



RCJA OnStage Open Performance Score Sheet

Team Name:

Category	Descriptor				Score
HARDWARE	Robots complete, sound and are working for the entire performance (3)				14
	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 (4)				
	4: all robots/props have a role	3-2: 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)				
	4-3: 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 (3)				7
	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 (4)				
4: multiple Interactions throughout the performance both visible and clear	3: several clear interactions within the performance	2-1: very few opportunities to interact within performance	0: no evidence or interactions		
INNOVATION	Robot movements demonstrate risk (6)				12
	6-5: Multiple, varying risks demonstrated throughout the performance	4-3: Several risks with some variety demonstrated within the performance	2-1: 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)				
	6-5: movement of robots was purposeful, coordinated and suitable	4-3: movement of robots was coordinated and suitable	2-1: movement of robots indicated some coordination	0: no coordination evident	
CREATIVITY	The performance is stimulating and artistic (6)				17
	6-5: Engaging, purposeful, audience centred	4-3: mostly engaging, audience centred	2-1: Inconsistent, lacking purpose and focus	0: no performance values visible	
	Performers were engaged in the performance (2)				
	2: Performers integral part of performance	1: Performers enhanced the performance through movement	0: No humans performed during performance		
	A clear concept/theme is established (5)				
	5-4: all aspects work together towards a clear goal	3-2: most aspects work as a clear theme/concept	1: some evidence of a theme/concept	0: no concept/theme evident through performance	
Creative use of the stage area (4)					
4-3: 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 = 50, MINIMUM SCORE = 0				



RCJA OnStage Open Interview Score Sheet

Team Name:

Category	Descriptor	Score			
SOFTWARE & SENSORS	Programming language(s) clearly demonstrate knowledge and use of accepted programming techniques and features (4)	16			
	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 with examples to improve efficiency and readability		1-2: advanced coding concepts with some code to 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) (5)				
	5-4: multi-sensor systems work in a purposeful manner at multiple occasions during the performance		3-2: multiple sensors used individually in a purposeful manner	1: at least one sensor programmed and used in a purposeful manner	0: no use of program code to enable any sensors
	Evidence of messaging or planned interaction between robot and other elements (4)				
4-3: purposeful programmed messaging between robot and other robots, props or stage element	2-1: some evidence of a programmed message between robot and another robot or prop or stage element	0: no programmed messaging evident			
HARDWARE & ENGINEERING	Design and construction new and unique for competition season (2)	14			
	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	
	Stable build with evidence of stabilisation techniques (4)				
	4-3: robots are stable, well balanced and braced. Costumes are designed to complement movement without inhibiting the robot(s) range or performance		2-1: robots have some stability through good design and construction. Costumes are present and do not interfere with robot(s) movement	0: robots are unstable, or lack any designed stabilisation. Costumes do not add to the performance and inhibit movement	
	Technically sophisticated concept (5)				
5-4: overall theme/concept displays multiple and varied technical components linked together to create a coherent performance	3-2: overall theme/concept some technical components that contributes to the performance	1: Some evidence towards technical components adding 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 (4)				10
	<i>4-3: team members fully understand and can explain all aspects of their robots, programming and their performance</i>	<i>2: team members understand and can explain most aspects of their robots, programming and performance</i>	<i>1: team members can explain few aspects of their robots, programming or performance</i>	<i>0: students cannot explain how their robots or programming work</i>	
	All team members involved throughout the interview (3)				
	<i>3: all and multiple team members have made a balanced contribution to interview answers</i>	<i>2: multiple team members can demonstrate evidence of their contribution to interview materials</i>	<i>1: evidence of contributions to interview or materials by more than one person</i>	<i>0: one team member only contributes to interview and interview materials</i>	
TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION PAPER	Students can explain the design process and provide examples of problem solving during the development of their performance (3)				10
	<i>3: Students can provide evidence of learning through examples of overcoming problems and solutions to create their performance</i>	<i>2: Some evidence provided with explanations and examples.</i>	<i>1: Limited evidence of learning. Students are unable to fully explain their solutions.</i>	<i>0: No learning or explanations of solutions provided.</i>	
	Demonstrates that the work on display is authentic (4)				
TOTAL	Hardware development process clearly indicated (2)				/50
	Performance concept development clearly indicated (2)				
	Software development process clearly indicated (2)				