

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 1 - 0.5 = 5



SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 1 B, Problem:

Gymnasium Freistadt: ^{Rep} Paveppad Iran: Moloseni (Opp) Russia: Jalvach (Rev)

sign *[Signature]*

Widmann, Eberhard

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

NOTES: Problem explanation rather short, theory quantities not well introduced, good experiments

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	0 almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0 almost no	too few	poor	no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions 3
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 some	some correct	good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
	3 all relevant points	many	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many correct	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> efficient	3 good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
	4 practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	very good	

blackboard extensively used

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1.5 + 0.5 + 0 - 0 = 5.5

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

NOTES: good analysis of review, overall rather short

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 4



SCORESHEET
 Stage: 1 Fight 1 B, Problem: *REP*
 Gymnasium Freistadt: *Persepolis* Iran: *Mohsen: Opp*

sign *Mohsen*

Mathelitsch, Leopold

Russia: *7 door* *Mohsen*

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 at the discussion	
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	too few	poor	0
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine	1
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	many	good	2
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	3
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	4
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated			
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight									
7										

NOTES: *No free speech in presentation ; no comparison theory - exp.*

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	almost no	too few	poor	no	0
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	few	some	some aspects fine	some	1
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	some	some correct	good	reasonable	2
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	3
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	4

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 0 + 2 + 1 + 0 - 0 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT			REVIEW OF OPPOSITION			DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	almost no	too few	irrelevant	0
1	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	too short/long	some	none	1
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many	relevant, constructive	2
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		3

NOTES: *No free speech at the presentation Diol not use his time*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 = 4



SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 1 B, Problem: 14

Gymnasium Freistadt: Papp (R)

sign

Kundracik

Kundracik, Frantisek

Yohseni (Opp)

Russia: Jalvach (Rev)

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

NOTES: + detailed explanation of the friction force, optimizing the angle.
- no qualitative theory, no relation to the experiments

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 6.5

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0 + 2.5 + 0.5 + 0.5 - 0 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES: - very weak in review of opposition and discussion

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 5



SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 1 B, Problem: 14

Gymnasium Freistadt: *Perappadan*

Iran: *Mohseni*

Russia: *REV Jalvach*

sign *[Signature]*

Werbach, Katharina

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

NOTES: Explain own phenomenon better

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

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

good presentation of own opinion

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0 + 2 + 1.0 + 1.0 + 0 - 0 = 4

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5



SCORESHEET

Stage: 1 Fight 1 B, Problem: 14 (Rep)

Gymnasium Freistadt: Mna P. Iran: Kala S. (Opp)

sign *Pamathi*

Hömöstre, Mihály

Russia: Jahodi. (Rev)

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

NOTES: What if was ratio 1:100? What would be the time?

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED		OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
		understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant		0 --- almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0 --- almost no	too few	poor	no	0 --- <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked --- --- -1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long --- -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> --- relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report		1 --- some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 --- few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used		2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> --- main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 --- some	some correct	good	reasonable	
		3 --- all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> --- good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
		4 --- practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 --- new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0 + 1 + 1 + 0.5 + 0 - 0 = 4

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7



SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 1 B, Problem: 4

Iran: Rep

Russia: Opp

sign

[Signature]

Widmann, Eberhard

Gymnasium Freistadt:

Reviewer

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

NOTES: good presentation, interactive graphics

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 1 = 3

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

NOTES: questions only; show slides, good summary, few prof/cons; new points raised: violation, oscillation level

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 0 + 0 ± 0 - 0 = 3

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

NOTES: few questions, short

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 - 0 = 4



SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 1 B, Problem:

Iran: *Mof*

Russia: *Touhigu*

Gymnasium Freistadt:

sign

Mathelitsch

Mathelitsch, Leopold

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 at the discussion			
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0	too few	poor	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1	some	some aspects fine	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2	many	good	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	3	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	4	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	4	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated					

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 + 2 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
		relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation		
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	0	too few	poor	no	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1	some	some aspects fine	some	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2	good	some aspects efficient	fair	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3		3	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	3	
4		4				4	

NOTES:

Too much long review, too short prior/cons;

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0 + 1 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 4

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

NOTES:

did not use his time

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + ~~4~~ - 0 = 7



SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 1 B, Problem:

Iran:

Russia:

sign *Jani*

Hömöstreit, Mihály

Gymnasium Freistadt:

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

NOTES: ? calculated, but then ~~did not get used~~ was not... +: effect of bouncing after questions → also pick up.

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0 + 1 + 1.5 - 0 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	too few	poor	no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some main points	few <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some aspects fine <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some	some correct	good	reasonable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 0 + 0.5 + 0 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES: No review of opposition, no missed points, but what they did was actually quite good.

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 6



SCORESHEET
Stage: 2 Fight 1 B, Problem:
Iran: Russia: Gymnasium Freistadt:

sign *Uradic*

Kundracik, Frantisek

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 at the discussion			
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0	too few	poor	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1	some	some aspects fine	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2	many	good	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	3	
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative					
5	demonstrative	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated					
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight											
7												

NOTES: + nice experiments, separated influence of R, m
- no connection between theory at the beginning to the experimental results

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 6

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

NOTES: + good point in the discussion

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1 + 0 ± 0 - 1 = 3

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

NOTES: no time to read papers - no analysis

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4,5 + 2,5 - 0,5 = 8



SCORESHEET

Stage: 2 Fight 1 B, Problem: 4

sign _____

Werbach, Katharina

Iran:

Russia:

Gymnasium Freistadt:

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

NOTES:

talk slower; Formulas on slides are not viewer friendly → diagram is better
 # limiting factors; approximations explained; variable your experiment was

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0,5 + 1 + 0 + 0,5 + 1 - 0 = 4

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

NOTES:

missing

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 1.5 - 0 = 7



SCORESHEET

Stage: 3 Fight 1 B, Problem: 5

Russia: Rep

sign

[Handwritten signature]

Widmann, Eberhard

Gymnasium Freistadt: Opp

Iran: Rev

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

NOTES: good comparison theory - experiment

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 5

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

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
		report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	0 poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	0 almost no	too few	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions -1 -2	
1 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used		1 partial	partially relevant	some	1 too short/long	partially relevant	some	1 too short/long	some		
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently		2 good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 relevant parts	many		
		3 detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	3 accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES: good questions

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 1 - 0 = 7



SCORESHEET

Stage: 3 Fight 1 B, Problem:

Russia: *Yelved*

sign */ M. T. ...*

Mathelitsch, Leopold

Gymnasium Freistadt: *Kafentoch* Iran: *Neonlicht*

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

NOTES: *too short presentation ;*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 2 + 0 = 6

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

NOTES: *+ tried hard to keep up the discussion*

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 + 7 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 6

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5



SCORESHEET

Stage: 3 Fight 1 B, Problem:

Russia:

sign

Uradze

Kundracik, Frantisek

Gymnasium Freistadt:

Iran:

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

NOTES: - not used time in presentation, many things remained unclear

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 0 = 7

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

NOTES:

+ very detailed + own opinion presented

- too best!

- too short

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.75 + 1 - 0 = 4$$



SCORESHEET
 Stage: 3 Fight 1 B, Problem: 5
 Russia:

sign *Primošten*

Hömöstreij, Mihály

Gymnasium Freistadt: Iran:

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

NOTES: *Please louder!*

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.5 + 1 + 2.5 - 0 = 5$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)					DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER				ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	0 --- almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0 --- almost no	too few	poor	no	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 --- few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
	3 --- all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 --- new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	
	4 --- practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used					

NOTES: *Too quiet! (In voice) could have concatted more to the report.*

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1.75 + 0.5 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 5$$

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

NOTES: *to few min off of opp. & disc. analysis..*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 1 - 0 = 5



SCORESHEET

Stage: 3 Fight 1 B, Problem: 5

Russia:

Gymnasium Freistadt:

Iran:

sign *W. Weber*

Werbach, Katharina

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

NOTES: *Your angle was not vertical! Many experiments, but please work more carefully & take time to explain the meaning of the results!*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 4

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

NOTES:

no Q&A

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES: *don't spend too much time on one point*