

Yurc 1.1 to je @

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 4 + 4 - 1 = 5$$

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions 3
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
7										

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS					
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions 3
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	
	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	
	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 - 2 + 1 - 10 - (-2) = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions 3
1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	
2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	superficial	superficial	superficial	none	
3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritised, time managed efficiently	good	good	relevant parts	relevant, constructive	
	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	
	pros & cons prioritisation	pros & cons prioritisation	correct own opinions	irrelevant	

NOTES:

FASA / Rep: 1 CG
Gabriel Benou 5-6

OPP: GJAR
Karol Maricica
Rev: Ba Mix
H. Zigo

④ Colored line
Replicator

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	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES:
 ⊕ well explained & science communication (also for proof methods log)
 ⊕ errors within ranges of colors

OPPONENT
Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 0.75 + 1 + 1.5 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions

NOTES:
 ⊕ didn't mention CD structure
 ⊕ 7 for each color
 ⊕ shaking of light bulb - why?
 - 1 what did you measure? errors - minimal errors
 - equalities
 - changes CD vs DVD - why?
 - agreement theory & experiment - how both pictures
 ⊕ other lines on fence

REVIEWER
Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 1.75 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1 - 0.5 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	none	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	relevant parts	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
2	good	good	relevant parts	relevant, constructive	
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing		

NOTES:
 ⊕ not well explained nuclear theory
 ⊕ CD vs DVD
 ⊕ line not clear
 ⊕ not important errors
 ⊕ blue ray
 ⊕ shaking vs. lines

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1.5 - 1 = 3.5

1/1

PLASCH

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	1	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	1	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	2	

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 0.5 - 1.5 = 1

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	1	
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	2	
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	2	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1 - 1 + 0.5 = 3.5

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	0	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	many	1	
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate	2	

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

Aneta Štefaničinová

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

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear				too few
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	3	
4	detailed demonstrat ve	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient		
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient		

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

Katarina Gersová

$$1 + 2 + 2 + 3 - 0 = 8$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	3	
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient		
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient		

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

Viktor Csontos

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

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS					
0	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0	irrelevant	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	1	none	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	2	relevant, constructive	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant parts	many				
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate				

NOTES:

Katarina Revicka' 1-FY200, 2.

Aneta Stefančinová

$\frac{24}{20} \rightarrow 1$

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 0.5 - 0 = 3$$

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly average	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	some aspects above average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	interesting solution	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	greater extent than expected	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	+ complex concepts well communicated		proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES: angle of incidence irrelevant?

experiments were done with hand (no rigid set-up)

Katarina Bersova

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 8$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions

NOTES: video
no measurements
no error analysis

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

Victor Santos

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	none	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	relevant, constructive	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
2	good	good	relevant parts		
2	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing		

NOTES: difference of surface tension → numbers measured
Please suitably adjust your grades taking into regard the [1,10] range.

Barinek 1-2 11/10/10

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 - 1 = 0.5

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES: ANGLE-NO EFFECT: SHAPE

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 3 - 2 - 0.5 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions

NOTES: SP...?

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 - 1.5 + 1.5 ± 0.5 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	none	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	relevant parts	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
2	good	good	accurate, convincing	relevant, constructive	
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised		

NOTES:

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

Slide 1.2

Slide 5 (X) ρ, μ, C, C_0, H' , measurement of width of particles

(-1)

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	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT	ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	OR multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	OR considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 3 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions

NOTES:

stream (X) drag force

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 - 0 = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	conclude and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	conclude and correct or no questions asked
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	good	good	relevant parts	many	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions

NOTES:

F1S2 / Rep: GJAR / OPP: BARix / Dev: 1SG
 Andrea S. / Gersona / Viktor Crouzos
 @upstream show / Natalia Suzichova

REPORTER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1 + 1.5 - [] = 3

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES:
 @ qualitative expl.: what is Harayon?
 @ results unclear @ theory?
 @ should video but unclear @ explained they recorded video
 @ could have discussed harayon etc. more

OPPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.7 + 3 - 2.5 - [] = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	3	
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	4	
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient		

NOTES:
 @ no observation, what particles went up
 @ detailed the workflow
 @ no qualitative expe.
 @ let's see explanation & Harayon
 @ errors but that measurement
 @ no prioritisation of measurement
 @ no relevant points

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 1.5 + 1.5 + 1 + 1.75 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	relevant parts	many	3	
4	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	4	

NOTES:
 @ identified the slides
 @ identified the workflow
 @ agreed T is relevant for p
 @ didn't agree with cons
 @ identified high vs low p and heat particles & p

1/2

PLF SCL

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 0.8 + 1.5 - \square = 3$$

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
6										

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.8 + 3.5 - 2.8 - \square = 9$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS			
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	almost nothing	almost none	too few	too few	poor/aggressive	
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used	some main points	too few/many	some	some	some aspects fine	
	main points	partially relevant	some correct	some correct	good	
	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	many correct	some aspects efficient	
	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1 - 0.5 + 2 + \square - \square = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	irrelevant	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	none	
2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	superficial	superficial	superficial	relevant, constructive	
3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritised, time managed efficiently	good	good	relevant parts		
	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing		

NOTES:

BA Mix 2. oscillating sphere

Opp: 15G = Omella

Rev - GTAD
Tadeas pastorek

PHS3
Purdie work

REPORTER
Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - \square = 4$$

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5			and errors analysis		and considerable theoretical				
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable		well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive		greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
7									

NOTES:

OPPONENT
Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.75 + 2 + 3 - \square = 7$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	almost none	too few
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	some
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used	main points	some correct
		all relevant points	many correct
		practically all points	+ improvement suggestions
			all time used

NOTES:

REVIEWER
Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 1.5 + 0.5 + 0.75 - \square = 5$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	irrelevant
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	good	good	relevant parts	many	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	

NOTES:

- efficient line
- irrelevant - errors, process

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.5 + 1 - \square = 4$

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 <u>some</u> fair	almost no <u>some</u> fair	almost no <u>some</u> fair	almost no some qualitative agreement	almost no review of sources, cited some <u>own</u> input	misunderstood <u>partly</u> average	unclear, chaotic <u>partly</u> clear average	relevant arguments/responses too few some <u>many</u>	reporter's conduct in the discussion poor/aggressive partly fine <u>good</u>	0 concise and correct or no questions asked
1	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or ↑ multitude of parameters examined ↓ errors analysis	+ limits discussed	or ↑ considerable experimental ↓ considerable theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	deep and com prehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated			

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 2 - \square = 7$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report + short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used	understanding of presentation almost nothing some main points main points all relevant points practically all points	topics raised and their prioritisation almost none too few/many partially relevant mostly relevant + well prioritised	own opinions presented too few some some correct many correct + improvement suggestions
	time management poor reasonable fair efficient +	topics raised and their prioritisation almost none too few/many partially relevant mostly relevant + well prioritised	opponent's conduct in the discussion poor/aggressive some aspects fine good some aspects efficient overall efficient
			0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract
 $1 + 1 + 1.5 + 0.8 + 1 - \square - \square = 5$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant relevant, meant to clarify unclear points + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used + short, apt and clear, well prioritised, time managed efficiently	evaluation & understanding poor/wrong superficial <u>good</u> apt, accurate	pros & cons prioritisation irrelevant partially relevant/correct mostly correct/prioritised fully adequate, well prioritised	speech evaluation poor/wrong superficial good apt & accurate	pros & cons prioritisation irrelevant partially relevant/correct mostly correct/prioritised fully adequate, well prioritised	discussion evaluation poor superficial relevant parts accurate, convincing
			correct own opinions irrelevant <u>some</u> many fully adequate	irrelevant none relevant, constructive	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions

NOTES:

Barnek 1-3 nota 2



REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + ~~5~~ + 1.5 - ~~2.5~~ = 4

Wire approximation

different sizes

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 nc	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	deta led demonstrat ve	quite detailed, correct	OR ↑ multitude of parametres examined ↓ errors analysis	+ limits discussed	OR ↑ considerable experimental ↓ considerable theoretical	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable		well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive		and	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding
6									
7									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + ~~1.4~~ - = 6

small-chang notes! parallel wires: resistance doesn't depend

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions
0	time management	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion
0	poor	too few	poor/aggressive
1	reasonable	some	some aspects fine
2	fair	some correct	good
3	efficient	many correct	some aspects efficient
4	all time used	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + ~~0.5~~ + ~~0.5~~ + 1 + 1 ± 0 - = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	irrelevant
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	none
2	good	good	relevant parts	many	relevant, constructive
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	
0	pros & cons prioritisation	pros & cons prioritisation			
0	irrelevant	irrelevant			concise and correct or no questions asked
1	partially relevant/correct	partially relevant/correct			some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	mostly correct/prioritised	mostly correct/prioritised			deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate, well prioritised			

NOTES:

Katarina Revicida

1. Fyzboj, 3. kolo

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 4

Maly Zigo

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses: too few	reporter's conduct in the discussion: poor/aggressive	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	partly fine	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	many	good	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	2	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	3	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated				

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 6

air resistance

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation: almost nothing	topics raised and their prioritisation: almost none	own opinions presented: too few	time management: poor	topics raised and their prioritisation: almost none	own opinions presented: too few	opponent's conduct in the discussion: poor/aggressive	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some main points	topics raised and their prioritisation: too few/many	own opinions presented: some	time management: reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	3	
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	4	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 1.5 + 1 ± 0.5 - 0 = 6.5

Tadea's Pastored

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0	evaluation & understanding: poor/wrong	speech evaluation: poor/wrong	discussion evaluation: poor	correct own opinions: irrelevant	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	good	good	good	many	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	apt & accurate	fully adequate	3	
	pros & cons prioritisation: irrelevant	pros & cons prioritisation: irrelevant	correct own opinions: irrelevant	irrelevant		
	partially relevant/correct	partially relevant/correct	relevant parts	none		
	mostly correct/prioritised	mostly correct/prioritised	accurate, convincing	relevant, constructive		
	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate			

NOTES:

smooth surface?
non-homogeneous vs. homogeneous

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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 4

Matej Žigo

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	1	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or ↑ ↓ and	multitude of parameters examined errors analysis	+ limits discussed	or ↑ ↓ and	considerable experimental considerable theoretical	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	2	
5	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable		well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive		greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	3	

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7

Alex Omelka

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	1	
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	2	
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	3	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 5

Tadeáš Pastorek

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS					
0	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	0	concise and correct or no questions asked	
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	1	irrelevant	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	0	none	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant parts	many	1	relevant, constructive	2	
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	2			

NOTES:

Topic 1.3

size of magnets or ball

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 1 = 3$$

slice to Res

0.7 mT

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES:

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 2.5 - 0.5 = 8$$

directions of vectors

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS					
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES:

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 0.5 + 1.5 + 1 - 0 - 0 = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	relevant parts	many	
4	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	
	pros & cons prioritisation	pros & cons prioritisation	correct own opinions	relevant, constructive	
	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant		
	partially relevant/correct	partially relevant/correct	some		
	mostly correct/prioritised	mostly correct/prioritised	many		
	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate		

NOTES:

Amorphous layer

6cm ↔ 9cm

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \square + \square - \square = \square$$

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or ↕ multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or ↕ considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and ↕ errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and ↕ considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
6										

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \square + \square + \square - \square = \square$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS					
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	
1	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + \square + \square + \square + \square \pm \square - \square = \square$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	
1	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	
2	good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant parts	many	
3	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	

NOTES:

(4)

Martin

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 - 1.5 = 6

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	1	
4	detailed	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	2	
5	x demonstrative		and errors analysis		and considerable theoretical			proved deep understanding	overall efficient	3	
6	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable		well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive		greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated				

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 - 2 + 2 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	2	
4	x all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	3	
5			+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	4	
6	practically all points	+ well prioritised							

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 - 1.5 + 1 + 1 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	x good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	many	2	
4			apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised		
5	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised				
6						

NOTES:

Matej Novota

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4.3 + 1.9 - [] = 7

~~AGG~~ CROSS Product

Martin Michuch

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	1	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	2	
5	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	3	

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2.8 + 2 - [] = 8

BA MIX

~~CROSS PRODUCT~~

Ketovina Gevorgov

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	1	
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	2	
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	2	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.5 - [] - [] = 7

1.56

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	many	1	
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate	2	

NOTES:

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

4

CHROBAKOVÁ

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 - 0 = 4

Cross product - Micuch

Table with 8 columns: 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.

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 2.5 + 3 - 0 = 8

Ba mix - Gernova

Table with 4 columns: QUESTIONS ASKED, OPPOSITION (SPEECH), DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER, ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS.

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 + 1 - 0 = 7

1.86

Table with 6 columns: QUESTIONS ASKED, REVIEW OF REPORT, REVIEW OF OPPOSITION, DISCUSSION ANALYSIS, MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT, ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS.

NOTES:

Thurs final 3 (9)

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 2.5 - 0 = 7 ~ 7

(.) x (.)

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	✓ good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	3	
4	✓ detailed demonstrative	✓ quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	4	
5	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	5	

NOTES:

slide < 11 → thole? linear fibs 23, fia 30, 3 angle eq.

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 3 + 2.5 - 0 = 8 ~ 8

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	3	
4	✓ all relevant points	✓ mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	✓ mostly relevant	✓ many correct	✓ some aspects efficient	4	
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	5	

NOTES:

fia 23 (F) ✓ error, change of color, angles

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

= + 1.5 + 2.5 + 4.5 + 1.5 - 0 - 0 = 8 ~ 8 1.5G

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS			
0	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	1	irrelevant
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	2	none
3	✓ good	mostly correct/prioritised	✓ good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant parts	many	3	relevant, constructive
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	4	relevant, constructive

NOTES:

dephalusi dista !! neurose vncel ?

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4 + 2 - 0 = 7

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or ↕ and multiplicity of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or ↕ and considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and ↕ and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and ↕ and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6									
7									

NOTES:

*→ irrelevantne! ←
nevedela se opsonent, letny' ulat xi letny' error bas bolu?!*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 3 + 3 - 0 = 9

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS					
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	no questions asked
1	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES:

pevo probe zeleuc = power & d + deklurva o faube!

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 - 1 = 8

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	no questions asked
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	good	good	relevant parts	many	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
	pros & cons prioritisation	pros & cons prioritisation	correct own opinions		
	irrelevant	irrelevant	irrelevant		
	partially relevant/correct	partially relevant/correct	some		
	mostly correct/prioritised	mostly correct/prioritised	many		
	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate		

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 2 - 0 = 6

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	1	
4	deta led demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	1	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows phys cal insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	3	

NOTES: *FACTUAL*

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

0 + 15 + 33 + 4 - 0 = 40

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	almost nothing	almost none	almost none	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	1	
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	2	
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	2	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.5 + 2 + 1.5 + 4.5 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
2	good	good	relevant parts	many	0	
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	1	

NOTES:

Rep: 1P: Michal
23.7

S3

Fraticolo

REPORTER
Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 1 + 1 - 0 = 3

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	<table border="1"> <tr> <th>relevant arguments/responses</th> <th>reporter's conduct in the discussion</th> </tr> <tr> <td>too few</td> <td>poor/aggressive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>some</td> <td>partly fine</td> </tr> <tr> <td>many</td> <td>good</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+ data/theory supported</td> <td>some aspects efficient</td> </tr> <tr> <td>proved deep understanding</td> <td>overall efficient</td> </tr> </table>	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	too few	poor/aggressive	some	partly fine	many	good	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	<p>0 concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions</p>
relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion																				
too few	poor/aggressive																				
some	partly fine																				
many	good																				
+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient																				
proved deep understanding	overall efficient																				
1	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear															
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	average	average															
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average															
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	OR multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	OR considerable experimental	interesting solution															
5			OR errors analysis		OR considerable theoretical																
6	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated														

NOTES: \ominus measure \perp plane \perp axis

- plane are \perp to each other
 \ominus large angles
 \ominus easy fresh
 \ominus systematic deviations, couldn't detect

\ominus gyroscope det

OPPONENT
Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 = 4

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS					
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	<p>0 concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions</p>
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	
1	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES: \ominus theory not fitting
 \ominus confusing angles

\ominus all angles
 \ominus green line always whole of
 \ominus more layers of colored line
 \ominus should have small error bars

1- only just green line
 2- varying of angles
 \ominus results are skewed, theory is linear - only does not fit, so 20 23
 4- wheel is large angle of incidence: $> 45^\circ$, should be larger
 \ominus mistake in theory

REVIEWER
Start from 1 and add/subtract
1 + 1.2 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.3 = 7.5

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	<p>0 concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions</p>
0	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	
1	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	
2	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	many	
3	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate	

NOTES: \ominus good speaking

\ominus clear prioritisation

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 1 - =

Victor

REP:RT	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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	1	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	2	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	3	

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - =

Lejca

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	1	
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	2	
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	3	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 1 + 1.5 ± - =

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS		
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	irrelevant	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	partially relevant/correct	some	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	mostly correct/prioritised	many	1	
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	fully adequate	2	

NOTES:

S.

Matej Novota

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 5 + 1 - 1 = 6

TSG

Viktor Santos

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	1	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	2	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	3	

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,2 + 2 + 1,5 - 0 = 6

CROSS Product Lujza Banra Lauriava

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	1	
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	2	
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	3	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2,5 + 1 + 1,5 - 0 = 8

BA MIX

Matej Zigo

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS	
0	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	correct own opinions	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	many	1	
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate	2	

NOTES:

5

Chrobotikova

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 1 - 0.5 = 5

1. PG - Coauthor

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 0 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -1 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	
6										

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 1.5 - 0 = 6

Cross product - LauriEva

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	poor/aggressive	
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	some aspects fine	
	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	good	
	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	some aspects efficient	
	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	overall efficient	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2 + 2 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 - 0 = 7

Ba mix - Zigo

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0 concise and correct or no questions asked -1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long -2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	
2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	
3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritised, time managed efficiently	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	many	
	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	relevant parts	fully adequate	
			accurate, convincing	relevant, constructive	

NOTES:

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

glenc final 2

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3.5 + 1.5 - 1 = 5 ~5

1.5G

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	<table border="1"> <tr> <th>relevant arguments/responses</th> <th>reporter's conduct in the discussion</th> </tr> <tr> <td>too few</td> <td>poor/aggressive</td> </tr> <tr> <td>some</td> <td>partly fine</td> </tr> <tr> <td>many</td> <td>good</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+ data/theory supported</td> <td>some aspects efficient</td> </tr> <tr> <td>proved deep understanding</td> <td>overall efficient</td> </tr> </table>	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	too few	poor/aggressive	some	partly fine	many	good	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	<p>0 concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions</p>
relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion																				
too few	poor/aggressive																				
some	partly fine																				
many	good																				
+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient																				
proved deep understanding	overall efficient																				
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear														
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average														
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done														
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative														
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated														

NOTES:

small changes vs. lin. fit of rel. irrelevant

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 1 - 0 = 6 ~6 (-) x (-)

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS					
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	<p>0 concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions</p>
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	
3	main points	partially relevant	✓ some correct	fair	✓ partially relevant	✓ some correct	good	
4	✓ all relevant points	✓ mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES:

graph. + , rel +

L in Strohal, N of holes

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 4.5 + 1.5 + 1.5 - 0 - 0 = 6 ~6 Ba mix

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS			
0	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	<p>0 irrelevant</p> <p>1 none</p> <p>2 relevant, constructive</p>	<p>0 concise and correct or no questions asked</p> <p>1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long</p> <p>2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions</p>
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant		
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some		
3	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant parts	many		
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate		

NOTES:

steps (+)

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 1 - 0 = 5

no theory?

Indene kinetics?
curve fit

$f = \frac{v}{L}$

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	OR multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	OR considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	OR errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	OR considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	3	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions

NOTES:

cos than detailom
nyclnt

weber's
partly done

no theory !!

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1 - 1 = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS						
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	3	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	4	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 7 + 7 + 7 + 0 ± 0 - 7 = 5

fit! Rekishi sita!

theory partly?
critical some believe!

