

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 H, Stage: 1, Problem No. **14**

sign

Karel Chwislek

Martchenko, Ilya

Rep: USA

Opp: Czech Republic

Rev: Chinese Taipei

Opponent Secy

REPORT

	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	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	too few	poor	
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine	___ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	many	good	___ 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	+ 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	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 + 1 - 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 ___ 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
___ relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 ___ some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 ___ few	some	some aspects fine	some	___ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 ___ + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 ___ main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	2 ___ some	some correct	good	reasonable	___ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	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 + 0 + 2 + 2 + 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
___ relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 ___ partial	partially relevant	some	1 ___ too short/long	partially relevant	some	___ too short/long	some	0 ___ none	___ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1 ___ + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 ___ good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 ___ informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	1 ___ relevant parts	many	1 ___ relevant, constructive	___ deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
2 ___ + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 ___ detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 ___ condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	2 ___ accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 H, Stage: 1, Problem No. 14

sign

[Handwritten signature]

Balcombe, John

Rep: USA

Opp: Czech Republic

Rev: Chinese Taipei

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1 + 1 - 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 --- too few, mostly irrelevant	0 --- almost nothing	0 --- no or irrelevant	0 --- too few	0 --- no	0 --- poor	0 --- almost no	0 --- too few	0 --- 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	1 --- few	1 --- some	1 --- some	1 --- reasonable	1 --- few	1 --- some	1 --- some aspects fine	1 --- some	
2 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 --- main points	2 --- some	2 --- some correct	2 --- reasonable	2 --- fair	2 --- some	2 --- some correct	2 --- good	2 --- reasonable	
	3 --- all relevant points	3 --- many	3 --- many correct	3 --- fair	3 --- efficient	3 --- good	3 --- many correct	3 --- some aspects efficient	3 --- fair	
	4 --- practically all points	4 --- practically all	4 --- + improvement suggestions	4 --- very good	4 --- + all time used	4 --- new crucial point(s)	4 --- + improvement suggestions	4 --- overall efficient	4 --- very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 2 + 9 ± 40.5 - 0 = ~~17~~ 17

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	0 --- irrelevant	0 --- no	0 --- poor/wrong	0 --- irrelevant	0 --- no	0 --- almost no	0 --- 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	1 --- partially relevant	1 --- some	1 --- too short/long	1 --- partially relevant	1 --- some	1 --- too short/long	1 --- some	0 --- none	
2 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	2 --- good	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- reasonable	2 --- informative, apt	2 --- mostly adequate	2 --- reasonable	2 --- relevant parts	2 --- many	1 --- relevant, constructive	
	3 --- detailed, complex	3 --- fully adequate	3 --- good	3 --- condensed & accurate	3 --- fully adequate	3 --- good	3 --- accurate, conclusive	3 --- fully adequate		

NOTES:

Too rushed.

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 1.5 - 0 = 6



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 H, Stage: 1, Problem No. 14

sign *Clare Byrne*

Byeon, Clare

Rep: USA

Opp: Czech Republic

Rev: Chinese Taipei

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor
2	fair	fair	fair	not well-fitting	some own input	average	average	some	some aspects fine
3								many	good
4	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
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative		
6	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		
7								proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES: Atwood machine is NOT the problem!

Slipping? Lagrange?

Source of loss, only air drag?

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1 + 1 - 0.5 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS				
0	understanding of presentation	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	3	
4	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	4	
	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	all time used		

should ask for slipping!

the largest energy loss 2 which one?

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	report evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	too few	1
2	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	2
3	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	3
4	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	4

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 7 - 0 = 5.5



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 H, Stage: 1, Problem No. 14

sign

D. Keller

Keller, Daniel

Rep: USA

Opp: Czech Republic

Rev: Chinese Taipei

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	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 some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	some aspects fine	
2 fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	many	good	
3 good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	+ 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: Phase diagram is missing → Use time!
(Mass ratio is important) 9:30??

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 7 + 7 - 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 too few, mostly irrelevant	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	some	some correct	good	reasonable	
	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

1:50? Time! Didn't give own opinion?

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4.5 + 7 + 7 + 0.5 + 7 - 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	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	almost no	too few	-1 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 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	too short/long	some	0 none	
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many	1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	
	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	2	

NOTES:

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 6$$



SCORESHEET
 Fight 1 H, Stage: 1, Problem No. 14
 Rep: USA

sign Uendrick

Kundracik, Frantisek

Opp: Czech Republic

Rev: Chinese Taipei

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: *no phase diagram found (e.g. wheel rec'n to an stop the fall).*

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

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 —	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	0 — almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	0 —	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	1 —	reasonable	1 — few	some	some aspects fine	some	
2 —		2 — main points	some	some correct	2 —	fair	2 — some	some correct	good	reasonable	
3 —		3 — all relevant points	many	many correct	3 —	efficient	3 — good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair	
4 —		4 — practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	4 —	+ all time used	4 — new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good	

only 3 points in pros/cons!

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.0 + 0.5 - 0 = 8$$

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		
0 —	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	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 —	+ 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 —		2 — good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 — informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	2 — relevant parts	many	1 — relevant, constructive	
3 —		3 — detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 — condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	3 — accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		
4 —											

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 4



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 H, Stage: 2, Problem No. **6**

sign

Martchenko, Ilya

Rep: Czech Republic

Opp: Chinese Taipei

Rev: USA

Ryan Baggett

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

NOTES:

Slide 15: what if some parameters were changed?

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 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	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation	
0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, -1 <input type="checkbox"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	3 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	
	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 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 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or 0 <input type="checkbox"/> no questions asked -1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, -1 <input type="checkbox"/> inconclusive or too long -2 <input type="checkbox"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
1 <input type="checkbox"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> none	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed & accurate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 H, Stage: 2, Problem No. 6

sign [Signature]

Balcombe, John

Rep: Czech Republic

Opp: Chinese Taipei

Rev: USA

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 --- <u>some</u>	some	<u>some</u>	some	review of sources, cited	<u>partly</u>	<u>partly clear</u>	--- some	some aspects fine	--- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	
2 --- fair	<u>fair</u>	<u>fair</u>	not well fitting	<u>some own input</u>	average	average	1 --- <u>many</u>	<u>good</u>	--- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
3 --- good	good	well performed, sufficient number	<u>deviations qualitatively analysed</u>	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	2 --- <u>data/theory convincingly supported</u>	<u>some aspects efficient</u>		
4 --- detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	3 --- 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				

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	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 --- relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	1 --- some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	1 --- few	some	some aspects fine	some	--- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 --- <u>main points</u>	some	some correct	<u>reasonable</u>	<u>fair</u>	2 --- <u>some</u>	some correct	<u>good</u>	<u>reasonable</u>	--- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	3 --- <u>all relevant points</u>	<u>many</u>	<u>many correct</u>	<u>fair</u>	<u>efficient</u>	3 --- <u>good</u>	<u>many correct</u>	some aspects efficient	<u>fair</u>	
	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

$$1 + 1.3 + 1 + 1 + 0.5 + 0.2 - 0 = 5$$

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	<u>too few</u>	-1 --- irrelevant	0 --- concise and correct or no questions asked
1 --- relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 --- <u>partial</u>	partially relevant	<u>some</u>	1 --- <u>too short/long</u>	partially relevant	<u>some</u>	1 --- <u>too short/long</u>	some	0 --- none	--- 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 --- relevant parts	many	1 --- relevant, constructive	--- 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	2 --- accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 - 5 = 4



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 H, Stage: 2, Problem No. 6

sign

Clare Byeon

Byeon, Clare

Rep: Czech Republic

Opp: Chinese Taipei

Rev: USA

REPORT	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	some	some aspects fine
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects 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	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES:

blowing? Model? Magnus effect? How about in vac? stable state? modified theory with experiment or blowing? model? friction? Lagrangian?

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 1 = 7

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

NOTES:

what causes lift? terminal speed? why? Asymmetry? by hands. what if symmetric initiation?

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	report evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	too few	1
2	partial	partially relevant	some	some	2
3	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	many	3
4	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	fully adequate	4

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 9.5 - 0 = 4



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 H, Stage: 2, Problem No. 6

sign

D. Keller

Keller, Daniel

Rep: Czech Republic

Opp: Chinese Taipei

Rev: USA

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		
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				

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1.5 + 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	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	0 almost no	too few	poor	no	
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	

friction in expansion (+) angular momentum!

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1 + 1.5 + 1 + 0.5 - 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	
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	2	

NOTES:

**)*

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 15 + 1 - 0 = 4



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 H, Stage: 2, Problem No. 6

sign

Wedra

Kundracik, Frantisek

Rep: Czech Republic

Opp: Chinese Taipei

Rev: USA

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
3	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	2	many	good	-2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
4	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		
5	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		
6	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: *no insight into the physics behind the evidence.*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 25 - 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	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	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	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	-1	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:

no conclusion from the discussion in many goals discussed.

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 15 + 1.5 + 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	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	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
1	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	1	relevant parts	many	1	relevant, constructive	-2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	2	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate				

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 3 - 2 = 5



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 H, Stage: 3, Problem No. 15

sign

Rep: Chinese Taipei Grace Sun Opp: USA

Colin Murphy

Rev: Czech Republic

Martchenko, Ilya

Barbara Adamov

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

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 3 - 6 = 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 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input 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 type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	3 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	
	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0 + 1 + 0 + 1 ± 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 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input 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"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partial	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> none	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed & accurate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1.3 - 0.3 = 4



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 H, Stage: 3, Problem No. 15

sign *AR*

Balcombe, John

Rep: Chinese Taipei

Opp: USA

Rev: Czech Republic

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 --- <u>some</u>	some	<u>some</u>	<u>some</u>	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	1 --- <u>some</u>	some aspects fine	1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 --- fair	<u>fair</u>	fair	not well fitting	<u>some own input</u>	<u>average</u>	<u>average</u>	2 --- many	<u>good</u>	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		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			

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 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	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	1 --- <u>some main points</u>	few	<u>some</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>reasonable</u>	1 --- few	<u>some</u>	some aspects fine	<u>some</u>	1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 --- <u>main points</u>	<u>some</u>	<u>some correct</u>	<u>reasonable</u>	<u>fair</u>	2 --- <u>some</u>	<u>some correct</u>	<u>good</u>	<u>reasonable</u>	2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
	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 + 1 + 1 + 0.5 + 4.0 - 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 --- concise and correct or no questions asked
1 --- relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 --- <u>partial</u>	<u>partially relevant</u>	<u>some</u>	1 --- <u>too short/long</u>	<u>partially relevant</u>	<u>some</u>	1 --- too short/long	<u>some</u>	0 --- none	1 --- some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1 --- + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 --- good	<u>mostly adequate</u>	<u>reasonable</u>	2 --- informative, apt	<u>mostly adequate</u>	<u>reasonable</u>	2 --- relevant parts	many	1 --- relevant, constructive	2 --- deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
2 --- + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 --- detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	3 --- condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	2 --- accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 1 - 0.5 = 5



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 H, Stage: 3, Problem No. 15

sign

Clare Byeon

Byeon, Clare

Rep: Chinese Taipei

Opp: USA

Rev: Czech Republic

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					
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	+ reproducible, convincing analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	considerable experimental and theoretical	greater expert than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated					

NOTES:

**elastic? phase & the model?*
Coaty thickness compared to §?
Coaty thickness > § and. motion chaotic?

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 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
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor	almost no	too few	poor	no	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable	some	some	some aspects fine	some	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair	some	some correct	good	reasonable	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
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	

NOTES:

friction? 2M release?
Mean mechanism to loose energy?

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1 + 1 + 0.5 - 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
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no	almost no	too few	-1	irrelevant	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	partial	partially relevant	some	too short/long	partially relevant	some	too short/long	some	0	none	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable	relevant parts	many	1	relevant, constructive	2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate	2			

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 15 - 0 = 5 ↓



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 H, Stage: 3, Problem No. 15

sign

D. Keller

Keller, Daniel

Rep: Chinese Taipei

Opp: USA

Rev: Czech Republic

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 ___ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -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	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							3 proved deep understanding	overall efficient	

NOTES:

misaligned alignment not properly derived → not convincingly supported solution

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 15 + 15 + 15 - 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 ___ 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 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:

sometimes contradictory arguments

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 7 + 7 + 9.5 - 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	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 ___ some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -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 too 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	2 accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:

you assessed yourself week discussion analysis no mixed physics

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 1 - 0 = 5



SCORESHEET

Fight 1 H, Stage: 3, Problem No. 15

sign *Uendri9*

Kundracik, Frantisek

Rep: Chinese Taipei

Opp: USA

Rev: Czech Republic

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

NOTES:

many wrong answers

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
	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 type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost nothing	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no or irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -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 type="checkbox"/> some main points	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	1 <input type="checkbox"/> few	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects fine	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> main points	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some	2 <input type="checkbox"/> some correct	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	
	3 <input type="checkbox"/> all relevant points	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	3 <input type="checkbox"/> efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> many correct	3 <input type="checkbox"/> some aspects efficient	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fair	
	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all points	4 <input type="checkbox"/> practically all	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + all time used	4 <input type="checkbox"/> new crucial point(s)	4 <input type="checkbox"/> + improvement suggestions	4 <input type="checkbox"/> overall efficient	4 <input type="checkbox"/> very good	

NOTES:

leads the discussion

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 0 ± 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 <input type="checkbox"/> too few, mostly irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> poor/wrong	0 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> almost no	0 <input type="checkbox"/> too few	-1 <input type="checkbox"/> irrelevant	0 <input type="checkbox"/> concise and correct or no questions asked 1 <input type="checkbox"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -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	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> partially relevant	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	1 <input type="checkbox"/> too short/long	1 <input type="checkbox"/> some	0 <input type="checkbox"/> none	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	2 <input type="checkbox"/> good	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> informative, apt	2 <input type="checkbox"/> mostly adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> reasonable	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant parts	2 <input type="checkbox"/> many	1 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently	3 <input type="checkbox"/> detailed, complex	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> condensed & accurate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	3 <input type="checkbox"/> good	3 <input type="checkbox"/> accurate, conclusive	3 <input type="checkbox"/> fully adequate	2 <input type="checkbox"/> relevant, constructive	

NOTES:

? many irrelevant points were discussed?