

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

What? Glenc 3.3 (17)

1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5			and errors analysis		and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable		well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive					
7									

NOTES:

Roll \approx ρ_{sand} \leftrightarrow what about Roll? , height of the beach losing energy to rolling sand? $\mu = \frac{v}{d} \leftarrow$ ball - why? $\mu = \frac{v^2}{gd}$ $\frac{a}{4g^2 d^2}$ $\frac{v^4}{4g^2 d^2}$ $\frac{v^4}{4g^2 d^2}$

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1 + 1.5 - 0 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions
0	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	own opinions presented	time management
1	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used	too few	poor
2		some	reasonable
3		some correct	fair
4		many correct	efficient
5		+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used
0		topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
1		almost none	too few
2		too few/many	some
3		partially relevant	some correct
4		mostly relevant	many correct
5		+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions
0		opponent's conduct in the discussion	
1		poor/aggressive	
2		some aspects fine	
3		good	
4		some aspects efficient	
5		overall efficient	
0			concise and correct or no questions asked
1			some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2			deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions

NOTES:

point on graph with red/blue

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
2	good	good	relevant parts	many	
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	
0	pros & cons prioritisation	pros & cons prioritisation	correct own opinions		
0	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant		
1	partially relevant/correct	partially relevant/correct	some		
2	mostly correct/prioritised	mostly correct/prioritised	many		
3	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate		
0				irrelevant	
1				none	
2				relevant, constructive	
3					
0					concise and correct or no questions asked
1					some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2					deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions

NOTES:

pushed sand after flattening

disc. ans. 23 slide

Slide 2 diam.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 6

5

Source 3.2

-0.5

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	OR multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	OR considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6									

NOTES:

freq. peak → for more more narrower for higher or → why? relevance of the fields, falling in the middle properties in the mesh, explanation of circles; const &

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions

NOTES:

✓ ✓ ✓ ✓

steps vs. line ✓ ✓ freqs. in a graph.

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	none	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	relevant parts	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
2	good	good	accurate, convincing	relevant, constructive	
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised		

NOTES:

meas. vel. + calc. → most good, it gets narrower

Glenc 3.1

(15)

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 - 1 = 3 *Poslona*

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	0
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	1
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	2
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	3
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	4

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2 - 0.5 = 6 *1.5G*

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
0	too few, mostly r-relevant	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	almost nothing	too few	poor/aggressive	0
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used	some main points	some	some aspects fine	1
		main points	some correct	good	2
		all relevant points	many correct	some aspects efficient	3
		practically all points	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	4

NOTES:

what is amount ??? (slide 9)

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + ~~1.5~~ + 2 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 1 - 0 = 4 *Ba Mix*

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	
1	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	0
2	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	1
3	good	good	relevant parts	many	2
4	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	3
	pros & cons prioritisation	pros & cons prioritisation			4
	irrelevant	irrelevant			
	partially relevant/correct	partially relevant/correct			
	mostly correct/prioritised	mostly correct/prioritised			
	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate, well prioritised			

NOTES:

centrif. force

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

Grade 4.3 (2)

1 + 5.5 + 2 - 0 = 7 ~7

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution?	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES:

$\alpha \propto (\alpha)^2$

metal on sphere, what material, how are errors calculated

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2.5 - 2 - 0 = 7 ~7

different angles of mag. field, non hom

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions

NOTES:

$V \propto V$, hom. mag. field (how), measured w. braced???

exper. setup +0.5

34 → not a drastic change! 0.5

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 - 1.75 + 1.25 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	none	some incorrect.
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	relevant parts	inconclusive or too long
2	good	good	good	accurate, convincing	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	apt & accurate	fully adequate	

NOTES:

spheres explained, non hom.

Thurs 4.2 (15)

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 3$$

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
7										

NOTES: Liquid-cordation, solid-antirotation; Coriolis phase transition, 24. opacine

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS					
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	
1	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

opp. -> Coriolis doesn't exist, does centrif. exist? (only in rot. fr. of ref.)

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 0.5 - 0 = 9$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS		
0	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0 irrelevant 1 none 2 relevant, constructive
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	
1	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	
2	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant parts	many	
3	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	

NOTES:

Source 4.1

(12)

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6									
7									

NOTES: Force chain (+), 21 graphs (22, 23, 24), both level x, locking phase trans. x, graphs x. humility grain param., ball dens. force spread from spoon to the walls (bottleneck?)

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 + 0.5 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions
0	time management	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion
0	poor	too few	poor/aggressive
1	reasonable	some	some aspects fine
2	fair	some correct	good
3	efficient	many correct	some aspects efficient
4	all time used	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient

rice to water to measure the volume ???
 p. (22) → pearls → bottlenecks
 pearls +

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 1.5 + 1.5 + 0 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	irrelevant
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	none
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	relevant, constructive
2	good	good	relevant parts	many	
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	
0	pros & cons prioritisation	pros & cons prioritisation	correct own opinions	relevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	partially relevant/correct	partially relevant/correct	some	some	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
2	mostly correct/prioritised	mostly correct/prioritised	many	many	
3	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate	fully adequate	

poor-granular

NOTES:

REPORTER ^{SP} Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0 + 25 - 1 = 25$$

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost r.c.	almost no	almost no	almost no ?	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some ?	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES:

↓
time dependence on angle
comparison theory vs. data

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 15 + 15 - 30 - \square = 15$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	none	some incorrect.
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	relevant parts	inconclusive or too long
2	good	good	relevant parts	relevant, constructive	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	apt & accurate	fully adequate	

NOTES:

how the ball was made

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 4$$

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	1	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	2	
5											
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	3	
7											

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - \square = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)				DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER			ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion		
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	almost nothing	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used	main points	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
		all relevant points	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	3	
		practically all points	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	4	

NOTES:

- experimental data
- other shapes?

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT		REVIEW OF OPPOSITION		DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions			
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	irrelevant	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	none	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant parts	many	relevant, constructive	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate			

NOTES:

Katarina Kovicka 4. FYZIK, 7. kola
12-Rice Bettelbelle

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 6 Anna Oledkova

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant argumer ts/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrat ve	quite detailed, correct	OR multitude of parametres examined	+ limits discussed	OR considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6									
7									

NOTES: depth of immersion vs. fullness vs height of rice

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 7 Karol Marinica

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
1	main points	partially relevant	fair
2	all relevant points	mostly relevant	efficient
2	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions
3			
4			

NOTES: material -> relevant pointed out the graph

changed more parameters at once! surface area =

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 0 - 0 = 8 Martin Micalch

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
1	good	good	relevant parts	many	
2	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	
2					
3					
4					

NOTES: prioritizacia

Tomas LOČIVANŠKÝ

4. Fight / 3 stage

Problem 2

Lojza Lea Laurikova

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 5 + 2 - 0 = 8$$

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
6										

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

Matej Žigo

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS					
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	
1	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

Karol Marinica

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	
1	superficial	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	
2	good	good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant parts	many	
2	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	

NOTES:

Tomáš Ložnjanský

4. Fyzička (2-stage)

Problem 15

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 0 - 0 = 3

Tadeáš Pastorek

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	OR multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	OR considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 1 = 6

Martin Marcinčák

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

Marián Koval

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	conclude and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
2	good	good	relevant parts	many	
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	

NOTES:

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 4.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 7

Anna Olearova

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear		
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6									
7	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long							
	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions							

NOTES:

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

Kard Murinica

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive		
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	3	
	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	4	
	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient		

NOTES:

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + 2 + 1 + 1 ± 1 - 0 = 8

Martin Mičuda

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant		
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	2	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	many	3	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate	4	

NOTES:

MARIAH KIRBY

(?)

