2024

RCJA OnStage Open Performance Score Sheet

Team Name:

Category	Descriptor				Score
HARDWARE	**Robot(s) complete, sound and are working for the entire performance (3)**				14
	3: all robot(s) work	*2: robot(s) have minor errors*	*1: robot(s) have major errors*	*0: no performance possible*	
	All Robot(s) play a role in the performance (4)				
	4: purposeful use of robot(s)	*2: some use of robot(s)*	*1: attempted use of robot(s)*	*0: no performance possible*	
	Interaction between robot and other non-robot components (4)				
	4: purposeful interactions	*2: attempted interactions*	*1: limited interactions*	*0: no interactions*	
	Robot(s) demonstrate motion via mechanical design. Examples include: wheelbase design, robotic arms, inclusion of simple systems (3)				
	3: motion created via unique mechanical designs	*2: motion created via mechanical design*	*1: limited motion via mechanical design*	*0: no functional motion via mechanical design*	
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 interaction. Examples include: Robot(s) interacting between other robot(s), props or humans performers (4)				
	4: purposeful interaction(s)	*3: some interaction(s)*	*1: attempted interaction(s)*	*0: no interactions*	
INNOVATION	**Robot movements demonstrate risk. Examples include: triggering performance elements via sensors, creative mechanical movements, moving static props (6)**				12
	6: Purposeful risk taking demonstrated	*4: Some risk taking demonstrated*	*2: Attempted risk taking demonstrated*	*0: no risks evident*	
	Robot(s) move in a themed manner. Examples include: synchronisation (Robot(s), music, human performers) (6)				
	6: movements were purposeful	*4: movements were coordinated and suitable*	*2: movements indicated some coordination*	*0: no coordination evident*	
CREATIVITY	**The performance is stimulating and artistic (6)**				17
	6: Engaging, purposeful, audience centred	*4: mostly engaging, audience centred*	*2: 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/goal is established (5)				
	5: all aspects work together towards a clear goal	*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 relative to the theme or story (4)				
	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). **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**
	4: Highly developed and clearly demonstrated advanced use of complex programming techniques and features	*2: some use of enhanced languages or features, techniques and/or functions*		*0: basic elements of simple programming languages only*	
	Concepts used to improve efficiency and readability of code (including referencing) (4)				
	4: Coding concepts with examples to improve efficiency and readability	*2: Coding concepts with some code to improve efficiency or readability in some way*		*0: no evidence of improved readability of code*	
	Sensors used to enhance interaction between robot(s) and the environment (stage, props, other Robot(s)) (5)				
	5: multi-sensor systems work in a purposeful manner	*3: multiple sensors used individually in a purposeful manner*	*1: at least one sensor used in a purposeful manner*	*0: no use of any sensors*	
	Evidence of planned interaction between robot and the environment (4)				
	4 purposeful programmed messaging between robot and other Robot(s), props or stage element	*2: 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 unique for competition season (2)**				**14**
	2: Unique design and construction developed for the competition season	*1: Attempted unique design developed, with some sourced or copied elements*		*0: no elements unique. copied or sourced designs*	
	Use of moving parts (4)				
	2: unique or team designed moving parts that add to the robot(s)	*1: attempted to add moving parts that add to the robot(s)*		*0: No added moving parts*	
	Stable build with evidence of stabilisation techniques (4)				
	4: Robot(s) are stable, well balanced and braced. Costumes are designed to complement movement without inhibiting the robot(s) range or performance	*2: Robot(s) have some stability through good design and construction. Costumes are present and do not interfere with robot(s) movement*		*0: Robot(s) are unstable or lack any designed stabilisation. Costumes do not add to the performance and inhibit movement*	
	Technically sophisticated concept (5)				
	5: overall theme/concept displays multiple and varied technical components linked together to create a coherent performance	*3: 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
	4: team members fully understand and can explain all aspects of their Robot(s), programming and their performance	*2: team members understand and can explain most aspects of their Robot(s), programming and performance*	*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*	
	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*	
	Students can explain the design process and provide examples of problem solving during the development of their performance (3)				
	3: Students can provide evidence of learning through examples of overcoming problems and solutions to create their performance	*2: Some evidence provided with explanations and examples.*	*1: Limited evidence of learning. Students are unable to fully explain their solutions.*	*0: No learning or explanations of solutions provided.*	
TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION PAPER	**TDP submitted (3)**				10
	Hardware & Engineering (3)				
	Software (2)				
	Performance (2)				
TOTAL					/50