





RCJA OnStage Novice Performance Scoresheet Team Name:

| Category | Descriptor | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|---|---|--|------------|---|----|--|--|--|--|
| HARDWARE | Robot(s) complete, sound and are working for the entire performance (3) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3: all robot(s) work | 0: no performance | | | | | | | | | |
| | All robot(s) play a role in the performance (4) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4: purposeful use of 2: some use of robot(s) 1: attempted use of 0: no performance | | | | | | | | | | |
| | robot(s) 2. some use of robot(s) 1. ut | | | | usc oj | possible | | | | | |
| | Interaction between robot and other non-robot components (e.g. props) (4) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4: purposeful interactions | _ | empted interactions | 1: limited interactions | | 0: no interactions | | | | | |
| | Robot(s) demonstrate motion via mechanical design. Examples include: wheelbase design, robotic arms, inclusion of simple systems (5) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 5: motion created via unique mechanical designs | 3: mot | ion created via inical design | 1: limited mot mechanical de | ion via | 0: no functional motion via mechanical design | | | | | |
| ENGINEERING | Robot appearance complimented the performance (5) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 5: well-coordinated robot appearance and performance theme/concept | appea attent | tly coordinated rance and ion paid to /concept | 1: appearance and performance theme/concept loosely linked | | 0: no obvious link between appearance and performance | | | | | |
| | Evidence of working interaction. Examples include: Robot(s) interacting | | | | | | | | | | |
| | between other robot(s), props or humans performers (3) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 3: purposeful interaction(s) | | e interaction(s) | 1: attempted interaction(s) | (-) | 0: no interactions | 11 | | | | |
| INNOVATION | Robot movements demonstrate risk. Examples include: triggering performance | | | | | | | | | | |
| | elements via sensors, creative mechanical movements, moving static props (5) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 5: Purposeful risk taking 4: Some risk taking 2: Attempted risk taking 0: no risks evident | | | | | | | | | | |
| | demonstrated demonstrated | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Robot(s) move in a themed manner. Examples include: synchronisation | | | | | | | | | | |
| | (Robot(s), music, human performers) (6) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 6: movements were | 4: movements were 2: movements indicated 0:no coordination | | | | | | | | | |
| CREATIVITY | purposeful coordinated and suitable some coordination evident The performance is stimulating and artistic (E) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | The performance is stimulating and artistic (5) 5: Engaging, purposeful, 4 mostly engaging, 2: Inconsistent, lacking 0: no performance | | | | | | | | | | |
| | audience centred | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Performers were e | Performers were engaged in the performance (2) | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2: Performers integral part of | | | | | | | | | | |
| | performance | | performance throu | | performand | re | | | | | |
| | A clear concept/th | | | ed (6) | | | | | | | |
| | 6: all aspects work together towards a clear goal | | t aspects work as a heme/concept | 2: some evidence of a theme/concept | | 0: no concept/theme evident through performance | | | | | |
| | Creative use of the | Creative use of the stage area relative to the theme or story (3) | | | | | | | | | |
| | 4: purposeful use of the stage area | 2: effort to use the stage area | | 1: some use of the stage area | | 0: limited use of the stage area | | | | | |
| 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 = 50, MINIMUM SCORE = 0 | | | | | | | | | | |







RCJA OnStage Novice Interview Score Sheet

Team Name:

| Category | Descriptor | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| HARDWARE | Design and construction unique for competition season (4) | | | | | | | | |
| | 4: Unique design and construence developed for the competition season | | 2: Attempted uniq developed, with so copied elements | - | 0: no elements unique. copied or sourced designs | | | | |
| | Use of moving parts (4) | | | | | | | | |
| | 4: unique or team designed moving parts that add to the robot(s) | | 2: attempted to a that add to the ro | ٥, | 0: No added moving parts | | | | |
| SOFTWARE | Programming language(s) clearly demonstrate knowledge and use of accepted | | | | | | | | |
| | programming techniques and features (4) | | | | | | | | |
| | 4: Highly developed and clearly demonstrated advanced use of complex programming techniques and features | | 2: some use of enl or features, techni functions | | 0: basic elements of simple programming languages only | | | | |
| | Concepts used to improve readability of code (including referencing) (4) | | | | | | | | |
| | 4: Coding concepts relevant to language, age and level improve readability | | 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 robot(s)) (4) | | | | | | | | |
| | 4: multiple sensors present that are all programmed and used in a purposeful manner | | 2: at least one sensor programmed and used in a purposeful manner | | 0: no use of program code to enable any sensors | | | | |
| ENGINEERING | Stable build (4) | | 1 | | | | 8 | | |
| | 4: Robot(s) are stable and well balanced | | 2: Robot(s) have some stability through good design and construction | | O: Robot(s) are unstable, or lack any designed stabilisation | | | | |
| | Technically sophistic | cated c | oncept (4) | | | | | | |
| | 4: overall theme/concept displays varied technical components to create a coherent performance | | 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 (5) | | | | | | | | |
| | 3: team members fully understand and can explain all aspects of their Robot(s), programming and their performance | 2: team underst explain their Ro | members and and can most aspects of bot(s), nming and | 1: team members can explain few aspects of their Robot(s), programming or performance | | 0: students cannot explain how their Robot(s) or programming work | 8 | | |
| | All team members involved throughout the interview (3) | | | | | | | | |
| | 3: all and multiple team members have made a balanced contribution to interview answers | can den of their | ole team members nonstrate evidence contribution to w 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 | TDP submitted (3) | | | | | | | | |
| DESCRIPTION | Hardware & Engineering (3) | | | | | | | | |
| PAPER | Software (2) | | | | | | | | |
| (shared with RCJ prior | Performance (2) | | | | | | | | |
| to or at competition) | - 5 | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | /50 | | | |