East Kingdom Arts and Science Competition - General Score Sheet



	_
-2	
W.	
W	
•	

Entrant SCA Name:	Item Description:		
Judges:		Total Score:	/48

Please include the names of all judges assessing the entry, and at least one e-mail address for follow-up questions.

Guidelines for use of the East Kingdom K&Q A&S Rubric

- The goal of this rubric is to provide a set of common criteria for arts and sciences entries that will provide concrete guidance and feedback to artisans about their work, and facilitate development of a more consistent judging experience in competition. We understand that there are subjective judgements involved when evaluators use rubrics, and that there could be variances between results from evaluator to evaluator. It is the goal of the Kingdom's Arts and Sciences office to work with evaluators to promote consistent use of the rubric by offering guidelines on how to use the rubric, and by working to familiarize evaluators with the rubric whenever possible. If you are having difficulty using the rubric with a particular entry in a competition, please notify the competition organizers so discussion can take place about how to work around this issue, and so that feedback can be given to the Kingdom Arts and Sciences office so the rubric can be modified in the future.
- This rubric uses an assumed ideal as its goal the recreation of a piece whose methods, materials, and social significance can be dated to specific time and place in the pre-17th century world. Artisans should aim to produce an item equivalent to a high quality museum reproduction piece, one that has been constructed using historically appropriate methods and materials, and one that functions in a historically appropriate manner. An item's performance in this rubric assumes that an artisan is striving for that ideal and wants to move their work in that direction. Some projects, depending on their goals, the nature of historic evidence available, or the practicality of using period construction methods, will be unable to attain certain levels in this rubric, and that's OK.
- While the rubric does not require detailed formal written documentation, it does require that an artisan supply evidence to support their work. The evidence should be drawn from relevant and authoritative sources and then analyzed and synthesized by the artisan to support their project. While written documentation is the most common vehicle for conveying evidence, artisans may provide evidence in other ways, including verbally. In face-to-face judging situations where written documentation is not required by competition rules, please consider both verbal and written documentation equally when judging. If you have a question and information is not provided by the artisan, please ask, and consider the artisan's answer when assessing the entry. Don't penalize an entrant for not supplying the information, if they know and can *fully* articulate and support the answer to your question.
- To provide a consistent judging experience for all entrants, please:
 - Read the rubric from left to right and apply the rubric categories as written while judging each entry.
 - o As you can see, there are six categories, and each category can have multiple elements.
 - Use the check boxes to indicate at what level an entrant has met each of the elements of a category. Judges can offer comments, where relevant, in the boxes under each rubric element during judging. After judging, please write summary comments and suggestions in the space provided at the end of the rubric.
 - o Scores for a category will be an average of the scores of each element in that category.
 - o Please note that a few categories are also weighted so they are worth more than other categories.
- The top score in the rubric should be very hard to achieve, and this score should be reserved for truly exemplary entries that go the extra mile to meet the assumed ideal stated above.

Challenge: Work is evaluated on the difficulty and challenge to the artisan for the project's creation and goals.					Average Score=
1	2	3	4	5	6
Work demonstrates a minimal degree of time, research, creativity and/or commitment.	Work demonstrates a basic degree of time, research, creativity and/or commitment.	Work demonstrates a moderate degree of time, research, creativity and/or commitment.	Work demonstrates a good degree of time, research, creativity and/or commitment.	Work demonstrates a great degree of time, research, creativity and/or commitment.	Work demonstrates an extensive degree of time, research, creativity and/or commitment.
Comments:					Score:
Artisans goals are unclear or vaguely expressed.	Goals are simplistic and "safe" for the artisan.	Goals push the artisan to develop their artistic skills in some way.	Goals force the artisan to expand their comfort zone relating to either their artistic skills or their knowledge of the topic.	Goals drive the artisan to explore and expand some aspects of both their artistic skills and their knowledge of the topic	Goals impel the artisan to explore new areas of knowledge in depth in order to enhance both their artistic skill and their understanding of the topic.
Comments:					Score:
Project is too easy for the artisan.	Project is relatively easy for the artisan.	Project presents some challenge or risk of project failure.	Project poses a new or interesting challenge for the artisan.	Project is difficult for the artisan, and poses multiple engaging challenges.	Project is of a very high degree of difficulty, addressing unique or esoteric challenges.
Comments:					Score:
Historical Context: Work is evaluated on the depth of its connection to a historic time and place, including a discussion and/or demonstration of its use an cultural context of the work. Cultural context can include information about the purpose of the item, its audience, and its value (social meaning/significance)					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Connection of work to historical time or place is tenuous at best.	Connection of work to historical time or place vague, covering a broad rang possibilities		at building a connec		Work presents a clear and compelling connection to a specific time and place in history.
Comments:					Score:
Discussion or analysis of historical and cultural context is weak. Use, meaning, or value of the work is not clear.	Discussion or analysis of historical and cultural context is developing. Possible use, meaning, or value is subjet to some speculation.	of historical and cultural context is clear.	Discussion or analysi of historical and cultu context is thoughtful. Insigl into probable use, meaning, value is provided.	ral cultural context argues for the use, meaning, and value of the work.	
Comments:					Score:

Materials: Work is evaluated on its use of materials (meaning items that are consumed or transformed in the creation process) that are similar or identical to historically appropriate materials. The material choices are supported with evidence and should be appropriate to the time, culture and purpose of the work. Substitutions should be appropriate and justifiable (e.g. not available in modern times, materials are hazardous).					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Work uses clearly modern or industrial materials that are substantially different from those in period.	Work uses more modern materials than historically appropriate ones, but does use historically appropriate materials.	Work uses a roughly even combination of historical and modern materials.	Work uses primarily historically appropriate materials.	Work uses historically appropriate materials, except for those extremely expensive or difficult to locate.	Work uses exclusively historically appropriate materials, including obscure, expensive, or difficult-to-locate materials; materials may even be researched and reconstructed independently.
Comments:					Score:
Substitutions are explained inadequately, or not at all.	Some substitutions may be explained and justifiable.	Most substitutions are reasonably explained and justifiable. Some period materials may not be used because of cost or time.	Substitutions are reasonably explained, appropriate, and justifiable. Period materials may not be used because of substantial cost or a lack of easy availability.	Substitutions are minimized as much as reasonably possible, and all substitutions are thoroughly explained, appropriate, and justified.	Entrant goes above and beyond to make sure that no substitutions have been made except in the case of health and safety, or materials which are cost-prohibitive, or unavailable in their period form.
Comments:					Score:
Information about historically accurate materials is vague or difficult to ascertain.	Minimal facts about historically accurate materials are present.	Some facts are provided about historically accurate materials.	Multiple facts are analyzed to present some evidence about historically accurate materials.	Ample evidence pertaining to materials and their historical accuracy is provided.	Information on all materials is completely supported by reputable evidence.
Comments:					Score:
Execution: Work is evaluated on the skill, workmanship, or artistic ability evident in its creation; in addition, the artisan is evaluated in how well their execution achieved their goals, and how they handled shortfalls Average Score					ution Average Score=
1	2	3	4	5	6
Work demonstrates a minimal degree of skill, workmanship, and/or artistic ability.	Work demonstrates a basic degree of skill, workmanship, and/or artistic ability.	Work demonstrates a moderate degree of skill, workmanship, and/or artistic ability.	Work demonstrates a good degree of skill, workmanship, and/or artistic ability.	Work demonstrates an advanced degree of skill, workmanship, and/or artistic ability.	Work demonstrates an exceptional degree of skill, workmanship, and/or artistic ability.
Comments:					Score:
It is unclear if the goals of the project were achieved.	Work achieves a few the goals set by the artisan.	of Work achieves many of the goals of the artisan.	The work achieves most of the artisan's goals.	The work achieves all of the artisan's goals for the project.	Not only does the artisan achieve their goals for this project, but their success informs other projects and goals as well.
Comments:					Score:

Artistic mistakes are not acknowledged.	Artistic mistakes are acknowledged.	Artistic mistakes and/or limitations in research or methodology are acknowledged, and some speculation for improvement is given.	Artistic mistakes and/or limitations in research or methodology are discussed in some detail, and the artisan gives a concrete idea of how this work could inform future projects.	Artistic mistakes and/or limitations in research or methodology are discussed in detail, and the artisan presents several possible "next steps" or ways this work could inform future projects to address what they've learned.	Artistic mistakes or limitations in research or methodology are embraced, being discussed in thorough detail, and in comparison to mistakes evident in period examples, if relevant. Lessons learned and multiple future avenues of exploration are outlined.
Comments:					Score:
supported with evidence a	and should be appropriate to the	ne time, culture and purpose of	dentical to or emulate those us of the work. Use of modern modern to to to reflect the execution or su	ethods should be appropriate, and	Average Score =(x2) =
1	2	3	4	5	6
Work uses modern techniques.	Work uses a majority of modern techniques with some use or emulation of period techniques.	Work uses or emulates a combination of period and modern techniques.	Work uses or emulates ma period techniques, but som modern techniques are used.		obscure or the product of experimental
Comments:					Score:
Reason for the use of the modern technique is explained inadequately, or not at all.	Some use of the modern techniques may be explained.	Most techniques employed are reasonably justified and explained. Some period methods may not be used because of cost or time.	Substitutions are reasonab explained, appropriate, and justifiable. Period methods may be used because of substantial coor time.	as reasonably possible, and all substitutions are thoroughly explained,	Entrant goes above and beyond to make sure that no substitutions are made except for those that are cost-prohibitive or impact health and safety.
Comments:					Score:
Information about the period technique is vague or difficult to ascertain.	Minimal facts about period technique are supplied.	Some facts are provided about period technique.	Multiple facts are analyzed present some evidence relatore to period technique.		Information on all period methods is completely supported by reputable evidence.
Comments:					Score:
Tools used are entirely modern, meaning that they are substantially and functionally different from period tools. No discussion of historic tools is included.	Some tool use is discussed in relation to historical method, though tools are still entirely modern.	Some attempt at period-similar tool use is made, and most tool use is related to historical practice, but tools still perform differently from period tools.	Period or period-similar to are employed in significan parts of the work; information of tool use informs process.	period-similar tools wherever	Period tools are employed exclusively, and may themselves be researched and reconstructed independently of the work in question.
Comments:					Score:

Sources: Work is evaluated on the use of evidence from many sources. Sources used should be a mixture of analytical (secondary) sources written by knowledgeable experts, and direct (primary) evidence, as available. Artisan should be able to discuss the significance of their sources					
1	2	3	4	5	6
Indirect or encyclopedic sources are used exclusively.	A minimal variety of direct or analytical sources used.	A fair variety of direct or analytical sources are used.	A good variety of direct and/or analytical sources are used.	An extensive variety of direct and/or analytical sources is employed.	An exhaustive variety of direct and analytical sources is employed to show current scholarly knowledge of the topic, and includes unique/obscure sources or original research.
Comments:					Score:
The quality of the sources seems very inadequate or limited.	Many of the sources are of inadequate or limited quality.	Quality of sources is uneven.	Quality of sources is generally good.	Quality of sources is excellent.	Quality is superlative, with an array of types of sources fitting the purpose of the project.
Comments:					Score:
Applicability of sources to the project and authority of the source creator have not been discussed.	Applicability of sources to the project and authority of the source creator have been minimally established.	Applicability of sources to the project and authority of the source creator is somewhat established	The applicability of sources to the project and authority of the source creator have been clearly established	Applicability of sources to the project and authority of the source creator have been well established & the limitations of sources used or available have been discussed.	Applicability of sources to the project and authority of the source creator have been well established & the limitations of sources used or available have been discussed in detail.
Comments:					Score:

Summary Feedback:

What did the entry do well?	
What are some next steps for the artisan?	