

SCORESHEET

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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + + - =

REPORT								DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY 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="text"/> almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	0 <input type="text"/> too few	poor	0 <input type="text"/> concise and correct or no questions asked	
1 <input type="text"/> some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	<input type="text"/>	partly fine	<input type="text"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long	
2 <input type="text"/> fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average	1 <input type="text"/> many	good	<input type="text"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions	
3 <input type="text"/> good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	<input type="text"/>	some aspects efficient	<input type="text"/>	
4 <input type="text"/> detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental <u>or</u> theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	2 <input type="text"/> + data/theory supported			
5 <input type="text"/> 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 <input type="text"/> proved deep understanding	overall efficient		

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 2 and add/subtract

2 + + - =

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)				DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER			ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
understanding of presentation	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	relevant topics and prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	
0 <input type="text"/> almost nothing	irrelevant	too few	poor	0 <input type="text"/> irrelevant	too few	poor	0 <input type="text"/> concise and correct or no questions asked
1 <input type="text"/> some main points	too few	some	reasonable	1 <input type="text"/> too few	some	some aspects fine	<input type="text"/> some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 <input type="text"/> main points	some	some correct	fair	2 <input type="text"/> some	some correct	good	<input type="text"/> deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions
3 <input type="text"/> all relevant points	most	many correct	efficient	3 <input type="text"/> most	many correct	some aspects efficient	
4 <input type="text"/> practically all points	well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	4 <input type="text"/> well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES: