RCJA OnStage Experienced Performance Score Sheet

Category	Descriptor				Score
HARDWARE	**Robots complete, sound and are working for the entire performance (3)**				**15**
	3: all robots work	2: robot has minor error	1: robot has major error	0: no performance possible	
	All robots play a role in the performance (5)				
	4-5: all robots/props 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 (4)				
	3-4: 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 (3)**				**8**
	3: well-coordinated robot appearance and performance theme/concept	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 (5)				
	5-6: multiple Interactions throughout the performance both visible and clear	3-4: several clear interactions within the performance	1-2: very few opportunities to interact within performance	0: no evidence or interactions	
INNOVATION	**Robot movements demonstrate risk (6)**				**14**
	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 (8)				
	7-8: movement of robots was purposeful, coordinated and suitable	4-6: movement of robots was coordinated and suitable	1-3: movement of robots indicated some coordination	0:no coordination evident	
CREATIVITY	**The performance is stimulating and artistic (8)**				**23**
	6-8: Engaging, purposeful, audience centred	4-5: mostly engaging, audience centred	1-3: 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). **Not applied if restart applied.**				
	Robot outside stage (-1). **Not applied if restart applied.**				
	Exceeding allotted time: Performance ends immediately (-5)				
TOTAL	MAXIMUM SCORE = 60, MINIMUM SCORE = 0				

RCJA OnStage Experienced Interview Score Sheet

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 not including a rolling base (2)			
	2: a range of moving parts that demonstrate multiple modes of movement	*1: some use of moving parts beyond a rolling base*	*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*	
	Advanced concepts used to improve efficiency and readability of code (4)			
	3-4: advanced coding concepts relevant to language, age and level improve efficiency and readability	*1-2: advanced coding concepts relevant to language, age and level improve efficiency or readability in some way*	*0: no evidence of any enhancement or effort used to improve readability or efficiency of code*	
	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 using efficient code to interact in multiple ways and at multiple times throughout	*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 with evidence of bracing or stabilisation techniques (2)**			**6**
	2: robots are stable, well balanced and braced	*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 multiple and varied technical components linked together 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*	

Category	Descriptor				Score
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*	

Category	Descriptor	Score
TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION PAPER	**Demonstrates that the work on display is authentic (4)**	**10**
	Hardware development process clearly indicated (2)	
	Performance concept development clearly indicated (2)	
	Software development process clearly indicated (2)	
TOTAL	/40	