

conical piles.

Kerry Parker

**SCORESHEET**

stage: 4  
reporter: Iran

fight (round no.): 1  
opponent: Chile

room: A  
reviewer: Belarins

problem no.: 7

Juror's name: Kerry Parker  
signature: Kerry Parker

**REPORTER**  
Start from 1 and add/subtract  
1 + 1.2 + 0.8 - 0.8 = 3

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	almost no	too few	poor
1	only technical	some	some aspects fine
2	some scientific	many	good
3	interesting points discussed	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
4	brought in new physics	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:  
how was it measured? still had loads of time. No force dig. normal is wrong.

**OPPONENT**  
Start from 1 and add/subtract  
1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 2 - 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)
0	understanding of presentation
1	relevant topics addressed
2	own opinions presented
3	prioritisation
4	time management

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no
1	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some
2	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ 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:  
very difficult with a weak presentation.

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT
0	report summary & understanding
1	pros & cons
2	discussion analysis
3	own opinions
4	prioritisation

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation
0	poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable
3	condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good

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: 4 fight (round no.): 1  
 reporter: CHILE opponent: RAN

room: A problem no.: 7  
 reviewer: BOLIVUS

Juror's name: KUNDRACK  
 signature: (Handwritten Signature)

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 $1 + 1.5 + 0.5 - 0 = 3$

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	scientific contribution	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion	
0 almost no	almost no	too few	no/almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 almost no	too few	poor	
1 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	1 only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 some scientific points cleared	many	good	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 interesting points discussed	+ 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	some aspects above average	4 brought in new physics	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				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract  
 $1 + 2 + 2.5 + 5 - 0 = 8$

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

NOTES:

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

QUESTIONS ASKED		REVIEW OF REPORT					REVIEW OF OPPOSITION					ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	some relevant, sufficient number, contributed to clarify some unclear points	report summary & understanding	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	speech summary	pros & cons	discussion analysis	own opinions	prioritisation	
0		0 poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	0 poor	irrelevant	almost no	too few	no	
1		1 partial	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	1 too short/long	partially relevant	too short/long	some	some	
2	many unclear points resolved; most time used, suitably allotted to Rep & Opp	2 good	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	2 informative, apt	mostly adequate	relevant parts	many	reasonable	
3	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 detailed, complex	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	3 condensed and accurate	fully adequate	accurate, conclusive	+ improvement suggestions	good	

NOTES: