

Guidelines for Judging Regional and Kingdom Arts & Sciences Faires

The goal of these guidelines is to provide a set of common criteria for 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 and that there could be variances between results from evaluator to evaluator. It is the goal of the Kingdom Minister of Arts and Sciences Office to work with evaluators to promote consistent use of these guidelines by working to familiarize evaluators with these guidelines whenever possible.

- These guidelines use an assumed ideal as its goal - the recreation of a piece from a 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. An item's performance with these guidelines 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 these guidelines; that does not mean these projects cannot achieve perfect scores. A perfect score does not mean the item or performance is perfect.
- While the guidelines do not require detailed formal written documentation, it does require that an artisan be able to provide Supporting Evidence (written or verbal) to support their work. The Supporting 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 probably the most common vehicle for conveying Supporting Evidence, artisans may provide evidence in other ways, including verbally. 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. Do not penalize an entrant for not supplying the information in writing, if they know and can fully articulate and support the answer.
- To provide a consistent judging experience for all entrants, please apply these guidelines (as written) while judging each entry.
- There may be 1/2 point scores given. If an entrant does not fully meet the criteria for a particular score, but exceeds the criteria of the next score down, then an extra half point may be given. (i.e. If an entry isn't a 6 in a category, but you consider it more than a 5, a 5 1/2 may be assigned.)
- When considering between two scores, be advised that the first sentence in each scoring section is considered the essential defining element of that section and should be considered the priority in judging; the remaining elements provide support.
- The top score should be very hard – but not impossible – to achieve and this score should be reserved for truly exemplary entries.
- When evaluating an entry for scoring, start by reading the highest score. If that describes what you see, that is the score you assign. If it doesn't, please move to the next highest score and repeat.
- If you are having difficulty using these guidelines 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 organizers so the judging guidelines can be modified in the future.

Category	6	5	4	3	2	1
<p>Supporting Evidence: Work is evaluated on the use of evidence from many sources. Sources used should be a mixture of direct sources (i.e. photographs of extant items, sculptures, manuscript illuminations, contemporary written accounts, translations of documents), as available, and analytical sources written by knowledgeable experts. Entrant should be able to discuss the significance of their sources.</p> <p>(Maximum Score: 4)</p>			<p>An exhaustive variety of primary and secondary sources is employed.</p> <p>Quality of sources is superlative and may include difficult-to-obtain sources or original research conducted by the artisan.</p> <p>Significance and authority of sources is well established and any limitations of sources used or available has been discussed in detail.</p>	<p>An extensive variety of primary and secondary sources are used.</p> <p>Quality of sources is generally excellent.</p> <p>Significance and authority of sources has been clearly established and any limitations of sources used or available has been discussed.</p>	<p>A fair variety of primary or secondary sources are used.</p> <p>Quality of sources varies. Significance and authority of sources has been mostly established.</p>	<p>Indirect sources (sources that only summarize secondary sources), or encyclopedic sources are the only resources cited.</p> <p>The quality of the sources seems inadequate and limited.</p> <p>The authority and significance of the sources is not considered by entrant.</p>

Category	6	5	4	3	2	1
<p>Methods and Materials: Work is evaluated on its use of processes, techniques, or methods and materials which are identical to or emulate those used in period and are historically appropriate. The processes and material choices are supported with evidence and should be appropriate to the time, culture and purpose of the work. An entrant may procure period materials from another source without penalty. An entrant is not required to produce their own individual period or historically accurate materials in order to make their entry. Alternative methods and substitutions in materials should be appropriate and justifiable (i.e. not available in modern times, methods and/or materials are hazardous or cost-prohibitive, objections based on personal values or religious reasons).</p> <p>(Maximum Score: 4)</p>			<p>Work uses exclusively period techniques (or the speculation of experimental archaeology when period method is unknown) and historically appropriate materials (may be modern if they resemble period materials).</p> <p>Information on all period methods and materials is completely supported by reputable evidence.</p> <p>No substitutions have been made except in the case of health and safety or when methods and/or materials are cost-prohibitive or are completely unavailable, or objections based on personal values.</p>	<p>Period tools and historically appropriate materials are employed in significant parts of the work, with few exceptions made (for reasons that are not considered acceptable substitutions).</p> <p>Entrant provides a good amount of knowledge about period technique and historically accurate materials.</p> <p>Deviations from period tools and historically appropriate materials do not impact the final look or utility of the entry.</p>	<p>Work uses a roughly even combination of historical and modern methods and materials, with some use or emulation of period techniques and historically appropriate materials.</p> <p>Minimal information about period techniques and historically accurate materials is present.</p> <p>Some tool use is discussed in relation to historical method, though tools are mostly modern.</p>	<p>Work uses a majority of modern techniques and clearly modern or industrial materials.</p> <p>Substitutions are explained inadequately or not at all.</p> <p>Information about the entry's historical accuracy is vague or difficult to ascertain.</p> <p>Tools used are entirely modern.</p>