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS		
0	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	irrelevant	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	irrelevant	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	none	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
3	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	many	relevant, constructive	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate		3	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions

NOTES:

reporter well seen

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 2 - 1 = 5$$

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	OR multiple of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	OR considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensive, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6									
7									

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 1.3 - \square = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS					
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1.8 + 1.5 + 1.3 + 0.5 - \square - \square = 6$$

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS			
0	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	none	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	relevant, constructive	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant parts	many		
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate		

NOTES:

misunderstood

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

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + \square + 1.5 - \square = 6

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient
6									
7									

NOTES:

- good defendability of structure in

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 1.5 - \square = 6

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions
			overall efficient

NOTES: ok but a bit irritated

Don't agree with no quant theory
 unclear plots & dependencies
 Be not well

1. Strouhal (Rayleigh) eq. - as what affects it apart from Re (3.5 min)
 1.7 bit given with frequency
 too much time spent
 ok slide 22 - not enough exp.
 2. Beberstedt not clear it

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 0.8 + 0.7 + 1.5 + 9.5 - \square - \square = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	none	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	relevant, constructive	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
2	good	good	relevant parts		
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing		
			correct own opinions		
			correct own opinions		
			fully adequate		

NOTES:

- absolute misunderstanding of presentation

quant theory not done
 ~ struc

- cleared out
 - go
 - stars for

14

Final - 1

Jaz Muhammad

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 5

Anna

Table with 8 columns: 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.

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2.5 + 3 - 0 = 8

Table with 4 columns: QUESTIONS ASKED, OPPOSITION (SPEECH), DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER, ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS.

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 2 + 1 + 1 ± [] - [] = 6

Table with 5 columns: QUESTIONS ASKED, REVIEW OF REPORT, REVIEW OF OPPOSITION, DISCUSSION ANALYSIS, MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT, ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS.

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 3,5 + 1,5 - = 6

BA MIX

Aniĕka Olešrová

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 in the discussion		
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	too few	poor/aggressive	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	some	partly fine	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	many	good	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	3	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	proved deep understanding	overall efficient		
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated				

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1 + 3,5 + 2,9 - = 7

156 Alex

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)				DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER			ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS	
	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion		
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	almost nothing	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	0	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	some main points	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	1	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used	main points	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	2	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3		all relevant points	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	3	
4		practically all points	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	4	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1,5 + 1,5 + 1,5 + 1 - - = 6

CROSS PRODUCT

Martin Marcinčík

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT		REVIEW OF OPPOSITION		DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions		
0	too few, mostly irrelevant	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	-1	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	partially relevant/correct	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	0	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	+ suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	mostly correct/prioritised	good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant parts	many	1	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	+ short, apt and clear, well prioritised, time managed efficiently	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	2	

NOTES:

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 3 + 1 - 0 = 6$$

Ba mix - Cleanova

did 39 during bad

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	OR multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	OR considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	
5			and errors analysis		and considerable theoretical					
7	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable		well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive		greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	

NOTES:

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

$$1 + 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7$$

1.96

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS					
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deep y incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	
	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	
	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES:

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

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

Cross product

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	0 concise and correct or no questions asked 1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long 2 deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	pros & cons prioritisation	pros & cons prioritisation	correct own opinions	irrelevant	
2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	
3 + short, apt and clear, well prioritised, time managed efficiently	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	
	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	many	
	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	relevant parts	relevant, constructive
			accurate, convincing	fully adequate	

NOTES:

Glenc final 1.

(16)

REPORTER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + ~~1.5~~ + 1.5 - 1 = 5 ^{~6} Ba mix

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES: lens water slide 28 33 name of angles (i - incident) in minor diff. 3 out of 30
36 lin fig 39 massive error bars 39 graphs scale

OPPONENT

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + ~~1.5~~ + 1.75 + 2.25 - 0 = 7 ^{~7} 1. SG

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS					
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	
4	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
5	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	

NOTES: + 0.15 curved fig

REVIEWER

Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 1.25 + 1.25 ± 0 - 0 = 6 ^{cross-product}

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	concise and correct or no questions asked
1	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	irrelevant	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	superficial	superficial	superficial	some	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
3	good	good	relevant parts	many	
4	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	

NOTES: precise setup - 1

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

additiona legitimita 100 100 100 For - mentione
 flow spec 100 100 100 $\xi = ?$ - filtering

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	DISCUSSION WITH OPPONENT		ANSWERS TO JURY, OPPONENT, and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion	
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine	
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good	3
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient	
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient	-2

NOTES:

large error in α

OPPONENT
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + 2 - 0 = 7

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)				DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER			ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	time management	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented	opponent's conduct in the discussion	
1 relevant, aimed at resolving unclear points in the report	almost nothing	almost none	too few	poor	almost none	too few	poor/aggressive	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 + short, apt and clear, well prioritised, all time used	some main points	too few/many	some	reasonable	too few/many	some	some aspects fine	
	main points	partially relevant	some correct	fair	partially relevant	some correct	good	3
	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct	efficient	mostly relevant	many correct	some aspects efficient	
	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	+ all time used	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions	overall efficient	-2

NOTES:

REVIEWER
 Start from 1 and add/subtract
 1 + 2 + 1 + 1 + 2 = 7

rather ξ ?

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT		REVIEW OF OPPOSITION		DISCUSSION ANALYSIS		MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0 too few, mostly irrelevant	evaluation & understanding	pros & cons prioritisation	speech evaluation	pros & cons prioritisation	discussion evaluation	correct own opinions	irrelevant	
1 relevant, meant to clarify unclear points	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor/wrong	irrelevant	poor	irrelevant	1 irrelevant	1 some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
2 + suitably allotted to Rep & Opp, most time used	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	partially relevant/correct	superficial	some	0 none	
	good	mostly correct/prioritised	good	mostly correct/prioritised	relevant parts	many	1 relevant, constructive	3
	apt, accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	apt & accurate	fully adequate, well prioritised	accurate, convincing	fully adequate	2	

NOTES:

[Handwritten signature]

Rep: BA mix (Olegarova)

Opp: 1SG (Alex)

Rep: (Olegarova?)

21

REPORTER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 2.5 + 1.5 - 0.5 = 5

Rep: Olegarova

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	almost no	almost no	almost no	misunderstood	unclear, chaotic	relevant arguments/responses	reporter's conduct in the discussion
1	some	some	some	some	review of sources, cited	partly	partly clear	too few	poor/aggressive
2	fair	fair	fair	qualitative agreement	some own input	average	average	some	partly fine
3	good	good	good	quantitative agreement	+ some interesting results	some aspects above average	some aspects well done	many	good
4	detailed demonstrative	quite detailed, correct	or multitude of parameters examined	+ limits discussed	or considerable experimental	interesting solution	overall clear, demonstrative	+ data/theory supported	some aspects efficient
5	deep and comprehensible, shows physical insight	detailed, complex, completely testable	and errors analysis	well fitting, deviations analysed, conclusive	and considerable theoretical	greater extent than expected	+ complex concepts well communicated	proved deep understanding	overall efficient

NOTES: - no conclusion from Es

- didn't have video

OPPONENT Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 2 + 2.5 - = 7

40s

QUESTIONS ASKED	OPPOSITION (SPEECH)	DISCUSSION WITH REPORTER	ANSWERS TO JURY and REVIEWER'S QUESTIONS
0	understanding of presentation	topics raised and their prioritisation	own opinions presented
0	almost nothing	almost none	too few
1	some main points	too few/many	some
2	main points	partially relevant	some correct
3	all relevant points	mostly relevant	many correct
4	practically all points	+ well prioritised	+ improvement suggestions

NOTES:

Good eye
 + no quant theory
 + systematic & deliberate
 + more time should have been spent

1. adhesive forces - "the closer the more" but not giant theory
 → how big the material change it?

REVIEWER Start from 1 and add/subtract

1 + 1.5 + 1 + 1 + 0.5 = 5

QUESTIONS ASKED	REVIEW OF REPORT	REVIEW OF OPPOSITION	DISCUSSION ANALYSIS	MISSED POINTS POINTED OUT	ANSWERS TO JURY QUESTIONS
0	evaluation & understanding	speech evaluation	discussion evaluation	irrelevant	concise and correct or no questions asked
0	poor/wrong	poor/wrong	poor	none	some incorrect, inconclusive or too long
1	superficial	superficial	superficial	relevant, constructive	deeply incorrect or shows deep misconceptions
2	good	good	relevant parts		
3	apt, accurate	apt & accurate	accurate, convincing		

NOTES: ⊖ adhesion
 ⊕ measure $u_1/u_2 = k$
 ⊕ explanation of phenomenon
 cons - ok
 pros: lot good explanation relevant points
 2 physical inferences of k

- not agree with closing

