 4   | deep misconceptions                                       | deep misconceptions                       | deep misconceptions                       | deep misconceptions                       | deep misconceptions                       |

NOTES.

|   |                        |                  |     |
|---|------------------------|------------------|-----|
| 4 | practically all points | well prioritised | + 5 |
| 5 |                        |                  |     |

| Improvement suggestions | all time used | well prioritised | + improvement suggestions |
|-------------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------------------|
|                         | +             | %                |                           |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <br>overall efficient | <br>deep misconceptions |
| <br>overall efficient | <br>deep misconceptions |

| REVIEWER   |     | Start from 1 and add/subtract                             |   |
|--|-----|---|---|
| 1  | + 1 | + 3   | + 6 ✓ ± □ - □ = 8                                 |
| <b>QUESTIONS ASKED</b>   |     |   |   |
| 0<br>too few, mostly irrelevant<br>relevant, meant to clarify unclear points |     | 0<br>+ suitably allocated to Rep & Opp.<br>most time used |   |
| 1<br>+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized,<br>time managed efficiently   |     | 2<br>detailed, complex                                    |   |
| REVIEW OF REPORT   |     | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION                                      |   |
| evaluation &<br>understanding  |     | pros & cons<br>speech<br>prioritisation                   | pros & cons<br>prioritisation                     |
| 0<br>poor/right  |     | 0<br>poor/right   | 0<br>irrelevant                                   |
| 1<br>partial   |     | 1<br>too short/long                                       | 1<br>irrelevant                                   |
| 2<br>good  |     | 2<br>informative, apt                                     | 2<br>mostly correct, prioritised                  |
| 3<br>detailed,<br>complex  |     | 3 – @ considered &<br>accurate,<br>conclusive             | 3<br>fully adequate,<br>well prioritised          |
| DISCUSSION ANALYSIS  |     | MISSING POINTS<br>POINTED OUT                             |   |
| discussion<br>evaluation   |     | correct own<br>opinions                                   | concise and correct or<br>irrelevant              |
| 0<br>almost no   |     | 0<br>irrelevant   | -1<br>no questions asked                          |
| 1<br>too short/long  |     | 1<br>some   | 0<br>none   |
| 2<br>relevant parts  |     | 2<br>many   | -1<br>some incorrect,<br>inconclusive or too long |
| 3<br>fully adequate,<br>conclusive   |     | 3<br>adequate   | 1<br>relevant,<br>constructive                    |
| 4<br>adequate  |     | 4<br>adequate   | -2<br>deep misconceptions                         |
| ANSWERS TO JURY<br>QUESTIONS   |     |   |   |
| 0<br>concise and correct or<br>irrelevant                                    |     | 0<br>no questions asked                                   |   |
| 1<br>deeply incorrect or show<br>deep misconceptions                         |     | 1<br>some incorrect,<br>inconclusive or too long          |   |

**NOTES:**

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

## SCORESHEET

Simplifying logic  
Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1.5 -   = 5

|                             |          |           |                |                                     |                             |
|-----------------------------|----------|-----------|----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| REPORTER                    | stage: 1 | room: 205 | problem no.: 1 | Jury's name & signature: KATEJ BAPU | reviewer: Michael Vondráček |
| reporter: Simplifying logic |          |           |                |                                     |                             |

| REPORT                |                               | DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT          |   |   |  | ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |   |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|
| OPPONENT              | REVIEWER                      | relevant theory/model experiments | comparison between theory and experiment          | own contribution  | task fulfillment                                   | science communication                               | reporter's conduct at the discussion            |
| 1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 7 | Start from 1 and add/subtract | almost no                         | almost no   | almost no   | misunderstood                                      | unclear, chaotic                                    | 0 too few                                       |
| 1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 7 | Start from 1 and add/subtract | some                              | some  | some  | partly clear                                       | poor  | 0 no questions asked                            |
| 1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 7 | Start from 1 and add/subtract | good                              | fair  | well performed, sufficient number                         | average  | average   | 0 concise and correct or partly fine            |
| 1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 7 | Start from 1 and add/subtract | detailed                          | quite detailed, errors analysed                   | + results explained + theory limits explained, conclusive | above average                                      | some aspects well done                              | 1 many good                                     |
| 1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 7 | Start from 1 and add/subtract | deep and comprehensible, correct  | + reproducible, well fitting, deviations analysed | considerable experimental or theoretical solution         | overall clear, demonstrative                       | some aspects efficient                              | -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long     |
| 1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 7 | Start from 1 and add/subtract | shows physical insight            | completely testable, convincing analysis          | greater extent and theoretical than expected              | deeply incorrect or show proved deep understanding | overall efficient                                   | -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |

NOTES:

[3] → Full credit  
(4 → Full credit  
+ additional hints point max 2)

[5] → Block 1

| QUESTIONS ASKED                   |                               | OPPOSITION (SPEECH)                                       |                                    |                           |                 | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER           |                        |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| REVIEWER                          | OPPONENT                      | understanding of presentation                             | relevant topics and prioritisation | own opinions presented    | time management | relevant topics and prioritisation | own opinions presented |
| 1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 8 | Start from 1 and add/subtract | 0 too few, mostly irrelevant                              | too few, mostly irrelevant         | too few                   | 0 poor          | irrelevant                         | too few                |
| 1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 8 | Start from 1 and add/subtract | 1 unclear points in the report                            | almost nothing                     | too few                   | 1 reasonable    | too few                            | poor                   |
| 1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 8 | Start from 1 and add/subtract | 2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used | some main points                   | some ↗                    | 2 fair ↗        | some                               | some aspects fine      |
| 1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 8 | Start from 1 and add/subtract | 3 all relevant points ↗                                   | main points ↗                      | most ↗                    | 3 efficient ↗   | many correct                       | good                   |
| 1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 8 | Start from 1 and add/subtract | 4 practically all points                                  | well prioritised                   | * improvement suggestions | 4 all time used | well prioritised                   | some aspects efficient |

NOTES:

→ learning

→ relevant arguments, theory

→ good argumentation

→ interesting w/o → funniness

→ good explanation

→ good argumentation





**REPORTER** Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 4$$

"Sogen KE - Brueckner"

5534

544 - 6 (Sitzung)  
Robots - 14 (Plausibilisierung)  
Finger - 10 (Vorbericht)

| 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                               | reporter's conduct at the discussion          |
| 0      | almost no                  | almost no                | almost no                         | almost no   | almost no                                     | almost no                                 | misunderstood                | unclear, chaotic                                    | 0 — too few                                   |
| 1      | some                       | (Fair)                   | Fair                              | fair  | not well fitting                              | review of sources, cited partly           | partly/clear                 | average   | 1 — many                                      |
| 2      | + good                     | good                     | well performed, sufficient number | well performed, deviations qualitatively analysed             | + some interesting results                    | some own input                            | strength                     | some aspects above average                          | 2 — + data/theory supported                   |
| 3      | + detailed                 | detailed                 | quite detailed, correct           | + results explained   | + theory limits explained, conclusive         | considerable experimental or theoretical  | interesting solution         | overall clear, demonstrative                        | 3 — proved deep understanding                 |
| 4      | + demonstrating            | demonstrating            | + reproducible, errors analysed   | + reproducible, well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive | well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | greater extent than expected | complex concepts well communicated                  | 4 — overall efficient                         |
| 5      | + deep and comprehensible, | deep and comprehensible, | + detailed, complex               | + detailed, complex, convincing analysis                      | convincing analysis                           | convincing analysis                       | convincing analysis          | convincing analysis                                 | 5 — deep misconceptions                       |
| 6      | + shows physical insight   | shows physical insight   |                                   |   |   |   |                              |   | 6 — no questions asked                        |
| 7      |                            |                          |                                   |   |   |   |                              |   | -1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long |
|        |                            |                          |                                   |   |   |   |                              |   | -2 — deeply incorrect or show                 |

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 8$$

Brü - Verteilung

7788

**REVIEWER**

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

Postive KE - Meissner

7788

| REVIEWER                      | Start from 1 and add/subtract |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 8 |                               |

| QUESTIONS ASKED  | OPPOSITION (SPEECH)  | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER  |
|--|--|---|
| 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant<br>— relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report            | understanding of presentation<br>0 — almost nothing<br>1 — some main points<br>2 — all relevant points | relevant topics and prioritisation<br>0 — irrelevant<br>1 — too few<br>2 — some<br>3 — most                                     |
| 0 — irrelevant, meant to clarify unclear points<br>+ possibly allotted to Rep & Opp.<br>+ past time used | prioritisation<br>0 — irrelevant<br>1 — partially relevant<br>2 — mostly correct, prioritised          | own opinions presented<br>0 — too few<br>1 — reasonable<br>2 — some<br>3 — many correct<br>4 — well prioritised                 |
| 0 — irrelevant, mostly irrelevant<br>+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently  | management<br>0 — poor<br>1 — reasonable<br>2 — good<br>3 — excellent                                  | time<br>0 — irrelevant<br>1 — too few<br>2 — some<br>3 — many correct<br>4 — well prioritised                                   |
|  |  | opponent's conduct of the discussion<br>0 — poor<br>1 — some aspects fine<br>2 — good<br>3 — very good<br>4 — overall efficient |

| QUESTIONS ASKED  | REVIEW OF REPORT  | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION  | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS   | MISSED POINTS   | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS   |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| 0 — irrelevant, mostly irrelevant<br>+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently  | evaluation & understanding<br>0 — poor/wrong<br>1 — partial<br>2 — good<br>3 — complex    | pros & cons prioritisation<br>0 — irrelevant<br>1 — partially relevant<br>2 — mostly correct, prioritised | discussion evaluation<br>0 — irrelevant<br>1 — too short/long<br>2 — relevant parts | correct own opinions<br>0 — irrelevant<br>1 — some<br>2 — many<br>3 — fully adequate, accurate  | POINTED OUT QUESTIONS<br>0 — irrelevant<br>1 — some<br>2 — many<br>3 — deeply incorrect or show  |
| 0 — irrelevant, meant to clarify unclear points<br>+ possibly allotted to Rep & Opp.<br>+ past time used | evaluation<br>0 — irrelevant<br>1 — partially relevant<br>2 — mostly correct, prioritised | evaluation<br>0 — irrelevant<br>1 — partially relevant<br>2 — mostly correct, prioritised                 | opinions<br>0 — irrelevant<br>1 — some<br>2 — many<br>3 — fully adequate, accurate  | irrelevant<br>-1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>0 — none<br>1 — relevant, constructive<br>2 — deeply incorrect or show | concise and correct or no questions asked<br>-1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>0 — none<br>1 — relevant, constructive<br>2 — deeply incorrect or show |
| 0 — irrelevant, mostly irrelevant<br>+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently  | evaluation<br>0 — irrelevant<br>1 — partially relevant<br>2 — mostly correct, prioritised | evaluation<br>0 — irrelevant<br>1 — partially relevant<br>2 — mostly correct, prioritised                 | opinions<br>0 — irrelevant<br>1 — some<br>2 — many<br>3 — fully adequate, accurate  | irrelevant<br>-1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>0 — none<br>1 — relevant, constructive<br>2 — deeply incorrect or show | concise and correct or no questions asked<br>-1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long<br>0 — none<br>1 — relevant, constructive<br>2 — deeply incorrect or show |

NOTES:

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

STR filip Brabeczk 4 Ace

**REPORTER**

$$1 + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{1.5} = \boxed{0.5} = \boxed{5}$$

**REPORT**

| phenomenon explanation                              | theory/model                           | relevant experiments  | comparison between theory and experiment  | own contribution                         | task fulfillment                     | science communication    |
|---|--|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant                      | almost no                              | almost no   | almost no                                 | almost no                                | misunderstood                        | unclear, chaotic         |
| 1 — relevant, meant to clarify unclear points       | some                                   | some  | # some                                    | review of sources, cited                 | # partly                             | partly clear             |
| 2 — + suitable allotted to Rep & Opp.               | fair                                   | fair  | # fair                                    | not well fitting, deviations             | # some own input                     | average                  |
| 3 — most time used                                  | good                                   | sufficient number   | well performed, qualitatively analysed    | + some interesting results               | some aspects above average           | well done                |
| 4 — detailed  | quite detailed, correct                | + results explained   | + theory limits explained, conclusive     | considerable experimental or theoretical | interesting solution                 | overall clear, supported |
| 5 — demonstrative                                   | detailed, complex, convincing analysis | + reproducible, well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical | greater extent than expected             | + complex concepts well communicated | deeply incorrect or show |
| 6 — deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | completely testable                    |   |   |  |                                      | deep misconceptions      |

**NOTES:**

| OPPONENT  | REVIEWER   |
|---|--|
| 1 + <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> + <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> = 7 | Start from 1 and add/subtract<br>+0.5 -0.5 = 0.5 = 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 | concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 1 — unclear points in the report                            | almost nothing                | irrelevant                         | no questions asked                        |
| 2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used | some main points              | too few                            | deeply incorrect or show                  |
| 3 — , all relevant points                                   | main points                   | some                               | deep misconceptions                       |
| 4 — practically all points                                  | most                          | many correct                       | inconclusive or too long                  |
|   |                               | + improvement suggestions          | deeply incorrect or show                  |
|   |                               | all time used                      | deep misconceptions                       |

| REVIEW OF REPORT           | REVIEW OF OPPONITION             | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS      | MISSING POINTS OUT                   | ANSWERS TO JURY                           |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| evaluation & understanding | prats & cons prioritisation      | discussion evaluation    | correct own opinions                 | concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 0 — poor/wrong             | irrelevant                       | 0 — irrelevant           | 0 — irrelevant                       | no questions asked                        |
| 1 — partial                | partially relevant               | 1 — too short/long       | 1 — too short/long                   | some incorrect, inconclusive or too long  |
| 2 — good                   | mostly correct, prioritised      | 2 — informative, apt     | 2 — mostly correct, prioritised      | deeply incorrect or show                  |
| 3 — detailed, complex      | fully adequate, well prioritised | 3 — condensed & accurate | 3 — fully adequate, well prioritised | deep misconceptions                       |

NOTES:  +  +  =  = 5



Present

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract.

$$1 + \boxed{3} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{-1} = \boxed{5}$$

Stk

Batory

| REPORT                                     |   | DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT                      |  |   |                  | ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |   |
|--|---|---|--|---|------------------|---|---|
| phenomenon                                 | theory/model                                | relevant experiments                          | comparison between theory and experiment | own contribution                          | task fulfillment | science communication                               | relevant reporter's conduct at the discussion   |
| explanation                                | almost no                                   | almost no                                     | almost no                                | almost no                                 | misunderstood    | uncler, chaotic                                     | 0 too few                                       |
| some                                       | some  | some  | some                                     | almost no                                 | partly           | partly clear  | 1 some  |
| fair                                       | fair  | fair  | not well fitting                         | review of sources, cited                  | average          | average   | 0 poor  |
| good                                       | good  | well performed, sufficient number             | qualitatively analysed                   | some open input                           | above average    | some aspects  | 1 good  |
| detailed                                   | quite detailed, correct                     | + results explained                           | + theory limits                          | + some interesting results                | well done        | well done   | 2 + theory supported                            |
| demonstrative                              | detailed, complex, shows physical insight   | + reproducible, errors analysed               | + theory limits                          | considerable experimental or theoretical  | over/unclear     | some aspects efficient                              | -1 inconclusive or too long                     |
| deep and comprehensive, convicing analysis | deep and comprehensive, convincing analysis | well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive | analyzed, conclusive                     | considerable experimental and theoretical | demonstrative    | complex concepts well communicated                  | -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$\boxed{1} + \boxed{1} + \boxed{2.5} + \boxed{2.7} - \boxed{\square} = \boxed{7}$$

GJH

Verso - vgl

Orde 13 → 5 Pkt

| QUESTIONS ASKED   |                                    | OPPOSITION (SPEECH)       |                 |                                    |                           | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER             |   |
|---|------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| 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        |
| too few, mostly irrelevant                                | almost nothing                     | too few                   | poor            | irrelevant                         | too few                   | poor                                 | 0 concise and correct or no questions asked     |
| relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report | some main points                   | some                      | reasonable      | too few                            | some                      | some aspects fine                    | 1   |
| + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used   | main points                        | some correct              | fair            | some                               | some correct              | good                                 | -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long     |
| all relevant points                                       | most                               | many/correct              | efficient       | most                               | main correct              | some aspects efficient               | -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| practically all points                                    | well prioritised                   | + improvement suggestions | all time used   | well prioritised                   | + improvement suggestions | overall efficient                    | -2  |

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$\boxed{1} + \boxed{3} + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{2.5} + \boxed{1.5} \pm \boxed{\square} = \boxed{6}$$

Ch. 12

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

NOTES:

10 min 20min Postponed

McC

Kaučeky

|                     |                               |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>REPORTER</b>     | Start from 1 and add/subtract |
| 1 + 1 + 1 - 0,5 = 2 | 20                            |

| REPORT                        |                               | DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT   |                                       |  |                                    | ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |                       |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| OPPONENT                      | REVIEWER                      | theoretical/explanatory model                                      | relevant experiments                  | comparison between theory and experiment | own contribution                   | task fulfillment                                    | science communication |
| 1 + 1 + 2,5 + 2,5 - 0,5 = 7   | Start from 1 and add/subtract | not well fitting   | some own input                        | review of sources, cited                 | misunderstood                      | poorly understood                                   | unclear, chaotic      |
| 1 + 6,5 + 4,5 + 1 + 1 ± 0 = 5 | Start from 1 and add/subtract | well performed, deviations   | + some interesting results            | average                                  | average                            | average   | average               |
| 1 + 6,5 + 4,5 + 1 + 1 ± 0 = 5 | Start from 1 and add/subtract | sufficient number, qualitatively analysed                          | + some interesting results            | some aspects                             | some aspects                       | well done   | well done             |
| 1 + 6,5 + 4,5 + 1 + 1 ± 0 = 5 | Start from 1 and add/subtract | + results explained  | + theory limits                       | above average                            | above average                      | good  | good                  |
| 1 + 6,5 + 4,5 + 1 + 1 ± 0 = 5 | Start from 1 and add/subtract | detailed, correct  | + reproducible, explained, conclusive | interesting solution                     | overall clear, demonstrative       | supported   | supported             |
| 1 + 6,5 + 4,5 + 1 + 1 ± 0 = 5 | Start from 1 and add/subtract | demonstrative  | well fitting, deviations              | or theoretical                           | complex concepts well communicated | some aspects efficient                              | no questions asked    |
| 1 + 6,5 + 4,5 + 1 + 1 ± 0 = 5 | Start from 1 and add/subtract | deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex, shows physical insight | convincing analysis                   | greater extent than expected             | proven deep understanding          | deeply incorrect or show                            | deep misconceptions   |

NOTES:

| QUESTIONS ASKED  |                               | OPPOSITION (SPEECH)           |                                    |                           |                 | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER           |                           |                                      |   |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| OPPONENT   | REVIEWER                      | 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 — too few, mostly irrelevant relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report | 1 + 6,5 + 4,5 + 1 + 1 ± 0 = 5 | almost nothing                | irrelevant                         | too few                   | poor            | 0 — irrelevant                     | too few                   | poor                                 | 0 — no questions asked                        |
| 1 + 6,5 + 4,5 + 1 + 1 ± 0 = 5  | Start from 1 and add/subtract | some main points              | too few                            | some                      | reasonable      | 1 — too few                        | some                      | some aspects fine                    | -1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long |
| 1 + 6,5 + 4,5 + 1 + 1 ± 0 = 5  | Start from 1 and add/subtract | main points                   | some                               | some correct              | fair            | 2 — some                           | some correct              | good                                 | -1 — inconclusive or too long                 |
| 1 + 6,5 + 4,5 + 1 + 1 ± 0 = 5  | Start from 1 and add/subtract | all relevant points           | most                               | many correct              | efficient       | 3 — most                           | many correct              | some aspects efficient               | -2 — deeply incorrect or show                 |
| 1 + 6,5 + 4,5 + 1 + 1 ± 0 = 5  | Start from 1 and add/subtract | practically all points        | well prioritised                   | + improvement suggestions | all time used   | 4 — well prioritised               | + improvement suggestions | overall efficient                    | -2 — deep misconceptions                      |

NOTES:

| QUESTIONS ASKED  |                               | REVIEW OF REPORT           |                                  | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION             |                                  | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS      |                                  | MISSING POINTS             |  | ANSWERS TO JURY, REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS          |  |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| OPPONENT   | REVIEWER                      | evaluation & understanding | pers & cons prioritisation       | speech evaluation                | pers & cons prioritisation       | discussion evaluation    | correct own opinions             | POINTED OUT QUESTIONS      | ANSWERS TO JURY, REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS          | ANSWERS TO JURY, REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS          |  |
| 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant relevant, meant to clarify unclear points | 1 + 6,5 + 4,5 + 1 + 1 ± 0 = 5 | poor/wrong                 | Irrelevant                       | Irrelevant                       | Irrelevant                       | 0 — almost no irrelevant | irrelevant                       | 0 — no questions asked     | 0 — concise and correct or no questions asked  | 0 — concise and correct or no questions asked  |  |
| 1 + 6,5 + 4,5 + 1 + 1 ± 0 = 5  | Start from 1 and add/subtract | partial                    | * partially relevant             | * too short/long                 | * partially relevant             | 1 — too short/long       | same                             | (D) more                   | -1 — some incorrect, inconclusive etc too long | -1 — some incorrect, inconclusive etc too long |  |
| 1 + 6,5 + 4,5 + 1 + 1 ± 0 = 5  | Start from 1 and add/subtract | good                       | mostly correct, prioritised      | informative, apt                 | mostly correct, prioritised      | 1 — relevant parts       | many                             | 1 — relevant, constructive | -2 — deeply incorrect or show                  | -2 — deeply incorrect or show                  |  |
| 1 + 6,5 + 4,5 + 1 + 1 ± 0 = 5  | Start from 1 and add/subtract | detailed, complex          | fully adequate, well prioritised | fully adequate, well prioritised | fully adequate, well prioritised | 2 — accurate, conclusive | fully adequate, well prioritised | 2 — deep misconceptions    | 2 — deep misconceptions                        | 2 — deep misconceptions                        |  |

NOTES:

13

3334

KUNDRAVIC

$$\text{REPORTER} \quad \boxed{1} + \boxed{2.5} + \boxed{1} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{4}$$

Bolnáček - Zelený

## REPORT

| phenomenon explanation                         | theory/model                           | relevant experiments                  | comparison between theory and argument | own contribution                      | task fulfillment                   | science communication                |
|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| almost no                                      | already so                             | almost no                             | (almost no)                            | almost no                             | misunderstood                      | unchar., chaotic                     |
| some   | some                                   | some                                  | (some)                                 | review of subjects, died              | partly                             | partly clear                         |
| fair   | fair                                   | fair                                  | (fair)                                 | not well fitting                      | average                            | average                              |
| good   | good                                   | well performed, sufficient number     | (well performed, sufficient number)    | + results explained                   | some aspects above average         | some aspects well done               |
| detailed                                       | quite detailed, correct                | + reproducible, explained, conclusive | (quite detailed, correct)              | + theory limits explained, conclusive | considerable experimental solution | overall clear, supported             |
| demonstrative                                  | detailed, complex, convincing analysis | analysed, conclusive and theoretical  | (demonstrative)                        | of theoretical                        | greater extent than expected       | + complex concepts well communicated |
| deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight | completely testable                    |                                       |  |                                       |                                    |                                      |

NOTES:

$$\text{OPPONENT} \quad \boxed{1} + \boxed{1} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{6}$$

Hajnáček - Machec

256

## Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$\boxed{1} + \boxed{1} + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{1} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{6}$$

Hajnáček - Machec

## DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

| QUESTIONS ASKED   | OPPOSITION (SPEECH) understanding of presentation | relevant topics and prioritisation | own opinions presented    | time management |
|---|---|------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| 0 - too few, mostly irrelevant                                | almost nothing                                    | irrelevant                         | too few                   | poor            |
| 1 - relevant, aimed at receiving unclear points in the report | some main points                                  | top few                            | some                      | reasonable      |
| 2 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used   | all (clear) points                                | most                               | many correct              | efficient       |
| 3 -   | practically all points                            | well prioritised                   | + improvement suggestions | all time used   |

NOTES:

more explanations

$$\text{REVIEWER} \quad \boxed{1} + \boxed{1} + \boxed{1.5} + \boxed{1} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{6}$$

Hajnáček - Machec

5556

| QUESTIONS ASKED  | REVIEW OF REPORT evaluation & understanding | pros & cons prioritisation       | REVIEW OF OPPONENT speech evaluation | pros & cons prioritisation       | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS discussion evaluation | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS          |
|--|---|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|
| 0 - too few, mostly irrelevant, meant to clarify unclear points        | poor/wrong                                  | irrelevant                       | poor/wrong                           | irrelevant                       | almost no irrelevant                      | 0 - concise and correct or no questions asked     |
| 1 - + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used                   | partial                                     | partially relevant               | too short/long                       | partially relevant               | almost no irrelevant                      | -1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long     |
| 2 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritised, time managed efficiently | good  | mostly correct, prioritised      | informative, apt                     | mostly correct, prioritised      | many relevant points                      | -2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| 3 -  | detailed, complex                           | fully adequate, well prioritised | condensed & accurate                 | fully adequate, well prioritised | 2 - accurate, fully adequate              | 1 - relevant, constructive                        |

NOTES:

**REPORTER** Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{2} + \boxed{0} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{3}$$

**REPORT**

| phenomenon explanation                         | theory/model               | relevant experiments                           | comparison between theory and experiment      | own contribution                                   | task fulfillment            | science communication                        |
|--|----------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------|--|
| almost no                                      | almost no                  | almost no                                      | almost no                                     | almost no  | misunderstood               | unclear, chaotic                             |
| some   | some                       | some   | some  | review of sources, cited some own input            | partly                      | partly clear                                 |
| (fair)   | Fair                       | Fair   | not well fitting                              | + some interesting results                         | average                     | average                                      |
| good   | good                       | well performed, sufficient number              | deviations qualitatively analysed             | + results explained                                | some aspects above average  | good   |
| detailed                                       | quite detailed, correct    | + reproducible, errors analysed                | + theory limits explained, conclusive         | considerable experimental or theoretical solution  | well done                   | some aspects efficient                       |
| demonstrative                                  | detailed, complex, correct | + deep and comprehensible, convincing analysis | well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive | considerable experimental and theoretical solution | overall clear demonstrative | deeply incorrect or show some misconceptions |
| deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight | completely testable        | notes:   | than expected                                 | + complex concepts well communicated               | greater extent              | deeply incorrect or show some misconceptions |

NOTES:

P.S. - *before play mode*

1.5 min

*Note: Tel*

*Focus Below*

*Notes*

**DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT**

| relevant arguments/responses | reporter's conduct at the discussion | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS     |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| too few                      | poorly fine                          | no questions asked                           |
| many                         | good                                 | some incorrect                               |
| + data/theory supported      | some aspects efficient               | inconclusive or too long                     |
| supported                    | overall efficient                    | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |

**NOTES:**

Start from 1 and add/subtract

**OPPONENT**

$$1 + \boxed{4} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{4} = \boxed{5}$$

$$Start from 1 and add/subtract$$

**REVIEWER**

$$1 + \boxed{9} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{1.5} - \boxed{4} = \boxed{5}$$

Start from 1 and add/subtract

| QUESTIONS ASKED   | OPPOSITION (SPEECH) understanding of presentation | relevant topics and prioritisation | own opinions presented    | time management  | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER             |
|---|---|------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| too few, mostly irrelevant                                | almost nothing                                    | irrelevant                         | too few                   | poor             | relevant topics and prioritisation   |
| relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report | some main points                                  | main points                        | some                      | reasonable       | own opinions presented               |
| + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used   | all relevant points                               | most                               | some correct              | fair             | opponent's conduct at the discussion |
| practically all points                                    | well prioritised                                  | + improvement suggestions          | many correct              | efficient        | the discussion                       |
| NOTES:  |   |                                    | many correct              | most             | irrelevant                           |
|   |   |                                    | some aspects efficient    | 4                | too few                              |
|   |   |                                    | + improvement suggestions | well prioritised | some aspects fine                    |
|   |   |                                    | overall efficient         |                  | good                                 |

*Initial size, arguments -- P.S.*

| REVIEW OF REPORT           | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION        | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS  | MISSED POINTS                    | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS     |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| evaluation & understanding | press & cons prioritisation | speech evaluation    | press & cons prioritisation      | correct own opinions                         |
| poor/wrong                 | Irrelevant                  | Irrelevant           | Irrelevant                       | irrelevant                                   |
| partial                    | partially relevant          | too short/long       | too short/long                   | almost no                                    |
| good                       | mostly correct, prioritised | informative, apt     | mostly correct, prioritised      | irrelevant                                   |
| 3 detailed, complex        | fully adequate, accurate    | confident & accurate | fully adequate, well prioritised | irrelevant, some questions asked             |
|                            |                             |                      |                                  | no questions asked                           |
|                            |                             |                      |                                  | some incorrect, inconclusive or too long     |
|                            |                             |                      |                                  | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |

| QUESTIONS ASKED  | REVIEW OF REPORT    | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION        | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS              | MISSED POINTS | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS     |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|--|
| too few, mostly irrelevant   | poor/wrong          | Irrelevant                  | Irrelevant                       | 0             | concise and correct or no questions asked    |
| relevant, meant to clarify unclear points                          | partial             | partially relevant          | too short/long                   | -1            | some incorrect, inconclusive or too long     |
| + suitably allotted to Rep. & Opp.                                 | good                | mostly correct, prioritised | informative, apt                 | 1             | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| most time used   | 3 detailed, complex | confident & accurate        | fully adequate, well prioritised | -2            | deeply incorrect or show                     |
| + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently |                     |                             |                                  |               |  |

NOTES:

## REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{0.45} + \boxed{1.75} - \boxed{-1} = \boxed{3}$$

Polar

Zarbil

Pescat

## REPORT

phenomenon explanation

almost no

Some

Fair

Good

Detailed

Demonstrative

Deep and comprehensive

Shows physical insight

completely testable

convincing analysis

analyzed, conclusive

demonstrative

experimental and theoretical

considerable experimental

greater extent than expected

communicated

675

KUNDRÁEK

*Legato Postone's KE - Lasca's 4465*

REPORTER  
 $1 + 3 + 1.5 - 0 = 5$

Start from 1 and add/subtract

| REPORT   |   | DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT          |  | ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |   |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| phenomenon explanation                                 | theory/model                            | relevant experiments              | comparison between theory and experiment | task fulfilment                                     | concise and correct or arguments/responses        |
| almost no  | almost no                               | almost no                         | almost no                                | understood  | no questions asked                                |
| some   | some                                    | some                              | some                                     | unclear, chaotic                                    | -1 - some incorrect, inconclusive or too long     |
| fair   | fair                                    | Fair                              | not well fitting                         | partly clear  | -2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| <i>good</i>  | good                                    | well performed, sufficient number | deviations                               | average   |   |
| <i>detailed</i>  | quite detailed,                         | results explained                 | + theory limits                          | some aspects above average                          |   |
| <i>demonstrative</i>                                   | correct                                 | + reproducible,                   | + theory limits                          | overall clear, demonstrative                        |   |
| <i>deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight</i> | deep and complex, completely restatable | convincing analysis               | explained, conclusive                    | considerable experimental and theoretical           |   |
| NOTES:   |   |                                   |  | complex concepts well communicated                  |   |

NOTES:

OPPONENT  
 $1 + 4 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7$

Start from 1 and add/subtract

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)  
 $0 + 1 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 3$

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:  
*some main points*  
*some correct*  
*mostly correct*  
*improvement suggestions*

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER  
 $0 + 0 + 0 - 0 = 0$

- 0 irrelevant
- 1 too few
- 2 too few
- 3 most
- 4 well prioritised

REVIEW OF REPORT  
 $0 + 0 + 0 - 0 = 0$

- 0 irrelevant
- 1 partially relevant
- 2 mostly correct, prioritised
- 3 condensed & accurate

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION  
 $0 + 0 + 0 - 0 = 0$

- 0 irrelevant
- 1 irrelevant
- 2 mostly correct, prioritised
- 3 fully adequate, well prioritised

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS  
 $0 + 0 + 0 - 0 = 0$

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

MISSING POINTS  
 $0 + 0 + 0 - 0 = 0$

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

QUESTIONS  
 $0 + 0 + 0 - 0 = 0$

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

REVIEWER  
 $1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 5$

Start from 1 and add/subtract

OPPONENT  
 $1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7$

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

NOTES:  
*some main points*  
*some correct*  
*mostly correct*  
*fully adequate, well prioritised*

REVIEWER  
 $1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 5$

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

## REPORTER

$$1 + \boxed{2,5} + \boxed{2,5} - \boxed{0,5} = \boxed{5}$$

start from 1 and add/subtract

## REPORT

|   |                        | DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT |                       |   |  | ANSWERS TO JURY,<br>OPPONENT, and<br>REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |                        |  |
|---|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|------------------------|--|
|   |                        | relevant explanation     | theory/model          | relevant experiments                          | comparison between theory and experiment | own contribution  | task fulfillment       | science communication  |
| 0 | almost no              | almost no                | almost no             | almost no                                     | almost no                                | misunderstood   | undear, chaotic        | arguments/expenses   |
| 1 | some                   | 4                        | some                  | some  | review of sources, cited                 | partly  | partly clear           | reporter's conduct at the discussion                                   |
| 2 | -                      | -                        | -                     | -   | -  | -   | -                      | REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS   |
| 3 | -                      | -                        | -                     | -   | -  | -   | -                      | 0 — concise and correct or no questions asked                          |
| 4 | good                   | fair                     | fair                  | fair  | well performed, sufficient number        | average   | average                | 1 — too few  |
| 5 | detailed               | quite detailed,          | good                  | + results explained                           | + theory limits                          | some aspects above average                                | some aspects well done | 2 — * data/theory supported  |
| 6 | demonstrative          | correct                  | + reproducible,       | explained, conclusive                         | considerable experimental solution       | overall clear, demonstrative                              | some aspects efficient | 3 — * deep misconceptions  |
| 7 | deep and comprehensive | detailed, complex        | + convincing analysis | well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive | greater extent than expected             | + complex concepts well communicated                      | overall efficient      | -2 — deeply incorrect or show some incorrect, inconclusive or too long |

## NOTES:

 $\rightarrow$  ~~halbwegs~~ ~~viel zu~~ ~~cah~~ ~~Wissens~~ ~~steigend~~Mangelhaft ~~schwach~~obne ~~schwach~~Mangelhaft ~~schwach~~obne ~~schwach~~

# SCORESHEET

fight (round no.):      stage:      room:      problem no.:      Junior's name & signature:      reviewer:

*Pastoral L'E. Reaktion L. Schäf*

REPORTER      1 + 2,5 + 1 - 0,25 = 4

reporter:

*(17)*

## 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          | almost no                                 | too few                             | 0 / not/almost no                        | others' data, incorrectly cited | misunderstood                          | unclear, chaotic      | 0 — relevant arguments/responses         | OPPONENT, and reporter's conduct at the discussion |
| 1 — some               | some                                      | some                                | 1 / same                                 | review of sources, cited        | 1 party                                | partly clear          | 1 — too few                              | concise and correct or no questions asked          |
| 2 — fair               | fair                                      | fair                                | 2 / not well fitting                     | some own input                  | 1 average                              | average               | 1 — some                                 | some aspects fine                                  |
| 3 — good               | good                                      | well performed, sufficient number   | 3 / qualitative analysis                 | some aspects above average      | 2 some parts                           | well done             | 1 — many                                 | good   |
| 4 — detailed           | quite detailed, correct                   | + results explained                 | 4 / + theory limits                      | + considerable experimental!    | 2 overall clear, interesting solution  | demonstrating         | 2 — * data/theory convincingly supported | some aspects efficient                             |
| 5 — demonstrative      | detailed, complex, shows physical insight | + reproducible, convincing analysis | 5 / errors analysed                      | + greater extent than expected  | 3 + complex concepts well communicated |                       | 2 — -2                                   | inconclusive or too long                           |
| 6 —                    |   |                                     |  |                                 |  |                       |  | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions       |
| 7 —                    |   |                                     |  |                                 |  |                       |  |  |

NOTES:

*ZB Werte*

*Pitcher, Vauban*

*Start from 1 and add/subtract*

OPPONENT      6,25      Start from 1 and add/subtract  
1 + 1 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 7

## QUESTIONS ASKED

| QUESTION ASKED   | OPPOSITION (SPEECH)           | REVIEWER   |
|--|-------------------------------|--|
| 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant, aimed at responding unclear points in the report | understanding of presentation | Start from 1 and add/subtract<br>1 + 0,25 + 2,25 + 1 + 1 + 0 - 0 = 6 |
| 1 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used                      | relevant topics addressed     |  |
| 2 —  | own opinions presented        |  |
| 3 —  | prioritisation                |  |
| 4 — practically all points   | time management               |  |

NOTES:

| DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER             | REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS                 |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| relevant scientific topics presented | opponent's conduct of prioritisation |
| almost no                            | the discussion                       |
| 0 / too few                          | poor                                 |
| 1 / few                              | bad                                  |
| 2 / some                             | some                                 |
| 3 / many correct                     | good                                 |
| 4 / new crucial point(s)             | overall efficient                    |
| + improvement suggestions            | very good                            |

| 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 |

| QUESTIONS ASKED  | REVIEW OF REPORT                  | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION     | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS   | MISSING POINTS                                    | ANSWERS TO JURY                              |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant, meant to clarify unclear points        | report evaluation & understanding | speech evaluation        | discussion evaluation | correct own opinions                              | QUESTIONS                                    |
| 1 — + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used                   | poor/wrong                        | pros & cons              | pros & cons           | POINTED OUT                                       | COHERENT AND CORRECT OR NO QUESTIONS ASKED   |
| 2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently | partial                           | prioritisation           | prioritisation        | irrelevant  | NO QUESTIONS ASKED                           |
| 3 —  | good                              | 1 / mostly adequate      | 1 / reasonable        | 0 / too few                                       | COHERENT AND CORRECT OR NO QUESTIONS ASKED   |
| 4 —  | fully adequate                    | 2 / condensed & accurate | 2 / fully conclusive  | 1 / some  | COHERENT AND CORRECT OR NO QUESTIONS ASKED   |
| 5 —  | adequate                          | 3 / good                 | 3 / good              | 0 / none  | COHERENT AND CORRECT OR NO QUESTIONS ASKED   |
| 6 —  |                                   |                          |                       | -1 / irrelevant                                   | INCONCLUSIVE OR TOO LONG                     |
| 7 —  |                                   |                          |                       | -1 / some incorrect                               | INCONCLUSIVE OR TOO LONG                     |
| 8 —  |                                   |                          |                       | -2 / deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions | DEEPLY INCORRECT OR SHOW DEEP MISCONCEPTIONS |

NOTES:

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

PLIESCH

| REPORTER           | Start from 1 and add/subtract |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 + 3 + 1 = -1 = 4 | Pos -                         |

REPORT

| phenomenon    | 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 |
|---------------|--------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| explanation   | almost no                      | almost no   | almost no   | review of sources, cited     | misunderstood                        | unclear, chaotic      | 0                            | too few                              | concise and correct or no questions asked           |
| almost eq     | some                           | some  | some  | some own input               | partly                               | partly clear          | 1                            | many                                 | no questions asked                                  |
| some          | fair                           | fair  | fair  | not well fitting             | average                              | average               | 2                            | + dark/theory supported              | some incorrect, inconclusive or too long            |
| fair          | good                           | good  | well performed, sufficient number                             | some aspects above-average   | some aspects well done               | 3                     | -                            | -2                                   | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions        |
| good          | detailed                       | quite detailed, correct   | * results explained + reproducible, explained, conclusive     | interesting, solution        | overall fair, demonstrative          | 4                     | -                            | -1                                   | inconclusive or too long                            |
| detailed      | demonstrative                  | deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex, convincing analysis | + reproducible, well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive | greater extent than expected | + complex concepts well communicated | 5                     | -                            | -2                                   | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions        |
| demonstrative | deep and comprehensive insight | completely testable   | analysed, conclusive  | 6                            | -                                    | -                     | -                            | -                                    | -   |

NOTES:

| OPPONENT              | Start from 1 and add/subtract |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 + 1 + 2 + 2 + 1 = 6 | 6.34                          |

OPPONENT

| QUESTIONS ASKED | OPPOSITION (SPEECH) understanding of presentation | relevant topics and prioritisation                          | own opinions presented    | time management | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER 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                        | irrelevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report | too few                   | poor            | 0   | irrelevant             | too few                              | 0  |
| 1               | mostly relevant, all time used                    | + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used     | some                      | reasonable      | 1   | too few                | poor                                 | 1  |
| 2               |   |   | some correct              | fair            | 2   | some                   | some aspects fine                    | 2  |
| 3               |   |   | mostly correct            | effector        | 3   | many correct           | (good)                               | 3  |
| 4               | practically all points                            | well prioritised  | + improvement suggestions | all time used   | 4   | well prioritised       | + improvement suggestions            | 4  |

NOTES:

| REVIEWER              | Start from 1 and add/subtract |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 + 1 + 2 + 1 + 1 = 6 | 6.34                          |

REVIEWER

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

NOTES:

(8)

Sofia KE

Vivianka Valajone 5566

Kundstek

**REPORTER**  
 1 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 6

start from 1 and add/subtract

| REPORT  |   | DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT                 |  |                            |                              |                                      |   |  |
|---|---|--|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| phenomenon explanation                            | theory/model  | relevant experiments                     | comparison between theory and experiment | own contribution           | task fulfillment             | science communication                | ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTION:           |  |
| 0 almost no                                       | almost nothing  | almost no                                | almost no alignment                      | almost no                  | misunderstood                | unclear, chaotic                     | 0 too few   |  |
| 1 some  | some  | some                                     | aligned                                  | review of sources, cited   | partly                       | partly clear                         | 1 some  |  |
| 2 fair  | fair  | fair                                     | aligned                                  | above average              | average                      | average                              | 2 many  |  |
| 3 good  | good  | well performed, sufficient number        | not well fitting                         | + some own input           | some aspects above average   | some aspects well done               | 3 good  |  |
| 4 detailed  | quite detailed,   | + results explained                      | qualitatively analysed                   | + some interesting results | interesting                  | overall good, convincing             | 4 supported   |  |
| 5 demonstrative                                   | correct   | + reproducible, explained, conclusive    | analysed, theoretical                    | considerable experimental  | solution                     | + complex concepts well communicated | 5 some aspects effective                                      |  |
| 6 deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable, convincing analysis | + reproducible, well fitting, deviations | analysed, conclusive                     | analysed, conclusive       | greater extent than expected | 6 overall efficient                  | -1 some incorrect, -2 deeply incorrect or show misconceptions |  |

NOTES:

**OPPONENT**  
 1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

Start from 1 and add/subtract

Postura KE  
Mia Lila Melchor

7787

| QUESTIONS ASKED   |   | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER  |                 |                                    |                           |                                      |   |  |
|---|---|---------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| OPPOSITION (SPEECH) 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                            | irrelevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report | too few                   | poor            | 0 irrelevant                       | top down                  | poor                                 | 0 concise and correct or no questions asked   |  |
| 1 short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used | 1 some main points  | some                      | reasonable      | 1 too few                          | some                      | poor                                 | 1 some incorrect, -1 inconclusive or too long, -2 deeply incorrect or show misconceptions |  |
| 2 all relevant points                                   | 2 most  | mostly correct            | fair            | 2 some                             | some                      | good                                 | 2 supported   |  |
| 3 practically all points                                | practically all points                                      | + improvement suggestions | efficient       | 3 most                             | many correct              | some aspects effective               | 3 overall efficient   |  |
| 4   |   |                           |                 | 4 well prioritised                 | + improvement suggestions | overachieved                         |   |  |

NOTES:

**REVIEWER**  
 1 + 1 + 2 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 6

Start from 1 and add/subtract

G-SH  
Baldemar Ghioenc 5566

| QUESTIONS ASKED  |   | REVIEW OF REPORT                   |                            |                                    |                               |                        |   |  |
|--|---|------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| EVALUATION & UNDERSTANDING   | PROS & CONS PRIORITISATION                  | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION               | EVALUATION & UNDERSTANDING | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION               | EVALUATION & UNDERSTANDING    | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS    | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS  |  |
| 0 too few, mostly irrelevant                                       | irrelevant, meant to clarify unclear points | 0 poor/wrong prioritisation        | 0 irrelevant               | 0 correct own opinions             | 0 irrelevant                  | 0 almost no discussion | 0 concise and correct or no questions asked   |  |
| 1 suitable allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used                   | 1 partial                                   | 1 partially relevant               | 1 irrelevant               | 1 irrelevant                       | 1 irrelevant                  | 1 almost no discussion | 1 some incorrect, -1 inconclusive or too long, -2 deeply incorrect or show misconceptions |  |
| 2 short, apt and clear, well prioritised, time managed efficiently | 2 good                                      | 2 mostly correct, prioritised      | 2 partially relevant       | 2 mostly correct, prioritised      | 2 mostly correct, prioritised | 2 relevant, effective  | 2 fully adequate, well prioritised  |  |
| 3  | 3 detailed, complex                         | 3 fully adequate, well prioritised | 3 accurate, conclusive     | 3 fully adequate, well prioritised | 3 adequate                    | 3 many                 | 3 relevant, constructive  |  |

| REVIEWER                      |               | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER |   |   |   |   |   |  |
|-------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1 + 1 + 2 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 6     | 1 + 2 - 0 = 3 | 1                        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |
| Start from 1 and add/subtract |               |                          |   |   |   |   |   |  |



Presch

8

| REPORTER  | Start from 1 and add/subtract |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 1 + <input type="text"/> + <input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/> = <input type="text"/> | STK                           |

| REPORT | phenomenon explanation                          | theory/model experiments                                    | 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   | 0                | unclear, chaotic      | arguments/responses      | reporter's conduct at the discussion                |
| 1      | some  | some  | some                              | some                                     | some  | 1                | average               | too few                  | no questions asked                                  |
| 2      | fair  | fair  | fair                              | not well fitting                         | some own input                                    | 1                | many                  | some                     | concise and correct or some incorrect,              |
| 3      | good  | good  | well performed, sufficient number | deviations                               | + some interpreting results                       | 2                | above average         | partly fine              | some incorrect, inconclusive or too long            |
| 4      | detailed  | quite detailed, errors analysed                             | sufficient number                 | qualitatively analysed                   | + theory limits                                   | 2                | well done             | good                     | deeply incorrect or show                            |
| 5      | demonstrative                                   | correct   | errors analysed                   | + reproducible, explained, conclusive    | considerable experimental or theoretical solution | 3                | interesting           | some aspects efficient   | deep misconceptions                                 |
| 6      | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed, complex, completely testable, convincing analysis | analysed, conclusive              | well fitting, deviations                 | greater extent than expected                      | 3                | demonstrative         | over all efficient       |   |
| 7      |   |   |                                   | + complex concepts well communicated     |   |                  |                       |                          |   |

NOTES:

| OPPONENT   | Start from 1 and add/subtract |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 1 + <input type="text"/> + <input type="text"/> + <input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/> = <input type="text"/> |                               |

| OPPONENT   | Start from 1 and add/subtract |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 1 + <input type="text"/> + <input type="text"/> + <input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/> = <input type="text"/> |                               |

Poster

Take Down

| QUESTIONS ASKED | OPPOSITION (SPEECH) understanding of presentation         | relevant topics and prioritisation | own opinions presented    | time management | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER 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                                | irrelevant                         | too few                   | poor            | 0   | too few                | poor                                 | 0  |
| 1               | relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report | irrelevant                         | some                      | reasonable      | 1   | some                   | poor                                 | 1  |
| 2               | + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used   | top few main points                | some                      | reasonable      | 2   | some                   | some aspects fine                    | 2  |
| 3               | + irrelevant points                                       | (most) irrelevant                  | many correct              | efficient       | 3   | many correct           | good                                 | 3  |
| 4               | practically all points                                    | well prioritised                   | + improvement suggestions | all time used   | 4   | well prioritised       | + improvement suggestions            | 4  |

| QUESTIONS ASKED | REVIEW OF REPORT evaluation & understanding                        | pros & cons prioritisation       | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION speech evaluation | pros & cons prioritisation | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS discussion evaluation | correct own opinions | MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT | ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS |
|-----------------|--|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------|---|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 0               | + suitable allotted to Rep & Opp.                                  | irrelevant                       | 0                                      | poor/wrong                 | 0   | almost no            | irrelevant                | 0                         |
| 1               | most time used   | partially relevant               | 1                                      | too short/long             | 1   | irrelevant           | -1                        | -1                        |
| 2               | + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently | mostly correct, prioritised      | 2                                      | informative, apt           | 1   | relevant parts many  | none                      | -1                        |
| 3               | complex  | fully adequate, well prioritised | 3                                      | condensed & accurate       | 2   | accurate, conclusive | fully adequate            | 1                         |

| REVIEWER   | Start from 1 and add/subtract |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 1 + <input type="text"/> + <input type="text"/> + <input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/> = <input type="text"/> |                               |

| REVIEWER   | Start from 1 and add/subtract |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 1 + <input type="text"/> + <input type="text"/> + <input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/> = <input type="text"/> |                               |

Poster

Take Down

| REVIEWER   | Start from 1 and add/subtract |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 1 + <input type="text"/> + <input type="text"/> + <input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/> = <input type="text"/> |                               |

| REVIEWER   | Start from 1 and add/subtract |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 1 + <input type="text"/> + <input type="text"/> + <input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/> = <input type="text"/> |                               |

| REVIEWER   | Start from 1 and add/subtract |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 1 + <input type="text"/> + <input type="text"/> + <input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/> = <input type="text"/> |                               |

Poster

Take Down

## REPORTER

$$1 + \boxed{6} + \boxed{6.5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{9}$$

Start from 1 and add/subtract

634 - Jelub Škára 99109

9

Kondsen

| REPORT   |                                     | DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT                 |  |                            |  | ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |  |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------|--|---|--|
| OPPONENT   | theory/model                        | relevant experiments                     | comparisons between theory and experiment  | own contribution           | task fulfillment                             | science communication                               | relevant arguments/responses                   |
| phenomenon explanation                           | almost no                           | almost no                                | almost no                                  | almost no                  | misunderstood                                | unclear, chaotic                                    | 0 too few                                      |
| some   | some                                | some                                     | some                                       | review of sources, cited   | partly                                       | partly clear  | 1 some   |
| fair   | fair                                | not well fitting                         | some own input                             | average                    | average                                      | average   | 2 poor   |
| good   | well performed, sufficient number   | qualitatively analysed                   | * some interesting results                 | some aspects above average | some aspects                                 | some aspects well done                              | 3 partly fine                                  |
| quite detailed, errors analysed                  | + rigours explained                 | + theorems                               | + considerable experimental or theoretical | well above average         | many   | good  | 4 no questions asked                           |
| demonstrative                                    | + reproducible, convincing analysis | + reproducible, well fitting definitions | + considered experimental and theoretical  | surpassed                  | + data/theory demonstrated                   | some aspects inconclusive or too long               | 5 some incorrect,                              |
| deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight. | completely predictable              | analysed, conclusive                     | considerable experimental results expected | promised described         | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions | deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions        | 6 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |

NOTES:

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

Sprague' KE - Martin Gruis 6766

| QUESTIONS ASKED   |                               | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER           |                        |                          |                                    | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |   |
|---|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| REVIEWER  | OPPOSITION (SPEECH)           | relevant topics and prioritisation | own opinions presented | time management          | relevant topics and prioritisation | own opinions presented                   | opponent's conduct of the discussion              |
| 1 + 2 + 2 + 1 + 0 - 0 = 7                                   | understanding of presentation | too few                            | poor                   | 0 irrelevant             | too few                            | poor                                     | 0 no questions asked                              |
| Start from 1 and add/subtract                               | almost nothing                | irrelevant                         | too few                | 1 reasonable             | some                               | some aspects fine                        | 1 some incorrect,                                 |
| 0 - too few, mostly irrelevant                              | some main points              | some                               | some                   | 2 main points            | some correct                       | good                                     | 2 inconclusive or too long                        |
| 1 - unclear points in the report                            | main point                    | some                               | some                   | 3 all relevant points    | many correct                       | inconclusive or too long                 | 3 -   |
| 2 - + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used | most                          | well prioritised                   | well prioritised       | 4 practically all points | + improvement suggestions          | overall efficient                        | -2 - deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |

NOTES:

OPPONENT  
 Start from 1 and add/subtract

Pozlona' KE - Marcos Mueller 7687

| QUESTIONS ASKED  |            | REVIEW OF REPORT           |                            |                   |                            | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION |                            | REVIEW OF OPPONENT |              | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS        |              | MISSING POINTS |           | ANSWERS TO JURY                           |   |
|--|------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------|---|---|
| REVIEWER   | OPPOSITION | evaluation & understanding | pres & cons prioritisation | speech evaluation | pros & cons prioritisation | evaluation           | pros & cons prioritisation | irrelevant         | irrelevant   | correct own evaluation     | opinions     | POINTED OUT    | QUESTIONS | concise and correct or no questions asked |   |
| 0 - too few, mostly irrelevant                                       | 0 -        | 0 -                        | 0 -                        | 0 -               | 0 -                        | 0 -                  | 0 -                        | 0 irrelevant       | 0 irrelevant | 0 almost no                | 0 irrelevant | 0              | 0         | 0   | 0 |
| relevant, meant to clarify unclear points                            | 1 -        | 1 -                        | 1 -                        | 1 -               | 1 -                        | 1 -                  | 1 -                        | 1 irrelevant       | 1 irrelevant | 1 too short/long           | 1 many       | 1              | 1         | 1   | 1 |
| + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp.                                    | 0 -        | 0 -                        | 0 -                        | 0 -               | 0 -                        | 0 -                  | 0 -                        | 0 irrelevant       | 0 irrelevant | 0 relevant parts           | 0 many       | 0              | 0         | 0   | 0 |
| most time used   | 1 -        | 1 -                        | 1 -                        | 1 -               | 1 -                        | 1 -                  | 1 -                        | 1 irrelevant       | 1 irrelevant | 1 accurate, fully adequate | 1 many       | 1              | 1         | 1   | 1 |
| 2 - short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently | 2 -        | 2 -                        | 2 -                        | 2 -               | 2 -                        | 2 -                  | 2 -                        | 2 irrelevant       | 2 irrelevant | 2 accurate, fully adequate | 2 many       | 2              | 2         | 2   | 2 |
| time managed efficiently   | 3 -        | 3 -                        | 3 -                        | 3 -               | 3 -                        | 3 -                  | 3 -                        | 3 accurate         | 3 accurate   | 3 accurate, fully adequate | 3 many       | 3              | 3         | 3   | 3 |

NOTES:

**REPORTER** Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{6} + \boxed{3} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{10}$$

**REPORTER**

$$\text{Start from 1 and add/subtract}$$

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

NOTES:

| ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS           |
|---|
| 0 $\rightarrow$ concise and correct or no questions asked     |
| -1 $\rightarrow$ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long     |
| -2 $\rightarrow$ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| -3 $\rightarrow$ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |
| -4 $\rightarrow$ concise and correct or no questions asked    |

$$\text{Start from 1 and add/subtract}$$

$$1 + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} - \boxed{1} = \boxed{5}$$

**OPPONENT**

$$1 + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} - \boxed{1} = \boxed{5}$$

**QUESTIONS ASKED**

D too few, mostly irrelevant

1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report

| OPPOSITION (SPEECH)           | REVIEW OF REPORT                   |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| understanding of presentation | relevant topics and prioritisation |
| 0 irrelevant                  | presented                          |
| 1 too few                     | management                         |
| 2 reasonable                  | poor                               |
| 3 most                        | 0                                  |
| 4 well prioritised            | 1                                  |

**REVIEWER**

$$1 + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} - \boxed{1} = \boxed{5}$$

$$\text{Start from 1 and add/subtract}$$

$$1 + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} - \boxed{1} = \boxed{5}$$

**QUESTIONS ASKED**

D too few, mostly irrelevant

1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points

| REVIEW OF REPORT           | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION        |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| evaluation & understanding | pros & cons evaluation      |
| 0 poor/wrong               | irrelevant                  |
| 1 partial                  | too short/long              |
| 2 good                     | mostly correct, prioritised |
| 3 detailed, complex        | condensed & accurate        |

| REVIEWER   | REPORTER   |
|--|--|
| 1 + <b>2</b> + <b>2</b> + <b>2</b> - <b>1</b> = <b>8</b> | 1 + <b>2</b> + <b>2</b> + <b>2</b> - <b>1</b> = <b>5</b> |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**REVIEWER**

$$1 + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} - \boxed{1} = \boxed{8}$$

$$\text{Start from 1 and add/subtract}$$

$$1 + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} - \boxed{1} = \boxed{8}$$

**QUESTIONS ASKED**

D too few, mostly irrelevant

1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points

| REVIEW OF REPORT    | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| understanding       | speech evaluation    |
| 0 poor/wrong        | irrelevant           |
| 1 partial           | partially relevant   |
| 2 good              | informative, apt     |
| 3 detailed, complex | condensed & accurate |

| REVIEWER   | REPORTER   |
|--|--|
| 1 + <b>2</b> + <b>2</b> + <b>2</b> - <b>1</b> = <b>8</b> | 1 + <b>2</b> + <b>2</b> + <b>2</b> - <b>1</b> = <b>5</b> |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

$$1 + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} - \boxed{1} = \boxed{5}$$

**REVIEWER**

$$1 + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} - \boxed{1} = \boxed{5}$$

G44 Galileo Etching

Kawichay

**REPORTER**

$$1 + \boxed{5,5} + \boxed{2,5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{9}$$

Start from 1 and add/subtract

| REPORT  |   | DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT          |  |   |   |                        |                              | ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |   |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| phenomenon  | theory/model  | relevant experiments              | comparison between theory and experiment | own contribution                            | task fulfillment                            | science communication  | relevant arguments/responses | reporter's conduct at the discussion                | REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS                            |
| 0 explanation almost no   | almost no   | almost no                         | almost no                                | almost no                                   | misunderstood                               | unpleasant, chaotic    | 0 too few                    | poor  | 0 concise and correct or no questions asked     |
| 1 some  | some  | some                              | some                                     | review of sources, cited                    | partly                                      | partly clear           | 1 many                       | good  | -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long     |
| 2 Fair  | Fair  | Fair                              | not well fitting                         | some own input                              | average                                     | average                | 2 + data/theory supported    | / efficient   | -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 | 3 proved deep understanding  | overall efficient                                   |   |
| 4 Detailed  | quite detailed, correct                                       | + results explained               | + theory limits                          | considerable experimental solution          | interesting if overall clear, demonstrative |                        |                              |   |   |
| 5 Demonstrative   | demonstrative   | % errors analysed                 | % explained, conclusive or theoretical   | % considerable experimental and theoretical | % greater extent than expected              |                        |                              |   |   |
| 6 Deep and comprehensible, detailed, complex, convincing analysis | + reproducible, well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive |                                   |  |   |   |                        |                              |   |   |
| 7 Shows physical insight  | completely testable   |                                   |  |   |   |                        |                              |   |   |

NOTES:

ST LE Platnick blouse

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{0,75} + \boxed{1,25} + \boxed{0} = \boxed{3}$$

| QUESTIONS ASKED   |   | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER           |                           |                    |                                    |                         |  | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS        |                      |
|---|---|------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|----------------------|
| OPPOSITION (SPEECH)                                       | 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           | reporter's conduct at the discussion            | REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |
| 0 too few, mostly irrelevant                              | irrelevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report | too few                            | poor                      | 0 irrelevant       | too few                            | poor                    | 0 no questions asked                           | 0 concise and correct or no questions asked     |                      |
| 1 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used | + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used     | some                               | reasonable                | 1 too few          | some                               | some aspects fine       | 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long     | -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long     |                      |
| 2 All relevant points                                     | all relevant points   | most                               | fair                      | 2 some             | some correct                       | 1 good                  | 1 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions | -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |                      |
| 3 Practically all points                                  | practically all points                                      | well prioritised                   | efficient                 | 3 most             | many correct                       | some aspects efficient  | 2 improved deep understanding                  | overall efficient                               |                      |
| 4   |   |                                    | + improvement suggestions | 4 well prioritised | all time used                      | improvement suggestions |  |   |                      |

Invaluable, interesting

Learn, understand, remember  
Be 2 → increase 2x by learning 2.

but later

Portions of the Report Reviewer

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \boxed{1,25} + \boxed{1,75} + \boxed{1} = \boxed{5}$$

| QUESTIONS ASKED  |   | REVIEW OF REPORT                   |                               |                                    |                               |                                    |                               | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION               |                               | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS                |                              | MISSING POINTS                                  |   | ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS                       |   |
|--|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| REVIEW OF REPORT   | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION                          | REVIEW OF REPORT                   | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION          | REVIEW OF REPORT                   | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION          | REVIEW OF REPORT                   | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION          | REVIEW OF REPORT                   | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION          | REVIEW OF REPORT                   | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION         | REVIEW OF REPORT                                | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION                            | REVIEW OF REPORT                                | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION                            |
| 0 too few, mostly irrelevant                                       | 0 irrelevant, meant to clarify unclear points | 0 poor/wrong                       | 0 irrelevant                  | 0 poor/wrong                       | 0 irrelevant                  | 0 almost no                        | 0 irrelevant                  | 0 irrelevant                       | 0 irrelevant                  | 0 correct own opinions             | 0 correct own opinions       | -1 irrelevant                                   | 0 no questions asked                            | 0 concise and correct or no questions asked     | 0 no questions asked                            |
| 1 + suitable allotted to Rep & Opp.                                | 1 partially relevant                          | 1 too short/long                   | 1 partially relevant          | 1 too short/long                   | 1 partially relevant          | 1 too short/long                   | 1 partially relevant          | 1 too short/long                   | 1 partially relevant          | 1 relevant parts                   | 1 many                       | -1 irrelevant                                   | -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long     | -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long     | -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long     |
| 2 Most time used   | 2 mostly correct, prioritised                 | 2 informative, apt                 | 2 mostly correct, prioritised | 2 informative, apt                 | 2 mostly correct, prioritised | 2 informative, apt                 | 2 mostly correct, prioritised | 2 informative, apt                 | 2 mostly correct, prioritised | 2 accurate, fully adequate         | 2 fully adequate, accurate   | 1 relevant, constructive                        | 1 relevant, constructive                        | 1 relevant, constructive                        | 1 relevant, constructive                        |
| 3 Short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently | 3 detailed, complex                           | 3 fully adequate, well prioritised | 3 accurate, well prioritised  | 3 fully adequate, well prioritised | 3 accurate, well prioritised  | 3 fully adequate, well prioritised | 3 accurate, well prioritised  | 3 fully adequate, well prioritised | 3 accurate, well prioritised  | 3 fully adequate, well prioritised | 3 accurate, well prioritised | -2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions |

NOTES:

**REPORTER** 1 + 5,5 + 3 - 0 = 9

Start from 1 and add/subtract

*6,5/4*

| REPORT   |   | DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT                        |                                       |   |   | ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS |   |
|----------|---|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| OPPONENT | REVIEWER  | relevant explanation                            | theory/model experiments              | task fulfillment  | science communication                             | relevant arguments/responses                        | reporter's conduct at the discussion          |
| 1        | + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">2</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">3</span> - <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0</span> = <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">9</span> | almost no                                       | almost no                             | misunderstood   | unclear, chaotic                                  | 0 — too few   | 0 — concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 2        | + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">2</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">3</span> - <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0</span> = <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">9</span> | some  | some                                  | partly understood   | partly clear                                      | 1 — some  | 1 — poor                                      |
| 3        | + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">2</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">3</span> - <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0</span> = <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">9</span> | fair  | (fair)                                | average   | average   | 2 — many  | 2 — no questions asked                        |
| 4        | + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">2</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">3</span> - <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0</span> = <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">9</span> | good  | well performed, sufficient number     | some aspects above average                                | some aspects well done                            | 3 — * quite good                                    | 3 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long  |
| 5        | + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">2</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">3</span> - <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0</span> = <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">9</span> | detailed demonstrative                          | quite detailed, correct               | + results explained errors analysed explained, conclusive | considerable experimental or theoretical solution | 4 — * very good                                     | 4 — deeply incorrect or show off              |
| 6        | + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">2</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">3</span> - <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0</span> = <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">9</span> | deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight | detailed complex, convincing analysis | well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive             | considerable experimental and theoretical         | 5 — * excellent                                     | 5 — deep misconceptions                       |

NOTES:

**OPPONENT** Start from 1 and add/subtract  
1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 6

*5,5*

*7,2 + 4,5*

*6,5/4*

**ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS**

| QUESTIONS ASKED  | OPPOSITION (SPEECH) understanding of presentation | REVIEW OF REPORT evaluation & understanding | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION speech evaluation | DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER relevant topics and prioritisation | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS discussion evaluation | MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT  | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS      |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|----------------------------|---|
| 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report | 0 — almost nothing irrelevant                     | 0 — almost nothing irrelevant               | 0 — irrelevant                         | 0 — irrelevant  | 0 — irrelevant                            | 0 — irrelevant             | 0 — concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 1 — + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used                                     | 1 — some main points main points                  | 1 — partial                                 | 1 — too short/long                     | 1 — too few   | 1 — too few                               | 1 — no questions asked     | 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long  |
| 2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently                   | 2 — all relevant points                           | 2 — mostly correct, prioritised             | 2 — informative, apt                   | 2 — some  | 2 — some                                  | 2 — none                   | 2 — deeply incorrect or show off              |
| 3 —  | 3 — practically all points                        | 3 — detailed, complex                       | 3 — fully adequate, well prioritised   | 3 — many relevant parts                                     | 3 — accurate, conclusive                  | 3 — relevant, constructive | 3 — deep misconceptions                       |

NOTES:

*from moderate to fairly hot*

*from moderate to fairly hot*

*7,2 + 4,5*

*6,5/4*

**ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS**

| REVIEWER | REVIEWER  | REVIEW OF REPORT evaluation & understanding                              | REVIEW OF OPPOSITION pros & cons prioritisation | DISCUSSION ANALYSIS discussion evaluation | MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT  | ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS      |
|----------|---|--|---|---|----------------------------|---|
| 1        | + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">2</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">3</span> - <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0</span> = <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">6</span> | 0 — too few, mostly irrelevant relevant, meant to clarify unclear points | 0 — almost nothing irrelevant                   | 0 — almost no irrelevant                  | 0 — irrelevant             | 0 — concise and correct or no questions asked |
| 2        | + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">2</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">3</span> - <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0</span> = <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">6</span> | 1 — + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used                     | 1 — partial                                     | 1 — partially relevant                    | 1 — too short/long         | 1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long  |
| 3        | + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">2</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">3</span> - <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0</span> = <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">6</span> | 2 — + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently   | 2 — mostly correct, prioritised                 | 2 — mostly correct, prioritised           | 2 — accurate, conclusive   | 2 — deeply incorrect or show off              |
| 4        | + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">2</span> + <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">3</span> - <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0</span> = <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">6</span> | 3 —  | 3 — detailed, complex                           | 3 — fully adequate, well prioritised      | 3 — relevant, constructive | 3 — deep misconceptions                       |

NOTES:

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