



# International Physicists' Tournament

Date: 12 May 2022

Time: 16:00 COL

Decision Assembly

Location: Bucaramanga, Colombia + Zoom

---

**Meeting called by:** Anastasiia Vasylychenkova      **Type of meeting:** Decision Committee Assembly

**Facilitator:** Alberto Rolandi      **Note taker:** Evgeniy Glushkov

**Attendees:**

<u>Execom</u>	<u>IOC</u>
Evgeniy Glushkov (+Switzerland)	Ake Andersson (Sweden)
Anastasiia Vasylychenkova (+UK)	Christos Andrikopoulos (Greece)
Matheus Pessoa (+Canada)	Federico Serrano Morales (Colombia)
Alberto Rolandi	Anastasiia Haieva (Ukraine, delegate)
Camilla Diaz	Maria Carolina França Volpato (Brazil)
David Collomb	Krzysztof Turzynski (Poland)
	Nikola Poljak (Croatia)
	Arnaud Raoux (France)
<u>Observers</u>	Aeysha Khalique (Pakistan)
Cyrus Walther (IAPS)	Manuel Morgado (Venezuela)
	Andrew Penton (Australia)
	Peter Vesborg (Denmark)
	Florian Hirsch, Lisanne Loher (Germany, delegates)
	Władysław Sowul, Szymon Błazucki (the Netherlands, delegates)

*also Evgenii, Anastasiia, Matheus (in Execom)*

**Apologies:** Stanislav Vinogradov (Russia), Vladimir Vanovsky (execom), Nicoletta Mauri (Italy), Dina Izadi (Iran), Suvendu Barik (India), Nikolay Lysenko (execom, design), Nikolay Avdeev (execom, IPT connect)

## Minutes

---

**Agenda item:** Last IPT feedback      **Moderator:** Anastasiia Vasylychenkova

### Discussion:

P. Vesborg raises the question of logarithmic vs. linear grading scale in CFs.

Krzysztof raises several concerns about the current PF grading at the IPT. He suggests making a task force, working on a common amendment to the IPT rules regarding grading (i.e. make each juror explain their mark). E. Glushkov agrees. A. Rolandi reminds that it's important to keep the jury grading independent from each other. Also suggest to swap feedback



from jurors (obligatory) and showing the grades. M. Pessoa suggests formalizing the feedback, F.Serrano suggests a grading & feedback form.

Krzystof raises the concern about the role of the reviewer and suggests changing the name of it and describing more clearly its tasks. Most of the online IOCs agree. Anastasiia from the Ukraine team suggests making a short video describing the roles.

A. Rolandi suggests renaming the Opponent as well.

German team says that the role, tasks and grading of the Reviewer are clear.

David agrees that more information about the Reviewer should be given.

Krzystof talks about problems requiring expensive scientific equipment, suggesting to take this into account when compiling the list of problems for next year. A. Rolandi agrees. A. Vasylychenkova suggests putting a passage about recommendations for the proposed problems to the problem suggestion form.

---

**Agenda item:** IAPS partnership

**Moderator:** Anastasiia Vasylychenkova

**Discussion:**

*Throughout the year we have been shaping the agreement with the International Association of Physics Students. The proposal is to become a major event under the umbrella of the IAPS, getting more certainty in terms of funding and publicity, but getting some bureaucratic burden. It appeared to be a contradictory topic within our community, so, I would very much like all opinions to be spoken up and heard. I am attaching a copy of last year's DA minutes, it may help to recall the decision made so far. At the current IAPS, I will present the agreement proposal, commitments and benefits. If the IAPS agreement goes live (it is subject to approval for both our DA and their decision body - Annual General Meeting happening in August), we will have to make live*



*updated official rules. I am attaching the first draft of the proposal, and we will want to hear your opinions and suggestions. A couple of IAPS representatives will be in presence for some short time during the DA meeting for Q'n'A session.*

Cyrus from IAPS briefly comments on the collaboration, stating mutual benefits.

A. Vasylichenkova describes in detail the draft of the agreement.

Cyrus adds that there's no desire to change IPT from the side of IAPS, as we know better how to run it.

Krzysztof raises the question of interference of IAPS vs. IPT National committees. Cyrus replies that the interaction is not obligatory, IPT can use the IAPS NCs as a resource.

Membership fee topic is brought up by F. Serrano. It might be a very heavy duty for Latin American countries. Krzysztof reminds everyone that it's a combination of benefits and obligations. A. Rolandi suggests removing the obligation of all participants of National Selections to be members of IAPS. Only at the International level. E. Glushkov agrees.

David reminds the importance to have the "way out" written for the IPT in the agreement with IAPS. E. Glushkov agrees.

E. Glushkov raises a question of the influence of the newcoming IAPS members on the IPT. M. Pessoa suggests limiting the number of the participating teams. Krzysztof says that they will be automatically filtered out during the National Selections.

---

**Agenda item:** EPS association update **Moderator:** Anastasiia Vasylichenkova

**Discussion:**

*We recently received the Association status with the European Physics Society, now the IPT Statute is held in court, and we have official recognition as an event.*

The association is warmly welcomed. A. Rolandi says it might be beneficial as now we can accept money from other organisations, like CERN.

---

**Agenda item:** Hosts for next editions **Moderator:** Anastasiia Vasylichenkova

**Discussion:**

2023: France – expressed interest months prior to the meeting, Croatia – can potentially host;

2024: Brazil – has interest and departmental support; , Ukraine – heartfully willing to host, Croatia – can potentially host, Germany – interested in hosting as well.

---

**Agenda item:** Exclusion of Team Russia and mixed team issues **Moderator:** Anastasiia Vasylichenkova + Alberto Rolandi

**Discussion:**

Establishing the IPT ethics committee.

- A. Bhat raises a question of who will be in this committee.



- Krzystof says that it shouldn't be an external body. Suggests that it's not a committee, but a code of conduct (which should also be written). And then Execom is a body enough of making sure this code of conduct is implemented.
- M. Pessoa and A. Rolandi suggested that it shouldn't be just in case of war, but also to enable general well-being of the IPT participants during the event.
- Christos raises up question of a faster communication channel for the IOC with Execom. A. Rolandi proposes to use Discord as everyone is used to it after the tournament.
- Anastasiia from Ukraine mentions that we should distinguish between banning countries, universities and individuals.

Registration of the mixed country team. Come up with a regulated way of dealing with mixed countries' participants.

- Krzystof says that not only universities, but also science clubs should be allowed to join IPT. A. Vasylenkova says that there's no prohibition in the rules for that.
- A. Rolandi says that it can be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. Christos says it's better to have it written in the rules. U. Mur strongly supports this idea, and thinks it's necessary to write down clear rules. Team Germany says that it is not a simple issue as it involves nationality and/or university affiliation. Many other opinions were expressed, but most people agree that a rule about that should be written. Execom will moderate this process.