

# East Kingdom Arts and Science Competition - Research Score Sheet



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 Research Rubric

The goal of this rubric is to provide a set of common criteria for research focused arts and sciences entries which 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. 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.

- This rubric uses an assumed ideal as its goal - the creation of a research project which does more than simply summarize known information. It should ask a question, make an argument, prove a point, or draw a conclusion of historical significance or of significance to the way in which we attempt to accurately recreate the past in the SCA.
- A research project can be a research paper, but, research can also be presented visually (using a poster board, table display, etc.) or, an entry can be a combination of the two. If the entry is a combination of a paper and visual display, please consider both 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.
  - As you can see there are 4 categories, but each category can have multiple elements.
  - Use the check boxes to indicate at what level and entrant has met each of the elements of a category. Judges can offer comments, where relevant, in the boxes under each rubric category during judging. After judging, please write summary comments and suggestions in the space provided at the end of the rubric.
  - Scores for a category will be an average of the scores of each element in that category.
  - 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.
- 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.

**Purpose:** Work is evaluated on the sophistication of its goals and research questions. The researcher seeks to go beyond summarizing information to make an argument, prove a point or a draw conclusion of historic or cultural significance. The researcher may also seek to put existing historical information into new contexts of relevance to SCA practice or persona development.

Average Score= \_\_\_\_\_

1	2	3	4	5	6
<input type="checkbox"/> Goals of the work are hard to determine or unclear and confusing.	<input type="checkbox"/> Goals are stated, but inconsistently present in the work, and they may appear to change midstream.	<input type="checkbox"/> Goals are consistent but simplistic and focus on information summary/review.	<input type="checkbox"/> Goals go beyond summary to begin to make arguments, prove a point, draw conclusions, or put information into contexts of relevance to the SCA.	<input type="checkbox"/> Goals are sophisticated and complex. They focus on making a compelling argument, proving a complex point, drawing complex conclusions, or putting information into useful contexts for SCA purposes.	<input type="checkbox"/> Goals are ambitious and focus on the desire to create new information, develop new conclusions, or put information into novel contexts of relevance to practice in the SCA.
<b>Comments:</b>					<b>Score:</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> The cultural context or historical or practical significance of the information is hard to determine or unclear and confusing.	<input type="checkbox"/> The cultural context or historical or practical significance of the information is also inconsistently presented.	<input type="checkbox"/> The cultural context or historical or practical significance of the information is articulated, but only weakly or briefly.	<input type="checkbox"/> The cultural context and historic or practical significance of the information created is noted	<input type="checkbox"/> The cultural context and historic or practical significance of the information created is made clear and understandable in some detail.	<input type="checkbox"/> The full significance and value of the information created is strongly articulated and thoroughly supported.
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Comments:</b>					<b>Score:</b>

**Investigation:** Work is evaluated on how it goes about meeting its goals. Information is supported with appropriate examples and data to form a body of evidence. Argumentation and research methodology is sound, highlighting connections in evidence, and conjectures are fully supported. Any gaps or shortfalls in research or methodology are acknowledged and areas for future exploration are identified.

Average Score= \_\_\_\_\_ (x3) = \_\_\_\_\_

1	2	3	4	5	6
<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence is lacking or dubious.	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence is reliable, but lacks coherence.	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence is reliable, and an attempt is made to connect ideas from multiple sources.	<input type="checkbox"/> Data, examples, and facts begin to build a coherent body of evidence.	<input type="checkbox"/> Data, examples, and other facts create a solid body of evidence.	<input type="checkbox"/> Ample data, examples, and other facts create a robust body of iron-clad evidence.
<b>Comments:</b>					<b>Score:</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments or research methodology are seriously flawed, and no attempt to address those flaws is made. Conjectures are made without evidence.	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments, research methodology, and conjectures have some significant flaws.	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments, research methodology, or conjectures have a few notable flaws that are discussed, but which still affect the research.	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments or methodology start to connect evidence together to support the goals of the research. Gaps or shortfalls are addressed, including their potential impact on the work. Any conjectures are supported with at least one piece of solid evidence.	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments or research methodology create a chain of logic that support the conclusions of the work. Gaps or shortfalls are few, and are acknowledged and explained. Conjectures are supported with evidence and logic.	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments or research methodology are flawless and fully support the goals and conclusions of the work. Conjectures are supported with an abundance of solid evidence and excellent logic.
<b>Comments:</b>					<b>Score:</b>

<input type="checkbox"/> No avenues for further exploration are outlined.	<input type="checkbox"/> An idea about a possible path for further investigation is hinted at.	<input type="checkbox"/> An idea for further investigation is made and discussed somewhat.	<input type="checkbox"/> Several suggestions for further research avenues are made and discussed, or one idea is discussed in some depth.	<input type="checkbox"/> Several suggestions for further avenues of research or applicability of the results to other projects are discussed in some depth.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple avenues for further exploration or applicability of the results to other projects are outlined and discussed in significant depth.
<b>Comments:</b>					<b>Score:</b>

<b>Presentation:</b> Work is evaluated on the effectiveness of its command of the chosen presentation medium(s). Information is well organized, possessing a logical flow with clear transitions between ideas, and precise language. The format chosen illustrates concepts well and makes ideas easy to understand.					
1	2	3	4	5	6
<input type="checkbox"/> The medium chosen to present information may not be suited for the investigation that was undertaken. The presentation medium is used poorly, such that meaning is highly obscured and the audience is confused or distracted.	<input type="checkbox"/> The presentation medium is appropriate but used to weak effect.	<input type="checkbox"/> The presentation medium is appropriate and used to satisfactory effect.	<input type="checkbox"/> The presentation medium chosen by the researcher is used to good effect.	<input type="checkbox"/> The presentation medium chosen by the researcher is used to very good effect.	<input type="checkbox"/> The presentation medium chosen by the researcher is used to superior effect, making it easy to follow even complex ideas.
<b>Comments:</b>					<b>Score:</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Organization is lacking. Transitions between topics are unclear or non-existent, and language is vague or unclear, making it almost impossible to follow the flow of the information being presented.	<input type="checkbox"/> Organization is weak. Errors or missteps in language choice or in the use of transitions somewhat hamper an understanding of the project's goals and conclusions and do distract that audience.	<input type="checkbox"/> Organization is passable. Any errors or missteps in language choice or use of transitions only minorly hamper an understanding of the project's goals and conclusions or minorly distract the audience.	<input type="checkbox"/> Information is organized using appropriate language and transitions. Any errors do not hamper an understanding of the project's goals and conclusions and do not greatly distract the audience.	<input type="checkbox"/> Information is well organized using effective language and transitions, leaving little to no room for confusion..	<input type="checkbox"/> Information is compellingly organized and clearly articulated through the use of excellent transitions and language choices leaving no room for confusion.
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Comments:</b>					<b>Score:</b>

**Average Score = \_\_\_\_\_ (x2) = \_\_\_\_\_**

**Sources:** Work is evaluated on the use of evidence from many different sources. The type of sources used should be appropriate for the investigation being undertaken and of good quality and variety of both direct (primary) and analytical (secondary) sources as available. The researcher should be able to explain their choices and discuss the significance of their sources.

Average Score = \_\_\_\_\_ (x2) = \_\_\_\_\_

1		2		3		4		5		6	
Indirect or encyclopedic sources are used exclusively.		<input type="checkbox"/> A minimal variety of direct or analytical sources used.		<input type="checkbox"/> A fair variety of direct or analytical sources are used.		<input type="checkbox"/> A good variety of direct or analytical sources are used.		<input type="checkbox"/> An extensive variety of direct and/or analytical sources is employed.		<input type="checkbox"/> An exhaustive variety of direct and/or analytical sources is employed, and includes unique sources or original research.	
<b>Comments:</b>										<b>Score:</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> The quality of the sources seems very inadequate or limited.		<input type="checkbox"/> The quality of the sources seems inadequate or limited for the investigation being undertaken.		<input type="checkbox"/> Quality of the sources is variable. Some may not be sufficiently appropriate or authoritative for how they are used.		<input type="checkbox"/> Quality of sources is generally good.		<input type="checkbox"/> Quality of sources is excellent and fit the investigation being undertaken.		<input type="checkbox"/> Quality is superlative, with sources fitting the specifics of the investigation being undertaken as directly as possible.	
<b>Comments:</b>										<b>Score:</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Applicability of sources to the project and authority of the source creator have not been discussed.		<input type="checkbox"/> Applicability of sources to the project and authority of the source creator have been minimally established.		<input type="checkbox"/> Applicability of sources to the project and authority of the source creator is somewhat established		<input type="checkbox"/> The applicability of sources to the project and authority of the source creator have been clearly established		<input type="checkbox"/> 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.		<input type="checkbox"/> 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.	
<b>Comments:</b>										<b>Score:</b>	

**Summary Feedback:**

What did the entry do well?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

What are some next steps for the artisan?

---

---

---