SCORESHEET
Stage: 1 Fight **1 E**, Problem:
Hungary: Rep **BG/BRG Villach 1:** Opp. **Poland:** Rev.

sign Martin Tazreiter Tazreiter, Martin

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 1 - 1 = 5

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	X no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	X average
3			well performed,	deviations		some aspects	some parts
4	X good	X good	X sufficient number	qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	above average	well done
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	X considerable experimental or theoretical	X interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
	X many	X good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	X few	some	X some	X reasonable
2 X	main points	some	X some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	X some aspects fine	some
2 X	some	X some correct	good	X reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 2 + 1 ± 1 - 1 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	X mostly adequate	reasonable
3 X	detailed, complex	fully adequate	X good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2 X	informative, apt	X mostly adequate	X reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

-1	irrelevant
0	none
1 X	relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET
Stage: 1 Fight 1 E, Problem:
Hungary: Rep BG/BRG Villach 1: Opp Poland: Reviewer

sign _____ Schweitzer, Susanne

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4,5 + 2 - 0 = 7,5 8

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + 2,75 + 2,75 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + 2 + 2 + 0,175 ± 0,5 - 0 = 7,175 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- -1: irrelevant
- 0: none
- 1: relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

Please, suitably adjust your grades taking into account the [-1,1] range.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2,5 + 1 - 0 = 5

SCORESHEET
Stage: 1 Fight **1 E**, Problem: 5

sign Poier

Poier, Peter

Hungary: **BG/BRG Villach 1:** **Poland:**

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4							
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some / many	some aspects fine / good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + ~~1,5~~ + ~~1,5~~ + 1,5 ± 0,5 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

SCORESHEET
Stage: 1 Fight **1 E**, Problem: 5
Hungary: ~~Reporter~~ BG/BRG Villach 1: Opponent Poland: Reviewer

sign Gerhard Dorn — Dorn, Gerhard

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, ~~sufficient number~~	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4							
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained ~~errors analysed~~	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	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

2 NOTES: the abstract reduction of the problem as system of resonators; not well explained: fast dive into some formulas no first simple rough theory (Start simple); exp. good theory bad communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + 2,5 + 3 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + ~~1,8~~ + 1,3 + 1,5 ± 0 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

-1	irrelevant
0	none
1	relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: pointed out well, that there is no comparison between exp. and theory

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 1 - 0.5 = 4

SCORESHEET
Stage: 1 Fight **1 E**, Problem:
Hungary: KOVÁCS BG/BRG Villach 1: WALLA Poland: SUPEŁ

sign

Plesch, Martin

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4							
5	detailed, demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

MISSING END-CORRECTION
VALUE OF α ?

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 2.5 + 2.5 - [ ] = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

- QUNTITATIVE

END CORRECTION, ERRORS?

T-E promnie?

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.75 + 3 + 3 + 0 ± 0 - [ ] = 9

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

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

SCORESHEET
Stage: 2 Fight **1 E**, Problem: 14
BG/BRG Villach 1: JOENSUU **Poland:** MUCHA **Hungary:** KOLATCS

sign

Plesch, Martin

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 - ___ = 4

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no / almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4							
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
1	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

VYSVETLIL L=const

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0,5 + 2,75 + 2 - ___ = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

L ≠ const + , Capstan - ?

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,15 + 2 + 1 + 1,2 ± -0,5 - ___ = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

KVANTITATÍVNA TEÓRIA? Zachovanie L nespomenuj

IYPT – March 2019

SCORESHEET
Stage: 2 Fight **1 E**, Problem: 14
BG/BRG Villach 1: Reporter Poland: Opponent Hungary: Reviewer

sign Gerhard Dorn

Dorn, Gerhard

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3,3 + 1,5 - 0 = 6

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
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

4
3
4
0,5
4,5
3
4,2
23,2

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: video would have been nice; stopping criteria not worked out theoretical stopping point; prediction missing; link is missing

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,2 + 1,7 + 1,2 - 0 = 5

2
0,5
1
1,2
4,7

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

2
1,8
1
1
3
8,8

question reasoning of usage of Capstan equation and not it's use at all in the question of reviewer; opinion on non-const. angul. mom.

use blackboard or graph to point out what angle you mean
→ switched point
→ lack of priorisation
→ thought usage of Cap. is okay

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0,5 + 1,5 + 0,9 + 0,5 ± -0,2 - 0,2 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET
Stage: 2 Fight **1 E**, Problem: 14

sign Poier

Poier, Peter

BG/BRG Villach 1: **Poland:** **Hungary:**

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 1 - 0 = 6

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no X	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some X	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input X	average X	average
3	good X	good	well performed, sufficient number X	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done X
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5							
6							
7	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1 X	some	some aspects fine X
1	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points X	some X	some correct X	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used X

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good X	many correct X	some aspects efficient X	fair X
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + 1,5 + 1,5 + 0,5 ± 0 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1 X	partial	partially relevant X	some X
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long X	partially relevant X	some X
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

- 0 X — concise and correct or no questions asked
- 4x
- -1 — some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
- -2 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

SCORESHEET
Stage: 2 Fight **1 E**, Problem:
BG/BRG Villach 1: Rep **Poland:** Opponent **Hungary:** Rev

sign _____ Schweitzer, Susanne

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4,25 + 1,75 - 0 = 7

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3		6					
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some / many	some aspects fine / good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1,75 + 1,75 + 1 ± 0,25 - 0 = 6,75 (7)

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- -1: irrelevant
- 0: none
- 1: relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract: 1 + 3 + 1 − 0 = 5

SCORESHEET
Stage: 2 Fight **1 E**, Problem:
BG/BRG Villach 1: **Poland:** **Hungary:**

sign Martin Tazreiter — Tazreiter, Martin

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	X no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3							
4 X	good	good	X well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	X + some interesting results	X some aspects above average	some parts well done
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	X overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7 X	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	X detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
1 X	X many	X good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract: 1 + 2 + 3 + 2 − 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	X fair	X efficient
4 X	X practically all points	X practically all	X + improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract: 1 + 2 + 2 + 3 + 1 ± 0 − 0 = 9

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3 X	X detailed, complex	X fully adequate	X good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	X some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3 X	X condensed & accurate	X fully adequate	X good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET
Stage: 3 Fight **1 E**, Problem: LOUD VOICES
Poland: SUPEL Hungary: BALAZS BG/BRG Villach 1: GFF/NER
sign

Plesch, Martin

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
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							
7							

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
1	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: Setup +

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,6 + 1 + 2,5 - [ ] = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES: CONF - HERN

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1,25 + 0,75 + 1 ± [ ] - [ ] = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

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

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES: je też OK (shape)

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

SCORESHEET Stage: 3 Fight **1 E**, Problem: 7 sign Dorn, Gerhard

Poland: Reporter Hungary: Opponent BG/BRG Villach 1: Reviewer

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract: 1 + 3 + 1 − 0 = 5

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4							
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

motivation of theory
where does integration come from
error, analysis, check of assumptions
horn 2
check point source
change of shape
resonator idea
focusing point (distance mic ↔ speaker)

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract: 1 + 1 + 0,9 + 1,9 − 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

2 / 1,8 / 0 / 1 / 1 ⇒ missed own opinion ⇒ not pointed out

3 / 1,5 / 1,5 / 7,0 form, resonator

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract: 1 + 1,5 + 2,1 + 1 + 0,75 ± 0,5 − 0 = 7 (6,85)

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

-1 irrelevant
0 none
1 relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + ~~2,5~~ + 1 - 0 = 5

SCORESHEET
Stage: 3 Fight **1 E**, Problem: 7

sign Poier, Peter

Poland: **Hungary:** **BG/BRG Villach 1:**

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair X	fair X	fair	not well fitting	some own input X	average X	average X
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number X	deviations qualitatively analysed X	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4							
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some ~	some aspects fine ✓
	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + ~~0,5~~ + ~~1,5~~ + ~~1,5~~ - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points X	few X	some X	some ~	reasonable ~
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few ~ some X	some ~	some aspects fine ✓	some
2		some correct	good	reasonable ✓
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong X	irrelevant ~	no ~
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong X	irrelevant X	no ~
1	too short/long X	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

-1 — irrelevant
0 — ~~X~~ none
1 — X relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET
Stage: 3 Fight **1 E**, Problem:
Poland: Reporter Hungary: Opponent BG/BRG Villach 1: Reviewer

sign _____ Schweitzer, Susanne

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract: 1 + 3 + 1,5 - 0 = 5,5 (5)

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4							
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some / many	some aspects fine / good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract: 1 + 1 + 2 + 1,75 - 0 = 5,75 (6)

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract: 1 + 1 + 2 + 1,75 + 0,75 ± 0,5 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- -1: irrelevant
- 0: none
- 1: relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 1 - 0 = 6

SCORESHEET
Stage: 3 Fight **1 E**, Problem:

sign Martin Tazreiter Tazreiter, Martin

Poland: Rep. **Hungary:** Opp. **BG/BRG Villach 1:** Rev.

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	X well performed, sufficient number	X deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4							
5	detailed demonstrative	X quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	X considerable experimental or theoretical	X interesting solution	X overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	8 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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	X some	X some aspects fine
1	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

NOTES:

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	X no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	X main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	X few	X some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

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

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 ± 0 - 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED

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

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	X partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

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

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

- -1 irrelevant
- 0 none
- X
- 1 relevant, constructive

ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS

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

NOTES:

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