Cross Prod

CHRISTOPHER LAURICOLA

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0 + 2 - 1 = 2

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6									
7									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 1 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions
0	time management	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion
0	poor	too few	poor/aggressive
1	reasonable	some	some aspects fine
2	fair	some correct	good
3	efficient	many correct	some aspects efficient
4	+ all time used	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 10 + 15 + 15 + 15 - 10 - 10 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	irrelevant
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	none
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	relevant, constructive
2	good	good	relevant parts	many	
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	
0	pros & cons prioritisation	pros & cons prioritisation	correct own opinions		
0	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant		
1	partially relevant/correct	partially relevant/correct	some		
2	mostly correct/prioritised	mostly correct/prioritised	many		
3	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate		

NOTES:

12

F4/1

MARIJA KIBES

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 5 + 15 - =

7 DaMIX

ANA OLEJAROVA

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions -1 -2
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or	multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or	considerable experimental	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed complex, completely testable	and	errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and	considerable theoretical	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
6										

NOTES:

OPPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 15 + 25 + 15 - =

6

KAROL MARJICA

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS					
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions -1 -2
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	
2 short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	
	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	
	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES:

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 20 + 25 + 15 + 15 - - =

8

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

NOTES:

MARWAN KAREJ

F4/2
TADDEA T PASTORAK

15

REPORTER
1 + 1 + 1 - = 3

3 Poso

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some fair	some fair	some fair	some qualitative agreement	review of sources, cited some own input	partly average	partly clear average	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	some	partly fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or ↕ and	multitude of parameters examined errors analysis	+ limits discussed well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	or ↕ and	considerable experimental considerable theoretical	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or ↕ and	multitude of parameters examined errors analysis	+ limits discussed well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	or ↕ and	considerable experimental considerable theoretical	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	3	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	or ↕ and	multitude of parameters examined errors analysis	+ limits discussed well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	or ↕ and	considerable experimental considerable theoretical	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	3	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
7	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	or ↕ and	multitude of parameters examined errors analysis	+ limits discussed well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	or ↕ and	considerable experimental considerable theoretical	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	3	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT
1 + 1.5 + 3.0 + 1.5 - = 6

6 Cos Prod

MARWAN KAREJ

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER
1 + 1 + 1.5 + + ± - = 7

KOVAC

10

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	-1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	0	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	many	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions

NOTES:

PUESCH 4/7

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.75 + 0.5 - \square = 2$$

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	2	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	OR multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	OR considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	-1	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	-2	

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 3.7 + 2 - \square = 8$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	2	
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	-1	
5	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

$$1 + 1.5 + 2 + 0.75 + 1 - 1 = 5$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS				
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0	irrelevant	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	1	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	0	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant parts	many	0	1	
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	1	1	

NOTES:

PUESCH

4/1

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + ~~3~~ + 1.5 - = = 7

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions 3
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	OR multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	OR considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
7										

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - = = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS					
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions 3
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1.5 + 1 - - = = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions 3
1	pros & cons prioritisation	pros & cons prioritisation	correct own opinions	correct own opinions	
2	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	
3	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	
4	good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant parts	many	
5	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate	
7			tully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 5 - 5 = 9

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic		
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or ↕ and ↕ and	multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or ↕ and ↕ and	considerable experimental	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and	errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and	considerable theoretical	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6									
7									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 7 + 2 + 36 - 5 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	3	
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	4	
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient		

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 0.2 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	relevant parts	many	3	
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate	4	

NOTES:

GJK: Horzjan

Cross product: Capta <

Dev: Aetke S. (GJAB)

[9. screen
FBSA
Feilic'ora -

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract ²⁻³

$$1 + 0.75 + 0.75 - \square = \square$$

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract ^{1, 27.5}

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions

NOTES: (too few g-)

+ lack of prediction
- didn't point out oscillation
- error analysis

⊕ do we see oscillation
⊖ came in too late
⊕ generic introduction script of screen 4

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract ^{1-1.5, 5}

$$1 + 1 + 1.25 + 1 + 0.75 - \square = \square$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
2	good	good	relevant parts	many	
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	