Category	6	5	4	3	2	1
<p>Scope: Work is evaluated on the difficulty and challenge of its creation and on the sophistication and ambition of its goals. The entry's Scope will be evaluated within the entry's time period, culture, and item type. That is, the judge will not assume that earlier period works are automatically less complex in Scope or that later period works are more complex in Scope. Judges will judge entries using standards and norms for the specific form presented in the entry.</p> <p>(Maximum Score: 6)</p>	<p>Work demonstrates an extensive degree of time, research, creativity and/or commitment.</p> <p>Goals impel the artisan to explore new areas of knowledge and skill in depth in order to enhance their understanding of the topic.</p> <p>Project is of a very high degree of difficulty, addressing unique or esoteric challenges.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a great degree of time, research, creativity and/or commitment.</p> <p>Goals drive the artisan to explore and expand their knowledge of the topic.</p> <p>Project is difficult for the artisan and poses multiple engaging challenges in improving their skill.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a good degree of time, research, creativity and/or commitment.</p> <p>Goals force the artisan to expand their comfort zone.</p> <p>Project poses an interesting or new challenge for the artisan.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a moderate degree of time, research, creativity and/or commitment.</p> <p>Goals push the artisan somewhat.</p> <p>Project presents some challenge or risk of failure.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a basic degree of time, research, creativity and/or commitment.</p> <p>Goals are simplistic and "safe" for the artisan.</p> <p>Project is relatively easy for the artisan.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a minimal degree of time, research, creativity and/or commitment.</p> <p>Goals are unclear or vaguely expressed.</p> <p>Project is too easy for the artisan.</p>

Category	6	5	4	3	2	1
<p>Skill: 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.</p> <p>(Maximum Score: 6)</p>	<p>Work demonstrates an exceptional degree of skill, workmanship, and/or artistic ability.</p> <p>Not only does the artisan achieve their goals for this project, but their success informs other projects and goals as well.</p> <p>Mistakes or shortcomings are embraced, being discussed in thorough detail and are comparable to mistakes evident in period examples, if relevant.</p> <p>Lessons learned and multiple future avenues of exploration are outlined.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates an advanced degree of skill, workmanship, and/or artistic ability.</p> <p>The work achieves all of the artisan’s goals for the project.</p> <p>Mistakes and/or shortcomings are discussed in detail, and the artisan presents several possible “next steps” to address what they’ve learned.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a good degree skill, workmanship, and/or artistic ability.</p> <p>The work achieves most of the artisan’s goals.</p> <p>Mistakes and/or shortcomings are discussed in some detail, and the artisan gives a concrete “next step” for their work.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a moderate degree skill, workmanship, and/or artistic ability.</p> <p>Work achieves many of the goals of the artisan.</p> <p>Mistakes and/or shortcomings are acknowledged, and some speculation for improvement is given by the entrant.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a basic degree skill, workmanship, and/or artistic ability.</p> <p>Work achieves a few of the goals set by the artisan. Mistakes are acknowledged.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a minimal degree of skill, workmanship, and/or artistic ability.</p> <p>It is unclear if the goals of the project were achieved.</p> <p>Known mistakes are unacknowledged and/or unjustified.</p>

Category	6	5	4	3	2	1
<p>Ingenuity: Work is evaluated for the ingenuity of the entry. Work is judged as to the entrant’s resourcefulness and inventive approach in creating their entry. Original thought and interpretation are used to develop a final product that fits into historic time and place. The use of templates (not kits) are permitted and are not necessarily penalized if original, exhaustive thought and interpretation are also applied in their use.</p> <p>(Maximum Score: 4)</p>			<p>Entry reflects period context while demonstrating exhaustive thought and interpretation in developing techniques and choosing historically appropriate materials except where prohibited by cost, safety, etc.</p>	<p>Entry reflects period context while demonstrating significant thought and interpretation in developing techniques and choosing appropriate materials or determining reasonable substitutes.</p>	<p>Entry is an item that demonstrates some thought and interpretation in development of techniques; however, the entry relies to some extent on the research or patterns of others.</p>	<p>Entry uses patterns or research developed by another person, with minimal modification by the artisan. Entry is essentially rote-copied, using other’s work and/or research.</p>
<p>Judge’s Observation: This section is used to rate the judge’s reaction to and overall impression of the entry. Additional comments may also be made here.</p> <p>(Maximum Score: 6)</p>	<p>Judge is extremely impressed with the entry.</p> <p>The entry is not only among the best arts and sciences projects or performances that the judge has ever seen, but there are few to no ideas for improvement for the entry.</p>	<p>Judge is highly impressed with the entry.</p> <p>The entry is in the upper echelon of arts and sciences projects or performances that the judge has ever seen.</p> <p>There are some ideas for improvement for the entry.</p>	<p>Judge is very impressed with the entry.</p> <p>The entry is a strong arts and sciences project or performance.</p> <p>There are several ideas for improvement for the entry.</p>	<p>Judge is moderately impressed with the entry.</p> <p>The entry is a competent arts and sciences project or performance.</p> <p>There are a number of ideas for improvement for the entry.</p>	<p>Judge is mildly impressed with the entry.</p> <p>The entry is a complete arts and sciences project or performance, however there are a number of ideas for improvement for the entry.</p>	<p>Judge is minimally impressed with the entry, as it is incomplete or not wholly realized.</p> <p>There are many ideas for improvement for the entry.</p>