

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): stage: room: problem no.: Juror's name & signature:

reporter: opponent: reviewer:

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + + - =

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 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions -2 —
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	1 — many	good	
3 — good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done	2 — + data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient	
4 — detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental <u>or</u> 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 <u>and</u> theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	3 —		
6 —									
7 —									

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + + + - =

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 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions -2 —
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:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + + + + ± - =

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 — deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions -2 —
1 — relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	1 — partial	partially relevant	some	1 — too short/long	partially relevant	some	— 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	1 — 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	2 — accurate, conclusive	fully adequate		

NOTES:

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