



Kingdom of the West

Arts & Sciences Judging Sheet - Bardic Composition

Contest
Date
Entrant #

Entry Description
Entrant's Starting Familiarity with Subject Matter of Entry <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Minor <input type="checkbox"/> Intermediate <input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
Entrant's Feedback Preferences

Judge's Name
Judge's Familiarity with Subject Matter of Entry <input type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Minor <input type="checkbox"/> Intermediate <input type="checkbox"/> Advanced

Metrics

Category	0-2 points	3-4 points	5-6 points	7-8 points	9-10 points	Points Awarded
Historical Accuracy/Aesthetics/Context (Does the presentation replicate a historical example? What are the reasons for deviations?) Work is evaluated on the connection to a historical time and place, including pupose/audience/use, as well as style and design.	clearly modern or out of SCA period. connection of work to historical time or place is flimsy. historical and cultural context is weak. use or meaning of the work is unclear.	object blends historical and modern elements. work could be applied to a wide general time or cultural range. uses SCA'isms over historical accuracies.	object shows informed attempt to minimize modern or personalized stylization successfully with a largely historical appearance. work attempts to build connection to a specific time or place.	object is historically accurate with an attempt to avoide modern style and aesthetics. historical and cultural context is clear. specific style and design is clearly illustrated. any embedded SCA'ism or personalization blends seamlessly with target style.	object could be a museum reproduction. a person contemporary to the inspiration piece would accept it.	/10
Composition/Engagement/Execution (Was the piece polished and well understandable? Was the audience engaged?) Skill, presentation, flare, "understanding the assignment",craft,artistic ability, successful messaging, understanding and handling of materials. Is the presenter confident?	item rough or lacking in finishing work. mistakes are obvious.	item shows an attempt at improving tool use, control, clean workmanship. mistakes are acknowledged and attempts at fixes have been made.	item is successful and functional. mistakes are acknowledged and addressed. quality fixes are applied. work is competent, shows solid skill, workmanship and artistic ability.	item shows close attention to detail, skill, workmanship. any mistakes would have to be pointed out by the artist. work shows advanced degree of skill, workmanship, knowledge of appropriate tools, clean finishing.	item is as well made as humanly possible, and addresses any "corrections" made to original work. item shows expert handling of form/design, and materials.	/10
Category	0-2 points	3-4 points	5-6 points	7-8 points	9-10 points	Points Awarded

<p>Method/Process/Materials</p> <p>(Is the presentation correct for the project/culture/era? What choices were made regarding language, word choice, form? What choices were made regarding substitutions bridging authenticity and approachability/audience understanding?) Performance identifiably reflects the of the culture and era being represented. Modern processes or methods are appropriate and justifiable due to accessibility the original.</p>	<p>modern methods and tools were used entirely (example: computer or digitized tools without hand work) modern materials and tools were used without notation of why substitutions were made</p>	<p>artisan substituted modern methods/construction with some explanation for choices. a good attempt at mimicing a historical object was made using modern substitutions of materials and tools</p>	<p>artisan clearly demonstrated understanding of modern vs historical methods. any modernizations clearly emulate historical technique and are explained. reasonable modern material and tool substitutions were made for accessibility, artisan shows understanding of reasons for their choices</p>	<p>artisan made every attempt to use and understand historical techniques/processes/methods, with minimal practical substitutions and shortcuts for safety only. item was produced as much as possible from correct and accurate materials, with reasonable allowance for safety/health/accessibility, with tools that approximate the correct historical tools</p>	<p>artisan used only historical tools, methods and techniques to complete entire project from historically accurate materials.</p>	/10
<p>Complexity/Challenge</p> <p>(Does the artisan state and meet a goal? How ambitious was the project? How difficult was it to present? Was the artisan challenging themselves? how much technical ability is needed to accomplish the presentation.)</p>	<p>project is simple, can be completed or reproduced by following instructions without practice. beginner project with little chance of failure.</p>	<p>project showed personal choices and understanding of scope/difficulty. includes multiple steps and alternatives/choices.</p>	<p>a serious attempt was made to improve skill and knowledge and design and execute an original work. time and effort were required. experimentation and advanced techniques were needed.</p>	<p>project shows artisan made an independent solid attempt at and aim for a finished product that involved knowledge of research, design, material choices, skilled tool use, etc. concentration, effort and stages were required to complete the work.</p>	<p>the project was ambitious and required expert, extensive and varied construction, understanding of specific materials, structures and tools. the work expands on a theme and combines difficult and time consuming techniques and stages with demonstrated detailed cultural knowledge.</p>	/10
<p>Documentation/Sources</p> <p>(has the artisan provided primary/secondary/tertiary sources? do they show they understand their source material? is the subject from a culture/era difficult to document with traditional written histories?)</p>	<p>none provided, or only very broadly or vaguely.</p>	<p>Item aims for a specific time and place. artisan is working from or relying completely on research done by someone else, ie an A&S class, online tutorial, etc</p>	<p>artisan has added their own research to known work, compared different resources, etc</p>	<p>artisan shows they have done personal research, and evaluated sources on their own, and provides strong bibliography/resources</p>	<p>artisan has done original research/experimentation , with academic notations, citations and footnotes.</p>	/10
<p>Judge's Discretion</p>						Score Given
<p>Judges discretion (Was the writer working in translating a historical or non-primary language? Is the artisan an expert or very experienced with the artform presented? Did the entrant blend modern references seamlessly with historical stylization or play on historical form?) Entries may bridge categories. JUDGES ARE ENCOURAGED TO USE DISCRETION AND FLEXIBILITY. ... as a judge/evaluator, do you give more or less points for the above?</p>						/5

Notes

Total Points	
Multiplier	x 2
Total Score	