SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 1 **stage:** 3 **room:** 202 **problem no.:** **Juror's name & signature:** PLPSCH

reporter: GRES — Šimon **opponent:** RONY Post **reviewer:** 9.56 Terk

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 15 + 0,75 − 0,5 = 3

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4							
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	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: FUKANIE ???

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3 + 3 − [ ] = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 3 + 3,25 + 0,75 ± [ ] − [ ] = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
1	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
	too short/long	some
1	relevant parts	many
2	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

−1	irrelevant
0	none
	relevant, constructive

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: CHAOS ?

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

SCORESHEET

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + [1,5] + [1] − [1] = [3]

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4							
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental _or_ theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0	concise and correct or no questions asked
	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
−2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES: dif. balls
energbot transfer bouncing + surface
→ rot. about axis 500
Blowing 2
Both ω are same → scaly
Precession

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + [1,5] + [3,0] + [2/15] − [0] = [8]

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

NOTES: Blowing
→ huberci

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

parameter dependences

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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + [2] + [3] + [1,5] + [1] ± [0] − [0] = [8]

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
1	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

NOTES: dif.

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some
	relevant parts	many
2	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

−1	irrelevant
0	none
1	relevant, constructive

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

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

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 1   stage: 3   room: 102   problem no.: 6

reporter: DANIEL GREŠ SROBAROVA

opponent: RONALD DOBOŠ POSTIVA

Juror's name & signature: MATEJ BADIN *(signature)*

reviewer: TEREZA ZUSKINOVA 1.96

HURRICAN BOLLS

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 3 + 1 - 1 = 4$

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0							
1	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
2	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
3	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	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:
- tape
- How balls were joined together?
- Blowing by them by tube?
- $(1 - I \cdot I_3)$? → which of those are moment of inertia should be taken into account.
- θ | exp → θ
- Slide 16
- $\sin\theta \cos\theta = \dfrac{I_3}{I_1}\left(\dfrac{1 - 2MgR/I_3\Omega^2}{A - I_3/I_1}\right)$
- $\sqrt{1 - \cos^2\theta}\,\cos\theta = \dfrac{I_3}{I_1}\cdot \dfrac{A - B}{\Omega^2}$
- $(1 - \cos^2\theta)\cos\theta = (C)\dfrac{AB}{\Omega^2} + \dfrac{B}{I_2 4}$
- $\cos\theta - \cos^3\theta = VEC$
- $x - x^2 = VEC$, $x^2 + VEC - x = 0$
- $x = -\dfrac{VEC}{2} \pm \sqrt{\dfrac{VEC^2}{2^2} - 4 \cdot VEC}$
- joining them together "sentence"

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 2 + 3.5 + 3.0 - 0 = 9$

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ 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:
- Fúkanie do gúl kompresor
- Fúkanie to grafikuje | 30 periodov
- Oscilácie v uhle
- Hmatnosti
- material z gule
- koeficient trenia
- vysvetlenie veľa rôznych vec
- velmi relevantné
- jet?
- prepojenie / odvodenie teórie
- precesia

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 2 + 3 + 2 + 1 \pm - = 9$

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some
	relevant parts	many
2	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

-1	irrelevant
0	none
1	relevant, constructive

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:
- Fúkanie

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

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): **1** stage: **3** room: **102** problem no.: **6** Juror's name & signature: **JAROSLAV TÓBIK** _JTóbik_

reporter: **ŠROBÁROVA, D. GREŠ** opponent: **POŠTOVÁ R.DOBOŠ** reviewer: **1SG T. ZUSKINOVÁ**

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + **2** + **1** − **0,6** = **3**

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	• fair	• fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	• average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	• deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4							
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental _or_ theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	← poor
1	• some	some aspects fine
	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	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: STEINER LAW NOT SENTENCE! NO BLOWING BY STRAW! Závisí rýchlosť rotácie a uhol?

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + **1,5** ~~2,2~~ + **3,2** + **3** − **0,2** = **9**

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	• practically all points	• practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	↗ reasonable
3	• good	many correct	• some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	↗ + 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:

Myslíte si že na pohyb má väčší vplyv trenie o podložku alebo o vzduch?

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + **1,5** + **2** + **1,5** + **1** ± **☐** − **0,2** = **7**

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
1	• + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	• good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	• partially relevant	some
2	• informative, apt	mostly adequate	• reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
	too short/long	some
1	relevant parts	many
2	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

−1	irrelevant
0	none
1	relevant, constructive

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:

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

IYPT – March 2019

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 1   stage: 3   room: 102   problem no.: 6   Juror's name & signature: ADAMUSČIN

reporter: SR. GREŠ   opponent: POS DOBOŠ   reviewer: ISG ZUSEINOVÁ

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + [1] + [1] - [ ] = [4]

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	(fair)	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5							
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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + [1,5] + [3] + [2,5] - [ ] = [8]

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
	some	some correct	good	reasonable
2	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
3				
4	new crucial point(s)	+ 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + [1,1] + [2,5] + [2,5] + [1,5] ± [0,5] - [ ] = [8]

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
(1)	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
	too short/long	some
1	relevant parts	many
2	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

-1	irrelevant
0	none
1	relevant, constructive

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:

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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2,75 − 0,5 = 7

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5							
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							

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	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: KAM IDE 80% ENERGIE???

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,25 + 1 + 0,75 − [ ] = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,25 + 2 + 1,75 + .2 ± [ ] − [ ] = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some
2	relevant parts	many
3	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

−1	irrelevant
0	none
1	relevant, constructive

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: PRIDLEE i 10% nenicjil JALO KRITICY

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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 3.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 6$

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3/4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
5/6	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
7	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
2	many	good
3	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
	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: Crucial points:
WP1, 2
Propagation → analysis
RCE problems?
DOF of problem → only when the wave is seen
video of measurement → hand?
speed of wave?
→ constant
→ Ampl. dependence?
standard energy...
290 fps?
→ track of rot.
standard/standard case
→10g

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 0.5 + 1 + 1.5 - 0 = 4$

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

NOTES: No key of questions :(

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

→ exp. → fine but analysis?
→ Vent, he hasn't done ...

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	very good

→ performance of measurement
→ principle
→ material length

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

REVIEWER 2.0

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 2 + 2.5 + 2 + 1.5 \pm 0 - 0 = 9$

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
2	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some
	relevant parts	many
2	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

-1	irrelevant
0	none
1	relevant, constructive

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: Error law
Why is the speed diff.
→ dep. on orientation
→ missing opinion!

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

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): **1** stage: **2** room: **102** problem no.: **17** Juror's name & signature: **JAROSLAV TÓBIK**

reporter: **1SG PETRUS** opponent: **ŠROBÁROVA LASCÁK** reviewer: **POŠTOVÁ DOBOŠ**

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + \boxed{2{,}8} + \boxed{1} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{5}$

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	● fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	● good	● well performed, sufficient number	●● deviations qualitatively analysed	●+ some interesting results	● some aspects above average	● some parts well done
4							
5	● detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
1	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	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: Experiment pa E – veľký rozdiel teória a merané, veľké tlmenie?
– prečo je opačný pohyb irelevantný? Čo merali na paličkách (čo je y?)

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + \boxed{0{,}8} + \boxed{1{,}8} + \boxed{1} - \boxed{0{,}2} = \boxed{4}$

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	● relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	● some	some	reasonable
2	● main points	● some	some correct	reasonable	● fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	● too few	● poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	● some
1	● some	some correct	good	reasonable
2	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
3	new crucial point(s)	+ 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: Povrch – aro ovplyvňuje pohyb Robry? Nebral to do úvahy pri diskusii. Tak isto trenie spomenuli ale aro súvisí s javom?

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + \boxed{1{,}5} + \boxed{2{,}2} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{2} \pm \boxed{0{,}5} - \boxed{0} = \boxed{9}$

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
	● relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
1	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	● good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	● good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
2	● condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
	too short/long	some
1	relevant parts	many
	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

-1	irrelevant
	none
	✓ many
1	relevant, constructive

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: Konečne spomenul že v hornom bode nie je kin. energia nulová, lebo rotácia!

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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4,5 + 1,5 − 0 = 7

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
5							
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							

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0	concise and correct or no questions asked
	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
−2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1,5 + 1,5 − 0 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2,5 + 2,5 + 1,5 ± ☐ − ☐ = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some
2	relevant parts	many
3	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

−1	irrelevant
0	none
1	relevant, constructive

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:

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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 2{,}5 + 1{,}5 - 0{,}5 = 5$

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6							
7	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	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: _absorption of Soy sauce >H₂O 770 how was it measured Linear fit? Bean divergence - measured / theory? Temperature measured? should be because dif. cryst. temperature of soy sauce on dif. positions - change of refractive index, change of thickness? Spále bode so focu rozptýlka?_

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 1{,}5 + 3{,}5 + 2 - 0 = 8$

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ 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: _otázky: absorbcia V sosove tekutá kapacita → nevieme měřenie food pointu ↓ rozpelenie teploty V dva knihy → odosobnie? teplovodivosť → nevie X what if otázky_

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 0{,}5 + 1 + 0{,}5 + 0{,}5 \pm -0{,}5 - 0 = 3$

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
1	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
	too short/long	some
1	relevant parts	many
2	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

-1	irrelevant
0	none
1	relevant, constructive

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: _Vhou la sevu? vhout lily? → zlyšanie → skoličné crucial points_

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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 3.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 5$

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3/4	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
5	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative
6/7	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

(3.5 circled)

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
1.5	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

0	concise and correct or no questions asked
-0.5	
-1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
-2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:
KEYWORDS: - thin layer - thermal lens - explain
- % too which d
- capillarity
- up coms focusing
2) Slide 7 why?
- How impname why interested
3) Slide 14 What is D_2 and D_1? - Beam waist
Exp Slide 2 - not static ? What changes if ....
Slide 25 - What causes fringes?
Slide 26 How did you measured focal length?
Interesting questions: - effect of glass a in container?

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 2 + 4 + 1 - 0 = 8$

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ 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: absorbing coefficient - measurement
Otázky: $\alpha \to$ measurement
- merná tepelná kapacita
- gaussovská propagácia laseru
- ako sa zmení propagácia laser c
- rozne vrstvy!
- fringes - Newtonove krúžky - distorsion - meranie focal point
- Propagácia teploty - do tuhého tela - Meranie ochladenim vzdialenosti
- chcem understanding of - difrakčné / Newtonove krúžky - sledu teplotrickosti
- spojka/rozptylka - vzdialenosti priamky - parametre - zlučenim
- Efekt spojovej tepelnej šošovky - porozumie dosti kvality na zlepšenice

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$1 + 0.5 + 0.5 + 0.5 + 0.5 \pm 1 - 0 = 2$

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
0.5	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
1	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0			
0.5	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0			
0.5	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0		
0.5	almost no	too few
	too short/long	some
1	relevant parts	many
	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

-1	irrelevant
0	none
1	relevant, constructive

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: - výkon laseru - Dobrá - Tešína?! - Aké parametre

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

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 1   stage: 1   room: 102   problem no.: 9   Juror's name & signature: JAROSLAV TÓBIK Tóbik

reporter: POŠTOVÁ M.MEŠTER   opponent: 1SG S.PLESNÍK   reviewer: ŠROBÁROVA, HALÁSE

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract   1,5

1 + 5̶ + 6̶ − 0,2 = 7

REPORT

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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
	many	• good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + 3 + 2,75 − 0 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2	• + short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	• all relevant points	• many	• many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	• very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	• good	reasonable
3	• good	{ many correct	some aspects efficient	• fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,2 + 2 + 2,2 + 1 ± 0 − 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
1	• + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	• partially relevant	some
2	• good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	• reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	• fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	• some
2	• relevant parts	many
	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

−1	irrelevant
0	• none
1	relevant, constructive

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:

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

SCORESHEET

fight (round no.): 1   stage: 1   room: 102   problem no.: 9   Juror's name & signature: ADAMUSČIN

reporter: MESTER   opponent: PLESNIK   reviewer: ~~MESTER~~ HALÁSZ

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 1 − 0 = 6

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	(some)	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	(good)	(well performed, sufficient number)	deviations qualitatively analysed	(+ some interesting results)	(some aspects above average)	some parts well done
4							
5	(detailed demonstrative)	quite detailed, correct	+ results explained errors analysed	+ theory limits explained, conclusive	considerable experimental or theoretical	interesting solution	(overall clear, demonstrative)
6							
7	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

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
	(many)	(good)
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	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:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3 + 2 − 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	(relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report)
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	(all relevant points)	(many)	(many correct)	(fair)	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	(+ all time used)

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	(some)
2	some	some correct	good	(reasonable)
	(good)	(many correct)	(some aspects efficient)	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ 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:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + 1,5 + ~~1~~ + 1 ± 0 − 0 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
1,5	(+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used)
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	(partially relevant)	some
2	(good)	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	(too short/long)	(partially relevant)	some
2	(informative, apt)	mostly adequate	(reasonable)
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
1	too short/long	some
	(relevant parts)	(many)
2	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

−1	irrelevant
0	(none)
1	relevant, constructive

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:

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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 1.5 − 1 = 4

REPORT

	phenomenon explanation	theory/model	relevant experiments	comparison between theory and experiment	own contribution	task fulfilment	science communication
0	almost no	almost no	too few	no/ almost no	others' data, incorrectly cited	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear
2	fair	fair	fair	not well fitting	some own input	average	average
3	good	good	well performed, sufficient number	deviations qualitatively analysed	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some parts well done
4							
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							

DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT

	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct at the discussion
0	too few	poor
1	some	some aspects fine
	many	good
2	+ data/theory convincingly supported	some aspects efficient
3	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS

	concise and correct or no questions asked
−1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
−2	deeply incorrect or show deep misconceptions

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1 − 0 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, all time used

NOTES: NIE NA PODSTATU

+ CHÝBA TEÓRIA

OPPOSITION (SPEECH)

	understanding of presentation	relevant topics addressed	own opinions presented	prioritisation	time management
0	almost nothing	no or irrelevant	too few	no	poor
1	some main points	few	some	some	reasonable
2	main points	some	some correct	reasonable	fair
3	all relevant points	many	many correct	fair	efficient
4	practically all points	practically all	+ improvement suggestions	very good	+ all time used

DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER

	relevant scientific topics	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct of the discussion	prioritisation
0	almost no	too few	poor	no
1	few	some	some aspects fine	some
2	some	some correct	good	reasonable
3	good	many correct	some aspects efficient	fair
4	new crucial point(s)	+ 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

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 0.5 + 0.5 + 0.5 ± 0 − 0 = 3

QUESTIONS ASKED

0	too few, mostly irrelevant
	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points
1	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritized, time managed efficiently

REVIEW OF REPORT

	report evaluation & understanding	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	partial	partially relevant	some
2	good	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	detailed, complex	fully adequate	good

REVIEW OF OPPOSITION

	speech evaluation	pros & cons	prioritisation
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	no
1	too short/long	partially relevant	some
2	informative, apt	mostly adequate	reasonable
3	condensed & accurate	fully adequate	good

DISCUSSION ANALYSIS

	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions
0	almost no	too few
	too short/long	some
1	relevant parts	many
2	accurate, conclusive	fully adequate

MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT

−1	irrelevant
0	none
1	relevant, constructive

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: Dobrá teória?

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