NOTES:

→ missing error analysis
⊖ very greedy to compare theory with concrete
⊕ task not fulfilled
↳ mostly irrelevant / not far ahead affects

Rep (Cross product): Marciniak

Opp: GJARS = (Cotanica)

Rev: Paleac (GTH)

F3 #2 Perfectiva

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2.5 + 0.75 - 0.5 = 4$$

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	1	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	2	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	3	

NOTES: too much theory -> apply - w exp - in 10 min!
 magnetic ind. no parameter condition - was but

Doesn't have tracked videos!
 200th est. 3 mark source

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1.5 + 2 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	1	
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	2	
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	3	

Opp's ideas
 sampling ansy

1. slide 30
 2. mag. measurement
 3. don't have videos that were tracked
 4. rolling resistance - 0
 5. tilted plate
 6. change of frequency
 7. force of the body

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 1.5 - 0.8 + 0.5 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	0	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	relevant parts	many	1	
4	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	2	

NOTES: what data went into eq. - magnetisation
 opp: - angle of the camera
 these measurements sufficient & repeatable
 who can op. only 2 prints on slides

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

Rep (GJA): Aneta Stetanova

Opp (GJA)

Rev: (cross p.)

F.S.S
B-Pony's heartbeat
Pasticova

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

9

1 + 2 + 0.8 - [] = 4

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant argumts/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions 3
1	some	some X	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement X	some own input	average >	average X	some	partly fine	
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement +	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	
4	detailed demonstrative X	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
6										

NOTES: a plot may be loaded

- defended herself but a bit chaotic

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

5-6

1 + 1.2 + 1.5 - 2 - [] = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS					
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions 3
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	
3	main points X	partially relevant X	some correct	fair X	partially relevant	some correct	good	
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES: pressure changes
caution
amplitude plot

- too high - they had conclusions, just qualitative
- there was some variability in parameters
- fluids -> water in the tank

noticed wrong scale - but it's not
output from fluorometer
while parsons were visible - not systematically
- how it was forced?
- was there better choice?
- insufficient param
- not systematic
- discrepancy with paper

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 0.2 - 0.8 + 0.8 ± [] - [] = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions 3
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	
3	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	many	
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate	

NOTES: what's the theory
- diff. in pos of bubbles
- how to determine

- not prioritised, irrelevant

TO USE
- Taylor bubble

Marián Hajzok

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 4

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
6										

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7

Lujza-Lia Lauriková

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS					
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	
1	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

Aneta Štefaničková

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS		
0	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	
1	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	
2	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant parts	many	
3	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	

NOTES:

Tomáš Lučivjanský

3. Fyzik (2. kola)

Problem 8

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 1 - 0 = 5

Martin MARCINČÁK

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
								relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic			
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear			
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average			
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	0	too few	poor/aggressive
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or ↑ multitude of parameters examined ↓ and errors analysis	+ limits discussed	or ↑ considerable experimental ↓ and considerable theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	1	many	good
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable						well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	+ complex concepts well communicated	2
6			proved deep understanding	overall efficient	-2		deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions			
7										

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6

Karol Matrnica

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)				DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER			ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion		
0	too few, mostly irrelevant				almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report				too few/many	some	some aspects fine	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used				main points	some correct	good	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
					all relevant points	many correct	some aspects efficient	3	
					practically all points	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	4	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 5

FILIP Pavlac

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

NOTES:

Tomáš LUČIUVANSKÝ

3. Fyzikoj (3. koloto)

Aneta Štefančíková

Problem 13

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 0 - 1 = 3

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5			and errors analysis		and considerable theoretical				
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable		well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive		greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
7									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 - 2 - 0 = 6

Jakub Nemček

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS					
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

Lujza-Lea Lavriková

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS			
0	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	none	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	relevant, constructive	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant parts	many		
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate		

NOTES:

Stage: 3, English 3
T. Rohl

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3.9 + 1 - 1 = 4$$

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6									
7									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 1 - 0.5 = 5$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS					
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	questions asked
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 1.5 + 1 - 0.5 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS		
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	none	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	superficial	some	relevant, constructive	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	relevant parts	many		
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate		

NOTES:

Fig 3: Stage 2

T. Rod

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.4 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 5.9 (5)

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6									
7									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1.2 - 0 = 5.2 (5)

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
1	main points	partially relevant	some correct
2	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
3	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions
4			

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.2 + 1 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 5.7 (5)

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
1	good	good	relevant parts	many	
2	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	

NOTES:

Fig 3: Stage 1
T. Kohl

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 - 1 = 3

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions 3
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
6										
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7		

NOTES: *fiction? initial conditions?*

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.2 + 3 + 1.2 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS					
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions 3
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	
	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	
	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES: *Q: 111*

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1 ± 0 = 6

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

NOTES: *length effects frequency*

area in direction of pros

head →

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 5 - [] = 4

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	3
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	5
6										
7										7

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 5 - [] = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)				DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER			ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	3
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	5
6								
7								7

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 + 1 + 1 - [] - [] = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT		REVIEW OF OPPOSITION		DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	irrelevant	
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	none	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	relevant, constructive	
3	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant parts	many		3
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate		
5								5
6								
7								7

NOTES:

3/2 PLR SC4

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 1 - 2 = 4

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	1	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	OR multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	OR considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	2	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	2	

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.8 + 2 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
1	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	1	
2	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	2	
4	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

1 + 1.5 + 1 + 0.8 + 0.2 ± 0 - 0 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
1	good	good	relevant parts	many	1	
2	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	2	

NOTES:

3/1

PLUESCK

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 5 - 4 = 3

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some fair	some fair	some fair	some	review of sources, cited	partly average	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	good	good	good	qualitative agreement	some own input	some aspects above average	average	some	partly fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	OR multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	OR considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 15 + 6 - 7 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	3	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	4	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1 + 1.5 + 0.5 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	relevant parts	many	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
4	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	3	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
5	pros & cons prioritisation	pros & cons prioritisation	correct own opinions	irrelevant	4	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
6	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant	none	5	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
7	partially relevant/correct	partially relevant/correct	some	relevant, constructive	6	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
8	mostly correct/prioritised	mostly correct/prioritised	many	relevant, constructive	7	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
9	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate	relevant, constructive	8	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 1.5 - \square = 5$$

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement +	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement +	some interesting results	some aspects above average +	some aspects well done	many	good	3	
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient		
5	demonstrative		and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient		
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable									
7											

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 3 - 2.5 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	3	
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	4	
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient		

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS				
0	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	irrelevant	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	irrelevant	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	none	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant parts	many	relevant, constructive	3	
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate		4	

NOTES:

FIGHT 3

STAGE 2

MARTONAK

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4.5 + 2.5 - 1 = 7$$

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6									
7									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - \square = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions
0	time management	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion
0	poor	too few	poor/aggressive
1	reasonable	some	some aspects fine
2	fair	some correct	good
3	efficient	many correct	some aspects efficient
4	+ all time used	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 1 + 1 \pm \square - \square = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	none	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	relevant parts	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
2	good	good	accurate, convincing	relevant, constructive	
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised		
0	pros & cons prioritisation	pros & cons prioritisation	correct own opinions		
0	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant		
1	partially relevant/correct	partially relevant/correct	some		
2	mostly correct/prioritised	mostly correct/prioritised	many		
3	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 0.5 - 0 = 4$$

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	irrelevant
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	none
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	relevant, constructive
2	good	good	good	many	
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	apt & accurate	fully adequate	

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 4

Aneta

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	3	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient		
5			and errors analysis		and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient		
6	deep and comprehensible shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable		well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive							
7											

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS			
0	too few, mostly irrelevant: relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used	almost nothing	too few	poor/aggressive	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2		some main points	some	some aspects fine	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
		main points	partially relevant	good	3	
		all relevant points	mostly relevant	some aspects efficient	4	
		practically all points	+ well prioritised	overall efficient		
			+ improvement suggestions			
			all time used			

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	pros & cons prioritisation	pros & cons prioritisation	correct own opinions	irrelevant	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	superficial	superficial	superficial	some		
4	good	good	relevant parts	many		
5	mostly correct/prioritised	mostly correct/prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate		
6	apt, accurate	apt & accurate				
7	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate, well prioritised				

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 1 - 1 = 4

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS		
0	almost no	a most no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	3	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined and errors analysis	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental and considerable theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient		
5	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable		well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive		greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated				

Martin

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	poor/aggressive	poor/aggressive	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	some	some aspects fine	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
		main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	some correct	good	3	
		all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	many correct	some aspects efficient	4	
		practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient		

Khalid

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1 + 0.5 - 0 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS				
0	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	irrelevant	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	irrelevant	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	none	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant parts	many	relevant, constructive		
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate			

Filip

NOTES:

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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 3$$

Marian

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
							relevant arguments/responses			reporter's conduct in the discussion
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	too few	poor/aggressive	
1	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	review of sources, cited <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	partly <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	partly clear	some	partly fine	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2	fair	fair	fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	many <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	-1
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	-2
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated			

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 2.5 - \square = 7$$

Lujza Lea

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)				DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER			ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	almost nothing	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used	main points	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	-1
		all relevant points	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
		practically all points	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	-2

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

Aneta

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT		REVIEW OF OPPOSITION		DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	-1	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
2	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant parts	many	1	-1
3	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	1	-2

NOTES:

0800
102/103

① Fractal Fringers

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 - = 7

~~GRIP~~ CROSS

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6									
7									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 - = 6

GJH

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions
		time management	all time used
		own opinions presented	many correct
		opponent's conduct in the discussion	overall efficient
		topics raised and their prioritisation	some aspects fine
		own opinions presented	good
		opponent's conduct in the discussion	some aspects efficient
		topics raised and their prioritisation	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
		own opinions presented	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
		opponent's conduct in the discussion	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1 + 0.5 + 1 ± 0 - = 4

Postora

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	none	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	relevant, constructive	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
2	good	good	relevant parts accurate, convincing		
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised		
	pros & cons prioritisation	pros & cons prioritisation	correct own opinions		
	irrelevant	irrelevant	relevant		
	partially relevant/correct	partially relevant/correct	some		
	mostly correct/prioritised	mostly correct/prioritised	many		
	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate		

NOTES:

Magnetic-Mechanical Oscillator

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \square + \square - \square = \square$$

15G

7

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	far	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrat ve	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parametres examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \square - \square + \square - \square = \square$$

Konice

5

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few
2	some main points	too few/many	some
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \square + \square + \square + \square \pm \square - \square = \square$$

GJH

7

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	none	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	superficial	superficial	relevant, constructive	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	relevant parts		
4	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing		

NOTES:

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

Konice Portava

4 COLORED LINE

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \square + \square - \square = \square$$

6

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or ↑ multitude of parameters examined ↓ and errors analysis	+ limits discussed	or ↑ considerable experimental ↓ and considerable theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensive, shows phys cal insight	detailed complex, completely testable		well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive		greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \square + \square + \square - \square = \square$$

7

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS					
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \square + \square + \square + \square \pm \square - \square = \square$$

7

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS		
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	superficial	some	none	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant, constructive	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	relevant parts	many		
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate		

NOTES:

EULER'S PENDULUM

GJH



REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + + - =

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or ↕ multiplicity of parameters examined and errors analysis	+ limits discussed	or ↕ considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable		well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and ↕ considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + + + - =

156



$$\ddot{x} = -kx$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	POSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few
2	some main points	too few/many	some
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + - + + ± - =

Konice

7

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	irrelevant
1	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	none
2	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	relevant, constructive
3	good	good	relevant parts	many	
4	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	

NOTES: