

The scoring criteria

VI International Natural Sciences Tournament

11-16 November 2015, Saint Petersburg, Russia



At the end of the challenge, each member of the jury gives a total of 6 scores for the participants, 1 to 10 points per each.

- The speaking Team is given 3 scores: for the solution of the problem, for the presentation, as well as a personal score for the Speaker's work
- The opposing Team is given 2 scores: for the opposition and a personal score for the Opponent's work
- The reviewing Team is given 1 score for the speech of the Reviewer

The personal scores for the Speaker's work and the Opponent's work take into account: the Speaker's report, the «Speaker-Opponent» polemics, the Opponent's speech, the triple polemics and the Speaker's and Opponent's answers to the questions of the jury.

Detailed scoring criteria are shown below. Participants are advised to pay attention to them while preparing for the tournament.

The Problem Solution		Final mark (from 1 to 10 points):	total
Problem statement	Analysis of the problem statement, indication of important points for the solution. Introduction of additional conditions and limitations, which are taken into account in the solution		up to 2 points
Information review about the problem	Analysis of original sources (books, articles, patents, thesis abstracts, etc.), completeness and reliability of information.		up to 2 points
Working through of the proposed solution	<i>Scored whatever is possible:</i> - Creating a scheme / model of the proposed process, installation, synthesis, etc. - Calculations justifying the solutions actuality - Experimental confirmation of the solution - Economic evaluation of proposed ideas, their profitability		up to 3 points
Analysis and evaluation of own solution	Consideration of advantages and drawbacks of the solution, comparative characteristic of existing approaches with the proposed solution		up to 3 points
Fines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Factual errors and incorrect statements <u>in the solution</u> (1-3) - Logical errors in the construction of <u>the solution</u> (1-2) - Incomplete solution, not all tasks stated in the problem are answered (1-4) - The solution doesn't work or is not applicable under given conditions (1-2) 		
Bonuses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Originality of the solution: Presence and quality of own original ideas or ideas that improve known solutions (1-2) - Consideration of non-obvious, but important facts affecting the solution (1-2) 		

The Presentation		Final mark (from 1 to 10 points):	total
Display of the scientific idea	Accessibility of the report to the listener, the relevance of diagrams, drawings, tables and other pictorial elements of the report, the presence of definitions of specific terms.		up to 4 points
Appearance of the presentation	The presentation's design and visual content. Presence and functionality of titles, signs, drawings, definitions of abbreviations, references, slide numeration, etc.		up to 3 points
Logic and consistency of narration	Interconnection between various parts of the report, the credibility and clarity of the solving process, the presence and accessibility of the information needed for understanding the essence of the problem and the proposed solution		up to 3 points
Fines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reading from the sheet / from slides (1-3) - Problems with performance duration (1-3) 		
Bonuses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional demonstrational material to help the perception of the solution (1) - Successfully finding a way to demonstrate a difficult-to-understand material (1) 		

The Opposition		Final mark (from 1 to 10 points):	total
Evaluation of the proposed solution	Adequacy of the findings made by the Opponent considering the integrity and quality of the proposed solution		up to 2 points
Indication of drawbacks of the solution	The fullness and significance of the found shortcomings in the Speaker's solution, indication of the facts the Speaker left out		up to 4 points
Justification of criticism and statements	Scientific validity of given criticism and solution analysis, the availability and quality of arguments used to explain own point of view		up to 4 points
Fines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Factual errors in the opposition (1-3) - Logic errors in the opposition (1-2) - Retelling of own solution (1-2) 		
Bonuses	- Consideration of non-obvious, but important facts that affect the analysis of the solution (1-2)		

The Reviewer		Final mark (from 1 to 10 points):	total
Evaluation of the Problem Solution	Adequacy and validity of the assessment made about the Problem Solution		up to 2 points
Evaluation of the Presentation	Adequacy and validity of the assessment made about the Presentation		up to 2 points
Evaluation of the Speaker's work	Adequacy and validity of the assessment made about the Speaker's Work		up to 2 points
Evaluation of the Opposition	Adequacy and validity of the assessment made about the Opposition		up to 2 points
Evaluation of the Opponent's work	Adequacy and validity of the assessment made about the Opponent's work		up to 2 points
Fines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Factual errors and incorrect statements (1-3) - Logic errors (1-2) - Incorrect behavior (1-2) - Quiet or slurred speech (1) 		
Bonuses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resourcefulness and the ability to hold the blow (1-2) - Answering questions and erudition (1-2) 		

The Speaker / the Opponent		Final mark (from 1 to 10 points):	total
Answering questions, erudition and mastery of the material	Scientific validity of the statements, the ability to think and properly use scientific terminology, the knowledge of the report subject, the answers to questions of the jury, the opponent etc.		up to 4 points
Polemical skills	Ability to intelligently argue, ask questions, find weaknesses in the foreign arguments, to listen to and to hear questions and answer them appropriately		up to 3 points
Oratory skills	Emotion, eloquence and persuasiveness of the performance, correctness of phrase construction and word use		up to 3 points
Fines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Factual errors and incorrect statements during the polemics and while answering questions (1-3) - Logic errors (1-2) - Incorrect behavior (1-2) - Quiet or slurred speech (1) 		
Bonuses	- Resourcefulness and the ability to hold the blow (1-2)		