RoboCup Junior AUSTRALIA

2022

mta modern teaching aids

RCJA OnStage Novice Performance Scoresheet

Team Name:

Category	Descriptor				Score
HARDWARE	**Robots complete, sound and are working for the entire performance (4)**				**15**
	3-4: all robot(s) work	*2: robot(s) have minor errors*	*1: robot(s) have major errors*	*0: no performance possible*	
	All robots play a role in the performance (5)				
	4-5: all powered objects have a role	*2-3: some powered object has no role*	*1: many powered objects have no role*	*0: all powered objects have no role*	
	Interaction between robot and other non-robot components (3)				
	3: multiple interactions between range of components	*2: some interactions*	*1: limited interactions at limited points in performance*	*0: no interactions*	
	Robots demonstrate moving components fit for the performance (3)				
	3: multiple moving components beyond a rolling base	*2: at least one component beyond rolling base*	*1: functional rolling base*	*0: no functional movement*	
ENGINEERING	**Robot appearance complimented the performance (5)**				**8**
	5-4: well-coordinated robot appearance and performance theme/concept	*3-2: mostly coordinated appearance and attention paid to theme/concept*	*1: appearance and performance theme/concept loosely linked*	*0: no obvious link between appearance and performance*	
	Evidence of working communication between robots through interaction (3)				
	3: multiple Interactions throughout the performance both visible and clear	*2: several clear interactions within the performance*	*1: very few opportunities to interact within performance*	*0: no evidence or interactions*	
INNOVATION	**Robot movements demonstrate risk (6)**				**12**
	5-6: Multiple, varying risks demonstrated throughout the performance	*3-4: Several risks with some variety demonstrated within the performance*	*1-2: At least one risk taken by moving close to edge, risking balance etc.*	*0: no risks evident*	
	Robots move in a synchronised/themed manner (6)				
	5-6: movement of robots was purposeful, coordinated and suitable	*3-4: movement of robots was coordinated and suitable*	*1-2: movement of robots indicated some coordination*	*0:no coordination evident*	
CREATIVITY	**The performance is stimulating and artistic (10)**				**25**
	8-10: Engaging, purposeful, audience centred	*5-7: mostly engaging, audience centred*	*1-4: Inconsistent, lacking purpose and focus*	*0: no performance values visible*	
	Performers were engaged in the performance (3)				
	3: Performers integral part of performance	*1-2: Performers enhanced the performance through movement*	*0: No humans performed during performance*		
	A clear concept/theme is established (8)				
	7-8: all aspects work together towards a clear goal	*4-6: most aspects work as a clear theme/concept*	*1-3: some evidence of a theme/concept*	*0: no concept/theme evident through performance*	
	Creative use of the stage area (4)				
	3-4: performance used whole stage in a variety of ways	*2: performance used parts of the stage in a creative way*	*1: performance used more than one part of the stage*	*0: static performance using set parts of the stage*	
DEDUCTIONS	Restarts (-1) **(Maximum of 2 allowed)**				
	Each unplanned human intervention (-1). **(Maximum 2 point deduction)** **Not applied if restart applied.**				
	Robot outside stage (-1) **(Maximum 4 point deduction)** **Not applied if restart applied.**				
	Exceeding allotted time: Performance ends immediately (-3)				
TOTAL	MAXIMUM SCORE = 60, MINIMUM SCORE = 0				

2022

RCJA OnStage Novice Interview Score Sheet

Team Name:

Category	Descriptor				Score
HARDWARE	**Design and construction new and unique for competition season (2)**				**4**
	2: new and unique design and construction developed for the competition season	*1: Some elements of design and construction newly developed, with some sourced or copied elements*	*0: no elements new or unique. copied previous models or sourced designs*		
	Use of moving parts (2)				
	2: a range of moving parts that demonstrate multiple modes of movement	*1: some use of moving parts*	*0: No moving parts beyond a rolling base*		
SOFTWARE	**Programming language(s) clearly demonstrate knowledge and use of accepted programming techniques and features (4)**				**14**
	3-4: Highly developed and clearly demonstrated advanced use of complex programming techniques and features	*1-2: some use of enhanced languages or features, techniques and/or functions*	*0: basic elements of simple programming languages only*		
	Concepts used to improve readability of code (4)				
	3-4: Coding concepts relevant to language, age and level improve readability	*1-2: Coding concepts relevant to language, age and level improve readability in some way*	*0: no evidence of any effort used to improve readability*		
	Sensors used to enhance interaction between robot(s) and the environment (stage, props, other robots) (4)				
	3-4: multiple sensors present that are all programmed and used in a purposeful manner	*1-2: at least one sensor programmed and used in a purposeful manner*	*0: no use of program code to enable any sensors*		
	Evidence of messaging between robot and other elements (2)				
	2: purposeful programmed messaging between robot and other robots, props or stage element	*1: some evidence of a programmed message between robot and another robot or prop or stage element*	*0: no programmed messaging evident*		
ENGINEERING	**Stable build (2)**				**6**
	2: robots are stable and well balanced	*1: robots have some stability through good design and construction*	*0: robots are unstable, or lack any designed stabilisation*		
	Technically sophisticated concept (4)				
	3-4: overall theme/concept displays varied technical components to create a coherent performance	*1-2: overall theme/concept has more than one technical component that contributes to the performance*	*0: performance is simple, without any technical complexity beyond a rolling base moving or a motor turning*		
PRESENTATION	**Students can clearly explain how their robot(s) work (3)**				**6**
	3: team members fully understand and can explain all aspects of their robots, programming and their performance	*2: team members understand and can explain most aspects of their robots, programming and performance*	*1: team members can explain few aspects of their robots, programming or performance*	*0: students cannot explain how their robots or programming work*	
	All team members involved throughout the interview (3)				
	3: all and multiple team members have made a balanced contribution to interview answers	*2: multiple team members can demonstrate evidence of their contribution to interview materials*	*1: evidence of contributions to interview or materials by more than one person*	*0: one team member only contributes to interview and interview materials*	
TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION PAPER	**Demonstrates that the work on display is authentic (6)**				**10**
	Hardware development process clearly indicated (1)				
	Performance concept development clearly indicated (1)				
	Software development process clearly indicated (2)				
TOTAL				**/40**	