



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
ENGINEERING	Robots demonstrate moving components fit for the performance (3)	8			
	3: multiple moving components beyond a rolling base		2: at least one component beyond rolling base	1: functional rolling base	0: no functional movement
	Robot appearance complimented the performance (5)				
	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				



RCJA OnStage Novice Interview Score Sheet

Team Name: _____

Category	Descriptor			Score	
HARDWARE	Design and construction new and unique for competition season (2)			4	
	<i>2: new and unique design and construction developed for the competition season</i>	<i>1: Some elements of design and construction newly developed, with some sourced or copied elements</i>	<i>0: no elements new or unique. copied previous models or sourced designs</i>		
HARDWARE	Use of moving parts (2)			4	
	<i>2: a range of moving parts that demonstrate multiple modes of movement</i>	<i>1: some use of moving parts</i>	<i>0: No moving parts beyond a rolling base</i>		
SOFTWARE	Programming language(s) clearly demonstrate knowledge and use of accepted programming techniques and features (4)			14	
	<i>3-4: Highly developed and clearly demonstrated advanced use of complex programming techniques and features</i>	<i>1-2: some use of enhanced languages or features, techniques and/or functions</i>	<i>0: basic elements of simple programming languages only</i>		
	Concepts used to improve readability of code (4)				
	<i>3-4: Coding concepts relevant to language, age and level improve readability</i>	<i>1-2: Coding concepts relevant to language, age and level improve readability in some way</i>	<i>0: no evidence of any effort used to improve readability</i>		
	Sensors used to enhance interaction between robot(s) and the environment (stage, props, other robots) (4)				
	<i>3-4: multiple sensors present that are all programmed and used in a purposeful manner</i>	<i>1-2: at least one sensor programmed and used in a purposeful manner</i>	<i>0: no use of program code to enable any sensors</i>		
SOFTWARE	Evidence of messaging between robot and other elements (2)			6	
	<i>2: purposeful programmed messaging between robot and other robots, props or stage element</i>	<i>1: some evidence of a programmed message between robot and another robot or prop or stage element</i>	<i>0: no programmed messaging evident</i>		
	Stable build (2)				
	<i>2: robots are stable and well balanced</i>	<i>1: robots have some stability through good design and construction</i>	<i>0: robots are unstable, or lack any designed stabilisation</i>		
	Technically sophisticated concept (4)				
	<i>3-4: overall theme/concept displays varied technical components to create a coherent performance</i>	<i>1-2: overall theme/concept has more than one technical component that contributes to the performance</i>	<i>0: performance is simple, without any technical complexity beyond a rolling base moving or a motor turning</i>		
PRESENTATION	Students can clearly explain how their robot(s) work (3)			6	
	<i>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)				
TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION PAPER	<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>	
	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	