

SCORESHEET

stage: 1 fight (round no.): 2 room: A problem no.: 6 Juror's name: Po:er
 reporter: Iran opponent: Polard reviewer: Serling signature: Wae

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + 1.5 - 1 = 4

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 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	too few	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	review of sources, cited	partly <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> only technical points cleared	some <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some aspects fine <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some scientific points cleared	many	good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	3 <input type="checkbox"/> interesting points discussed	+ 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	some aspects above average	4 <input type="checkbox"/> brought in new physics	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				

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 - 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	scientific contribution	relevance of topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation				
0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost no, irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	very little	no	poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	almost no	irrelevant	very little	poor	no	0 <input type="checkbox"/>	concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="checkbox"/>	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	little	some	some	some aspects fine	some	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="checkbox"/>	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	main points <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	partial	average	some correct	good	reasonable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 <input type="checkbox"/>		3 <input type="checkbox"/>	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	most	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
4 <input type="checkbox"/>		4 <input type="checkbox"/>	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	new crucial point(s)	all relevant discussed	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good		

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 2 - 0 = 6

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

NOTES:

SCORESHEET

stage: 1
reporter: Iran

fight (round no.): 2
opponent: Poland

room: A
reviewer: Serbia

problem no.: 6

Juror's name: PANOŠOVA
signature: Paw.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7$$

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	almost no	too few	poor	0
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	only technical points cleared	some	some aspects fine	1
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	some scientific points cleared	many	good	2
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	interesting points discussed	+ 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	some aspects above average	brought in new physics	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	4
5	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater extent than expected				
6										

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2.5 + 2 - 0 = 6.5$$

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

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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

NOTES: