

How to Judge at Art/Sci Using the New Judging Forms

- I. The Scoring Forms and Comment Forms have been separated. Each judge will fill out one (1) Scoring Sheet and one (1) Comment Sheet for each entry they judge. All Scoring and Comment Forms should be turned in to the Registrar as they are completed. The entrant will receive all of the Comment Forms. The entrant will receive an average score derived from the scores reported on the Scoring Forms.
 - a. Discussion among judges, as well as discussion with the entrant, is permissible but not required. The scores and comments recorded on your individual Scoring Form and Comment Form should reflect your own views.
 - b. Judges are encouraged to judge in a group, as was done in the past, but are not required to do so.
 - c. Judges should print their name at the top of each form and sign the bottom.
 - d. Judges will need to ensure that they fill in the ID#, Division, Category & Title of Entry at the top of each form to ensure that the scores and comments are applied to the correct entry. If your forms have that information provided for you, make sure that you are using the correct forms for each entry you judge.
- II. The Scoring Forms and Comment Forms will be color coded: Novice Forms are pink, Journeyman forms are yellow, Artificer forms are green, and Masterwork forms are blue. Entries will either have the entry level highlighted in the appropriate color or will have a post-it note in the appropriate color attached to the documentation.
- III. Some judges find it easier to make comments on an entry and then assign scores. Other judges find that they work better reversing this process. Each judge is encouraged to find a method that is comfortable and efficient.

IV. Scoring Forms:

- a. All Scoring Forms are based on the old judging forms. The layout is almost identical and should feel familiar. Each category has its own table with an explanation of the category in the box at the top of the table and the rubric for judging the category listed beneath. The lowest possible score for a category is at the bottom of the rubric for that category and the highest possible score is at the top of the rubric. Categories that are broken down into sub-categories (such as Documentation and Workmanship) are all contained within the same large table. This is exactly like the layout of the old judging forms.
- b. An effort was made to use consistent language/wording both within a single scoring form and across scoring forms. Within each scoring form, categories that can use the same or very similar language within their scoring rubric do so. The same principal was applied across scoring forms as well – the language used across all the scoring forms is very similar and in some places is identical. The Journeyman scoring form is an expanded version of the Novice scoring form. The Artificer scoring form expands on the Journeyman scoring form, while also containing a change in language and emphasis in the Documentation category. The Masterwork scoring form is an expansion of the Artificer scoring form.
- c. Half (1/2) points are allowed on the Scoring Forms.

V. Comment Forms:

- a. Comment areas are broken down to correspond to the categories on the Scoring Form and follow the same order.
- b. Judges need not write comments in every category – the category areas are provided as a convenience.
- c. Commentary needs to be polite, professional, constructive and informative:
 - i. When providing commentary for Novices and Journeymen entrants especially, try to provide at least one positive comment for every negative comment. Remember that many less experienced artisans view suggestions for ways to improve their project or technique as negative comments.
 - ii. If you make a comment that something is incorrect in an entry, explain why it is incorrect. If you make a comment that an entrant's technique or project needs to be improved, explain how to do this or provide contact information and/or resources for the entrant.
 - iii. One word comments, even positive ones, should be used very sparingly! If you say "God!" or "Excellent!" - tell the entrant what is good about it.

VI. Specific Judging Categories:

- a. **Documentation:**

- i. *Novice & Journeyman*: On the Novice and Journeyman forms the Documentation evaluation is designed to guide the entrant towards providing good, basic documentation. The information provided should be complete, should accurately reflect the materials, tools, and methods used in the entry. Additionally the documentation should include image(s), written description(s), date(s) and other information about the model (referred to as “Source of Inspiration”). Sources used should support the entry and the work done.
 - ii. *Artificer & Masterwork*: Entrants are assumed to understand how to conduct research and build documentation at these levels. Emphasis is on evaluating the completeness and accuracy of the information provided and on the use of primary and scholarly sources. Due to the disparity of availability of primary and/or scholarly sources across the various arts and sciences, scores for this section are based on the judge’s knowledge of “average scholarship” for a given field of study. Entrants are rated as their work relates to “average scholarship” rather than being rated against a rigid rubric.
- b. Overall Authenticity/Overall Authenticity of Appearance:**
- i. *Novice & Journeyman* – Overall Authenticity of Appearance: At this level the emphasis is on the overall appearance. This is not the SCA’s “10 foot rule”, but if you saw the item on display in a museum (and therefore could not handle it or examine it up close) would you immediately recognize it as a modern item (ignoring the cleanness and newness of the materials/ingredients). As a general rule, an item that you immediately recognize as modern will score a 6 points or less on the rubric. An item that you would wonder about will score 7 to 12 points, and an item that would require longer/closer examination will score 11 to 15 points.
 - ii. *Artificer & Masterwork* – Overall Authenticity of the Entry: How closely does the entry resemble an actual period artifact? This is an overall evaluation of physical appearance, materials/ingredients used, tools/equipment used, methods used, sound, feel, etc.
- c. Authenticity: Materials/Ingredients Used:**
- i. *Novices & Journeyman*: This score is broken up into Materials/Ingredients Used and Substitutions. The evaluation is designed to guide entrants towards documenting their substitutions and using their research to help them choose good, period looking/feeling substitutions over blatantly modern materials/ingredients. The Materials/Ingredients Used score evaluates the actual choice of materials while the Substitutions score evaluates the use of research to choose substitutions and providing documentation for those choices.
 - ii. *Artificer & Masterwork*: It is assumed that entrants at this level know that period materials are superior to non-period materials, that choice of substitution should be guided by research and that substitutions need to be documented. Materials/ingredients and Substitutions are evaluated within a single rubric. Note that use of all period materials (with the noted exception of poisonous, illegal, prohibitively dangerous and prohibitively expensive materials) with documentation scores substantially higher than the same materials without documentation. This holds true for “materials that are the same and/or very similar to those used in period” and “materials are similar to those used in period”.
- d. Authenticity: Methods & Tools/Equipment Used:** Scoring for this category is treated exactly like the Authenticity: Materials/Ingredients Used category.
- e. Workmanship:**
- i. *Novice & Journeyman*: At this level workmanship is broken up into 3 sub-categories.
 - 1. **Skill Demonstrated with the Tools/Equipment:** At this level this is an evaluation of the skill demonstrated with the tools/equipment that the artisan actually used. This is not a reflection on the choice of period vs. non-period tools and equipment. For example, a costumer who hand sewed the entry should be evaluated on the neatness and accuracy of stitching, size of the stitches, etc. A costumer who machine sewed the entry should be evaluated on the neatness and accuracy of machine stitching, machine techniques, etc.
 - 2. **Skill Demonstrated with the Method(s) Used:** At this level this is an evaluation of the skill demonstrated with the method(s) actually used. This is not a reflection on the choice of

period vs. non-period methods. As much as possible, separate the method(s) from the tools/equipment used. To continue the example of a costumer's entry, the Method score would evaluate the costumer's skill in following a paper pattern or drafting a patter, in assembling the pieces into a complete garment, etc.

3. **Overall Skill, Quality and Success of the Entry:** This is a summary evaluation that considers the entrant's research, material/ingredient choices, method and tool/equipment choices, skill with the tools and skill with the method into account. This is not the same as overall authenticity; here the greater emphasis is on the work and skill invested into the entry. Given the source(s) of inspiration the entrant started with, how well did they succeed in creating an item similar to their source of inspiration?
- ii. *Artificer & Masterwork:* At this level workmanship is broken up into 4 sub-categories.
1. **Skill Demonstrated with the Tools/Equipment Used:** It is assumed at this level that the majority of tools/equipment will be period or close to period. This is an evaluation of the entrant's skill with the tools used in the creation of the entry.
 2. **Skill Demonstrated with the Method(s) Used:** It is assumed at this level that the majority of method(s) used will be period or close to period. This is an evaluation of the entrant's skill with the method(s) used in the creation of the entry.
 3. **Skill Demonstrated with Research & Documentation:** It is assumed at this level that the entrant has at least basic research and documentation skills. This is an evaluation of the entrant's skill and should consider such factors as breadth of research/information, depth of research/information, ability to draw original conclusions, ability to apply research to the project, and ability to present their research as documentation.
 4. **Overall Skill, Quality and Success of the Entry:** It is assumed at this level that authenticity of appearance, materials/ingredients, method(s) and tools/equipment will be considered in this evaluation, in addition to workmanship.

f. Complexity:

- i. *Novices & Journeymen:* There is no Complexity score for Novices or Journeymen.
- ii. *Artificers & Masterworks:* This is an evaluation of the amount of labor invested into the project by the artisan as compared to the amount of labor that would have been invested by a period artisan. The top score for Complexity would be awarded to entrants who do not use any purchased materials that a period artisan would not also have purchased (as supported by the documentation). This entrant will have taken no shortcuts with the entry and may have also done additional work/steps that a period artisan would not have needed to do in order to complete the same project. For example, a calligrapher/illuminator finishing their own vellum, grinding their own pigments and making their own ink so that they can work with period materials where a period artisan would have purchased their vellum, pigments and ink from other artisans/merchants. Complexity should not be a comparison of large, complicated projects vs. small, comparatively simple projects. Simple projects can receive high complexity scores as long as the entrant took no shortcuts and did everything the way a period artisan would have had to do it.

g. Creativity:

- i. *Novices & Journeymen:* There is no Creativity score for Novices or Journeymen.
- ii. *Artificers & Masterworks:* This is an evaluation of the amount of creativity invested into the project by the artisan. It is more difficult to create a new item that is completely and typically period in style, decoration, materials, methods, etc. than it is to make a replica of a well documented period item. Straight copies of period artifacts will receive low Creativity scores.

h. Bonus Point(s):

- i. *Novices & Journeymen:* 1 bonus point may be awarded to entries that use 50% or more period tools and methods in the creation of the entry.
- ii. *Artificers & Masterworks:* 2 bonus points may be awarded to entries that use 100% period tools and methods in the creation of the entry.

Trimaris Arts & Sciences Faire Static Entry Novice Scoring Form

Turn this form in to the registrar.

ID # : _____ Division: _____ Category: _____

Title of Entry: _____

Judge's Name (Please Print): _____

Each judge will receive their own Judging Form. Fill in the entrant information at the top of the first page (above) and the top of the Comments Page. Write comments for each judging category in the appropriate section on the Comments Page. To score an entry - please circle the score in each area. ½ points are acceptable when scoring. Place the total score for each section in the box at the bottom of each table. Place the total score for the entry in the section at the bottom of the last page and sign. Discussion among judges is permitted prior to scoring, however your score pages should reflect your impressions of the entry.

Documentation: Information, 1-4 pts. <i>How completely was the documentation form filled out? Was the information provided relevant to the project? Does the information provided aid the judges in reviewing the project?</i>	
4	Questions on the Documentation Form are answered thoroughly and accurately. <i>All information provided relates directly to the project and accurately reflects the materials, tools/equipment, methods, and sources used. Entrant should consider entering as a Journeyman in this art/science at future Art/Sci Faires.</i>
3	Answers on the Documentation Form are incomplete. <i>For example, not all materials used are listed (but all materials listed are used), not all tools/equipment used are listed, method of creation does not include all steps taken, sources listed do not include all sources used. Information can come from direct observation of the project and/or from conversation with the entrant during judging.</i>
2	Answers provided on the Documentation Form do not appear to relate directly to the entered project. <i>For example, materials listed are not the materials used, tools/equipment listed to not appear to be the tools/equipment actually used, method of creation described does not appear to be method of creation actually used, sources listed to not appear to have actually been consulted. Information can come from direct observation of the project and/or from conversation with the entrant during judging.</i>
1	Incomplete Documentation Form – <i>Any questions, other than “questions for the judges” left blank.</i>
Documentation: Sources, 1-2 pts. <i>Do the sources listed support the entry? If no sources are listed, there will be no score for this category.</i>	
2	Sources support the project.
1	Sources do not support the project.
Documentation: Source of Inspiration, 1-2 pts. <i>Information provided about the source of inspiration for the project. If no source of inspiration is provided, there will be no score for this category.</i>	
2	Written description and image of source(s) of information provided.
1	Source of inspiration is incomplete. <i>Source of inspiration provided is a written description or image, but not both.</i>
	Total Score for Documentation Section.

Authenticity: Source of Inspiration, 1-4 pts. <i>Source(s) of inspiration should date from 1650 or before unless justification is provided. Acceptable justification includes but is not limited to: projects modeled on other SCA projects that are themselves modeled on period items or dance, brewing or other entries where primary sources dating from prior to 1650 are extremely rare. This does not allow for items that did not exist prior to 1650 but for which there are ample choices of pre-1650 items, such as styles of dress that are post 1650. All sources of inspiration should be pre-1650 in look and feel.</i>	
4	Source(s) of inspiration are pre-1650 (unless justified) and the entry replicates or strongly resembles the source(s) of inspiration.
3	Source(s) of inspiration are pre-1650 (unless justified) and the entry makes a reasonable attempt at replicating or resembling the inspiration.
2	Source(s) of inspiration are pre-1650 (unless justified) but the entry does not replicate or resemble the provided source(s) of inspiration.
1	Source(s) of inspiration are not pre-1650 and cannot be justified.
Authenticity: Materials/Ingredients Used, 1-4 pts. <i>Are the materials/ingredients used in the creation of the project the same as those used in period, are they modern materials/ingredients that closely resemble/replicate period materials/ingredients, or are they obviously modern materials/ingredients? Are variations and/or substitutions from materials used in period explained?</i>	
4	Materials/Ingredients used are the same or very similar to those used in period and/or variations or substitutions are explained.
3	Materials/Ingredients used are modern but demonstrate an attempt to replicate period materials/ingredients as much as possible. Variations or substitutions for period materials/ingredients are explained.
2	Materials/Ingredients used are visibly modern but variations or substitutions for period materials/ingredients are explained.
1	Materials/Ingredients are visibly modern with no attempt to replicate period materials. Variations or substitutions for period materials/ingredients are not explained.

Authenticity: Tools/Equipment Used, 1-2 pts. <i>Are the tools/equipment used entirely modern, or are at least some period tools/equipment used?</i>	
2	Tools/equipment used include at least some period items.
1	Tools/equipment used are entirely modern.
Authenticity: Methods Used, 1-2 pts. <i>Are the methods used entirely modern, or are at least some period methods used?</i>	
2	Methods used include at least some period methods and techniques.
1	Methods used are entirely modern.
Authenticity: Overall Authenticity of Appearance, 1-4 pts. <i>How closely does the entry resemble a period artifact?</i>	
4	The item looks like an item that could have existed prior to 1650.
3	The item resembles a pre-1650 item, but has some uncharacteristic elements.
2	The item only vaguely resembles a pre-1650 item and/or has obviously modern elements.
1	The item does not resemble a pre-1650 item.
	Total Score for Authenticity Section.

Workmanship: Skill Demonstrated with the Tools/Equipment Used, 1-5 pts. <i>Basic evaluation of the level of skill demonstrated with the chosen tools. This is not a reflection of the choice of period vs. non-period tools/equipment.</i>	
5	Entry demonstrates very high skill with the tools/equipment used. <i>Entrant should consider entering as Journeyman in this art/science at future Art/Sci Faires.</i>
4	Entry demonstrates high skill with the tools/equipment used. <i>Entrant should consider entering as Journeyman in this art/science at future Art/Sci Faires.</i>
3	Entry demonstrates moderately high skill with the tools/equipment used. <i>Entrant has a very good understanding of the tools/equipment used and should focus on refining their technique for future projects.</i>
2	Entry demonstrates moderate skill with the tools/equipment used. <i>Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the tools/equipment in their future projects.</i>
1	Entrant would benefit from more practice with the tools/equipment used. <i>Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the tools/equipment in their future projects.</i>
Workmanship: Skill Demonstrated with the Method(s) Used, 1-5 pts. <i>Basic evaluation of the level of skill demonstrated with the chosen method(s). This is not a reflection of the choice of period vs. non-period methods.</i>	
5	Entry demonstrates very high skill with the method(s) used. <i>Entrant should consider entering as Journeyman in this art/science at future Art/Sci Faires.</i>
4	Entry demonstrates high skill with the method(s) used. <i>Entrant should consider entering as Journeyman in this art/science at future Art/Sci Faires.</i>
3	Entry demonstrates moderately high skill with the method(s) used. <i>Entrant has a very good understanding of the tools/equipment used and should focus on refining their technique for future projects.</i>
2	Entry demonstrates moderate skill with the method(s) used. <i>Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the method(s) in their future projects.</i>
1	Entrant would benefit from more practice with the method(s) used. <i>Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the method(s) in their future projects.</i>
Workmanship: Skill and Quality of the Entry, 1-4 pts. <i>This is an summary evaluation of the skill the entrant has with all the tools/equipment used, all the methods used, and how they are used together to create the finished project. How closely does the entry come to the ideal established by the Source(s) of Inspiration? In entries with multiple parts, look at the quality of the workmanship of the individual pieces as they add up to the finished item.</i>	
5	Entry demonstrates a very high level of skill and very high quality of workmanship. <i>All parts fit together smoothly. The resulting entry replicates or strongly resembles a period item in terms of skill and workmanship. Entrant should consider entering as a Journeyman in this art/science at future Art/Sci Faires.</i>
4	Entry demonstrates a high level of skill and high quality of workmanship. <i>All parts fit together with only minor flaws. The resulting entry has very few minor visible flaws. Entrant should consider entering as a Journeyman in this art/science at future Art/Sci Faires.</i>
3	Entry demonstrates a moderately high level of skill and moderately high quality of workmanship. <i>Not all parts to fit together smoothly. The resulting entry has some minor visible flaws. Entrant is encouraged to refine their technique in future projects.</i>
2	Entry demonstrates a moderate level of skill and moderate quality of workmanship. <i>Parts do not fit together smoothly. The resulting entry has many minor visible flaws and/or some major visible flaws. Entrant is encouraged to increase their skill and workmanship with future projects.</i>
1	Entrant would benefit from greater familiarity with the skills and methods used to produce projects of this type. <i>Entrant is encouraged to continue to build their knowledge and skills with future projects.</i>
Bonus Point:	
1	Awarded for using 50% or more period tools and methods in the creation of the entry.
	Total Score for Workmanship Section.

Total Score for This Entry	Judge's Signature:
-----------------------------------	---------------------------

**Trimaris Arts & Sciences Faire Static Entry
Novice Comments Form**

Turn this form in to the registrar.

ID # : _____ Division: _____ Category: _____

Title of Entry: _____

Judge's Name (please print): _____

Judge's Email Address and/or Telephone Number: _____

Documentation: Information. *How completely was the documentation form filled out? Was the information provided relevant to the project? Does the information provided aid the judges in reviewing the project?* _____

Documentation: Sources. *Number of sources used and quality of the sources.* _____

Documentation: Source of Inspiration. *Information provided about the source of inspiration for the project.* _____

Authenticity: Materials/Ingredients Used. *Comment on ways to begin using more authentic materials/ingredient, keeping in mind such factors as availability, expense and the need to learn to use more complicated or difficult materials.*

Authenticity: Tools/Equipment Used. *Comment on ways to begin using more authentic tools/equipment, keeping in mind such factors as availability, expense and the need to learn to use more complicated or difficult tools.*

Authenticity: Methods Used. *Comment on ways to begin using more authentic methods, keeping in mind such factors as availability, expense and the need to learn to use more complicated or difficult methods.*

Authenticity: Overall Authenticity of Appearance. *How closely does the entry resemble a period artifact? How closely does the entry come to the ideal established by the Source(s) of Inspiration?*

Workmanship: Skill Demonstrated with the Tools/Equipment & Method(s) Used. *Basic evaluation of the level of skill demonstrated with the chosen tools and chosen methods. This is not a reflection of the choice of period vs. non-period*

Answers to Questions Posed to the Judges.

Any additional Comments:

Judge's Signature:

Trimaris Arts & Sciences Faire Static Entry Journeyman Scoring Form

Turn this form in to the registrar.

ID # : _____ Division: _____ Category: _____

Title of Entry: _____

Judge's Name (Please Print): _____

Each judge will receive their own Judging Form. To score an entry - please circle the score in each area. ½ points are acceptable when scoring. Discussion among judges is permitted prior to scoring, however your score pages should reflect your own impressions of the entry.

Documentation: Information, 1-4 pts. <i>How completely was the documentation form filled out? Was the information provided relevant to the project? Does the information provided aid the judges in reviewing the project?</i>	
4	Questions on the Documentation Form are answered thoroughly and accurately. <i>All information provided relates directly to the project and accurately reflects the materials, tools/equipment, methods, and sources used.</i>
3	Answers on the Documentation Form are incomplete. <i>Not all materials used are listed, not all tools/equipment used are listed, method of creation does not include all steps taken, and/or sources listed do not include all sources used.</i>
2	Answers provided on the Documentation Form do not appear to relate directly to the entered project. <i>Materials listed are not the materials used, tools/equipment listed to not appear to be the tools/equipment actually used, method of creation described does not appear to be method of creation actually used, and/or sources listed to not appear to have actually been consulted.</i>
1	Incomplete Documentation Form – <i>Any questions, other than "questions for the judges" left blank.</i>
Documentation: Sources, 1-4 pts. <i>Do the sources listed support the entry? If no sources are listed, there will be no score for this category.</i>	
4	Sources listed support all aspects of the project, including: appearance, materials, tools/equipment, construction, etc.
3	Sources listed support most aspects of the project.
2	Sources listed support the project, but only in a general way. <i>For example, sources support appearance but not materials or construction.</i>
1	Sources listed do not support the project .
Documentation: Information About Source of Inspiration, 1-4 pts. <i>Information provided about the source of inspiration for the project. If no source of inspiration is provided, there will be no score for this category. Source(s) of inspiration should date from 1650 or before unless justification is provided. Acceptable justification includes but is not limited to: projects modeled on other SCA projects that are themselves modeled on period items or dance, brewing or other entries where primary sources dating from prior to 1650 are extremely rare. All sources of inspiration should be pre-1650 in look and feel.</i>	
4	Clear image(s) and written description(s), including date(s) provided for source(s) of inspiration. <i>Source(s) are from SCA period or justification for using post-period inspiration is provided.</i>
3	Clear image(s) and written description(s), including date(s) provided for source(s) of inspiration. <i>Source(s) are from outside of SCA period and/or justification for using post-period inspiration is NOT provided.</i>
2	Clear image(s) and written description(s) without date(s) provided for source(s) of inspiration -or- clear image and date provided, but no written description.
1	Source of inspiration is incomplete. <i>Source of inspiration provided is a written description - or- an image, but not both. No date is provided.</i>
Total Score for Documentation Section.	

Overall Authenticity of Appearance, 1-15 pts. <i>How closely does the entry resemble a period artifact?</i>	
15	Entry could be mistaken for a period artifact. <i>All design elements and decoration are/feel true to the period. There are no distinguishably modern elements.</i>
14	Entry strongly resembles a period artifact. <i>Most design elements and decoration are/feel true to the period. There are almost no distinguishably modern elements.</i>
13	
12	Entry resembles a period artifact. <i>Materials used resemble period materials. Most design elements and decoration are/feel true to the period. There are few distinguishably modern elements.</i>
11	
10	Entry mostly resembles a period artifact. <i>The design elements and decoration are/feel mostly true to the period. There are some distinguishably modern elements.</i>
9	
8	Entry mostly resembles a period artifact. <i>The design elements and decoration are/feel somewhat true to the period. There are some distinguishably modern elements.</i>
7	
6	Entry somewhat resembles a period artifact. <i>The design elements and decoration are not true to the period. There are many distinguishably modern elements.</i>
5	
4	Entry does not resemble a period artifact. <i>The design elements and decoration are not true to the period. Elements are mostly modern in look and feel.</i>
3	
2	Entry does not resemble a period artifact and is blatantly modern in look and feel.
1	
Total Score for Overall Authenticity Section.	

Authenticity: Materials/Ingredients Used, 1-5 pts. <i>Are the materials/ingredients used in the creation of the project the same as those used in period, are they modern materials/ingredients that closely resemble/replicate period materials/ingredients, or are they obviously modern?</i>	
5	Materials/Ingredients used are the same or very similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions closely replicate period materials</i>
4	Materials/Ingredients used are the same or very similar to those used in period with only minor variations. <i>Substitutions mostly replicate period materials.</i>
3	Materials/Ingredients used are modern but demonstrate an attempt to replicate period materials/ingredients. <i>Substitutions somewhat replicate period materials.</i>
2	Materials/Ingredients used are visibly modern but choices of substitutions for period materials/ingredients are explained.
1	Materials/Ingredients are visibly modern with no attempt to replicate period materials.

Authenticity: Substitutions, 1-4 pts. <i>How well do the modern substitutions mimic period materials? Are the choices supported by documentation or explanation?</i>	
4	Substitutions for period materials were chosen because of their close resemblance to period materials. Choices are supported with documentation.
3	Substitutions for period materials were chosen because of their resemblance to period materials. Choices are not supported with documentation.
2	Substitutions for period materials were chosen without regard to their resemblance to period materials. Choices are explained in the documentation.
1	Substitutions for period materials were chosen without regard to their resemblance to period materials. Choices are not explained in the documentation.
Total Score for Authenticity of Materials Section.	

Authenticity: Methods & Tools/Equipment Used, 1-5 pts. <i>Are the methods & tools/equipment used in the creation of the project the same as those used in period, are they modern methods & tools/equipment that closely resemble/replicate period methods & tools/equipment, or are they obviously modern?</i>	
5	Methods & tools/equipment used are the same or very similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions closely replicate period methods & tools/equipment.</i>
4	Methods & tools/equipment used are the same or very similar to those used in period with only minor variations. <i>Substitutions mostly replicate period methods & tools/equipment.</i>
3	Methods & tools/equipment used are modern but demonstrate an attempt to replicate period materials/ingredients. <i>Substitutions somewhat replicate period methods & tools/equipment.</i>
2	Methods & tools/equipment used are visibly modern but choices of substitutions for period methods & tools/equipment are explained.
1	Methods & tools/equipment are visibly modern with no attempt to replicate period methods & tools/equipment.

Authenticity: Substitutions, 1-4 pts. <i>How well do the modern substitutions mimic period methods & tools/equipment? Are the choices supported by documentation or explanation?</i>	
4	Substitutions for period methods & tools were chosen because of their close resemblance to period methods & tools. Choices are supported with documentation.
3	Substitutions for period methods & tools were chosen because of their resemblance to period methods & tools. Choices are not supported with documentation.
2	Substitutions for period methods & tools were chosen without regard to their resemblance to period methods & tools. Choices are explained in the documentation.
1	Substitutions for period methods & tools were chosen without regard to their resemblance to period methods & tools. Choices are not explained in the documentation.
Total Score for Authenticity of Methods & Tools/Equipment Section.	

Workmanship: Skill Demonstrated with the Tools/Equipment Used, 1-5 pts. <i>Basic evaluation of the level of skill demonstrated with the chosen tools. This is not a reflection of the choice of period vs. non-period tools/equipment.</i>	
5	Entry demonstrates very high skill with the tools/equipment used. <i>Entrant should consider entering as Artificer in this art/science at future Art/Sci Faires.</i>
4	Entry demonstrates high skill with the tools/equipment used. <i>Entrant has a very good understanding of the tools/equipment used and should focus on refining their technique for future projects.</i>
3	Entry demonstrates moderately high skill with the tools/equipment used. <i>Entrant has a good understanding of the tools/equipment used and should focus on improving and refining their technique for future projects.</i>
2	Entry demonstrates moderate skill with the tools/equipment used. <i>Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the tools/equipment in their future projects.</i>
1	Entrant would benefit from more practice with the tools/equipment used. <i>Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the tools/equipment in their future projects.</i>

Workmanship: Skill Demonstrated with the Method(s) Used, 1-5 pts. <i>Basic evaluation of the level of skill demonstrated with the chosen method(s). This is not a reflection of the choice of period vs. non-period methods.</i>	
5	Entry demonstrates very high skill with the method(s) used. <i>Entrant should consider entering as Artificer in this art/science at future Art/Sci Faires.</i>
4	Entry demonstrates high skill with the method(s) used. <i>Entrant has a very good understanding of the tools/equipment used and should focus on refining their technique for future projects.</i>
3	Entry demonstrates moderately high skill with the method(s) used. <i>Entrant has a good understanding of the tools/equipment used and should focus on improving and refining their technique for future projects.</i>
2	Entry demonstrates moderate skill with the method(s) used. <i>Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the method(s) in their future projects.</i>
1	Entrant would benefit from more practice with the method(s) used. <i>Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the method(s) in their future projects.</i>

Workmanship: Overall Skill, Quality and Success of the Entry, 1-5 pts. <i>This is an summary evaluation of the skill the entrant in creating the finished project. How closely does the entry come to the ideal established by the Source(s) of Inspiration? In entries with multiple parts, look at the quality of the workmanship of the individual pieces as they add up to the finished item.</i>	
5	Entry demonstrates a very high level of skill and very high quality of workmanship. <i>All parts fit together smoothly. The resulting entry replicates or strongly resembles a period item in terms of skill and workmanship</i>
4	Entry demonstrates a high level of skill and high quality of workmanship. <i>All parts fit together with only minor flaws. The resulting entry has very few and/or only minor visible flaws.</i>
3	Entry demonstrates a moderately high level of skill and moderately high quality of workmanship. <i>Not all parts to fit together smoothly. The resulting entry has some visible flaws. Entrant is encouraged to refine their technique in future projects.</i>
2	Entry demonstrates a moderate level of skill and moderate quality of workmanship. <i>Parts do not fit together smoothly. The resulting entry has many minor visible flaws and/or some major visible flaws. Entrant is encouraged to increase their skill and workmanship with future projects.</i>
1	Entrant would benefit from greater familiarity with the skills and methods used to produce project s of this type. <i>Entrant is encouraged to continue to build their knowledge and skills with future projects.</i>

Bonus Point:	
1	Awarded for using 50% or more period tools and methods in the creation of the entry.
Total Score for Workmanship Section.	

Total Score for This Entry	Judge's Signature:
-----------------------------------	---------------------------

**Trimaris Arts & Sciences Faire Static Entry
Journeyman Comments Form**

Turn this form in to the registrar.

ID #: _____ Division: _____ Category: _____

Title of Entry: _____

Judge's Name (please print): _____

Judge's Email Address and/or Telephone Number: _____

Documentation: Information. *How completely was the documentation form filled out? Was the information provided relevant to the project? Does the information provided aid the judges in reviewing the project?* _____

Documentation: Sources. *Number of sources used and quality of the sources.* _____

Documentation: Source of Inspiration. *Information provided about the source of inspiration for the project.* _____

Authenticity: Overall Authenticity of Appearance. *How closely does the entry resemble a period artifact? How closely does the entry come to the ideal established by the Source(s) of Inspiration?* _____

Authenticity: Materials/Ingredients Used. *Comment on the use of period materials and/or choices in substitutions.*

Trimaris Arts & Sciences Faire Static Entry Artificer Scoring Form

Turn this form in to the registrar.

ID # : _____ Division: _____ Category: _____

Title of Entry: _____

Judge's Name (Please Print): _____

Each judge will receive their own Judging Form. To score an entry - please circle the score in each area. ½ points are acceptable when scoring. Discussion among judges is permitted prior to scoring, however your score pages should reflect your own impressions of the entry.

Documentation: Information, 1-4 pts. *Includes information pertinent to the entry provided for use by judges. Does the documentation include: ingredients, materials, recipes or period instructions, tools, & techniques appropriate to the stated time frame and geographic/cultural origins of the source(s) of inspiration; and, the characteristics of the model(s)? Have the entrant's ingredients, materials, recipes or instructions, tools, tools, & techniques been included? Have drawings, pictures, and diagrams been included? Is the documentation well organized and legible? Is the information provided relevant to the project? Does the information provided aid the judges in reviewing the project?*

4 Exceeds judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated.

3 Meets judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated.

2 Falls slightly below judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated.

1 Falls well below judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated.

Documentation: Sources, 1-4 pts. *Did the entrant cite examples and list sources? Is a bibliography included? (If no sources are listed, there will be no score for this category.) Do the sources listed support the entry? Are primary sources, if available, emphasized? Are primary sources from an appropriate time and place to support the entry? Are secondary, and possibly tertiary, sources used appropriately? Do these supplementary sources include information about the specific time and place of the entry?*

4 Exceeds judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated.

3 Meets judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated.

2 Falls slightly below judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated.

1 Falls well below judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated.

Documentation: Information About Source of Inspiration, 1-4 pts. *Information provided about the source of inspiration for the project. (If no source of inspiration is provided, there will be no score for this category. Source(s) of inspiration should date from 1650 or before unless justification is provided. Acceptable justification includes but is not limited to: projects modeled on other SCA projects that are themselves modeled on period items or dance, brewing or other entries where primary sources dating from prior to 1650 are extremely rare.) Does the documentation for the source(s) of inspiration include: Time frame & geographic/cultural origins of the model(s) for the entry; ingredients, materials, tools, & techniques used in creation of the model(s); and, the characteristics of the model(s)?*

4 Exceeds judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated.

3 Meets judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated.

2 Falls slightly below judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated.

1 Falls well below judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated.

Total Score for Documentation Section.

Overall Authenticity of the Entry, 1-16 pts. *How closely does the entry resemble a period artifact? How closely did the entrant followed pre-17th century techniques and how nearly did the entrant achieved a piece that would not have been out of place in a pre-17th century cultural setting? To what degree has the entrant gone to use pre-17th century tools, ingredients, and processes to make the entry? Are the ingredients and techniques used appropriate to the stated time frame and geographic/cultural origin of the entry? If modern substitutes were used, did the entrant explain why? Does the item give the appearance and impression of pre-17th century item? Overall, would this item have been considered acceptable, good, or even outstanding if used/consumed/made within the stated time frame and geographic/cultural setting?*

16 Entry could be mistaken for an average period artifact. *All design elements and decoration are/feel true to the period. There are no distinguishably modern elements.*

14 Entry strongly resembles a period artifact. *Most design elements and decoration are/feel true to the period. There are almost no distinguishably modern elements.*

12 Entry resembles a period artifact. *Materials used resemble period materials. Most design elements and decoration are/feel true to the period. There are few distinguishably modern elements.*

10 Entry mostly resembles a period artifact. *The design elements and decoration are/feel mostly true to the period. There are some distinguishably modern elements.*

8 Entry mostly resembles a period artifact. *The design elements and decoration are/feel somewhat true to the period. There are some distinguishably modern elements.*

6 Entry somewhat resembles a period artifact. *The design elements and decoration are not true to the period. There are many distinguishably modern elements.*

4 Entry does not resemble a period artifact. *The design elements and decoration are not true to the period. Elements are mostly modern in look and feel.*

2 Entry does not resemble a period artifact and is blatantly modern in look and feel.

Total Score for Overall Authenticity Section.

Authenticity: Materials/Ingredients Used, 1-12 pts. <i>Are the materials/ingredients used in the creation of the project the same as those used in period, are they modern materials/ingredients that closely resemble/replicate period materials/ingredients, or are they obviously modern? Are substitutions for period materials documented? Do the substitutions used complement the authenticity of appearance or detract from it?</i>	
12	Materials/Ingredients used are the same and/or very similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions closely replicate period materials. All substitutions are well supported by the documentation.</i>
11	Materials/Ingredients used are the same and/or very similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions closely replicate period materials. Substitutions are somewhat supported by the documentation.</i>
10	Materials/Ingredients used are similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions mostly replicate period materials. All substitutions are supported in the documentation.</i>
9	Materials/Ingredients used are similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions mostly replicate period materials. Substitutions are somewhat supported by the documentation.</i>
8	Materials/Ingredients used are the same and/or very similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions, if used, closely replicate period materials. Substitutions are not supported by the documentation.</i>
7	Materials/Ingredients used are similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions mostly replicate period materials. Substitutions are not supported by the documentation.</i>
6	Materials/Ingredients used are mostly modern but demonstrate an attempt to replicate period materials/ingredients. <i>Substitutions somewhat replicate period materials. Rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
5	Materials/Ingredients used are mostly modern but demonstrate an attempt to replicate period materials/ingredients. <i>Substitutions somewhat replicate period materials. No rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
4	Materials/Ingredients used are visibly modern with minimal attempt to replicate period materials. <i>Rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
3	Materials/Ingredients used are visibly modern with minimal attempt to replicate period materials. <i>No rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
2	Materials/Ingredients are visibly modern with no attempt to replicate period materials. <i>Rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
1	Materials/Ingredients are visibly modern with no attempt to replicate period materials. <i>No rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
Total Score for Authenticity of Materials Section.	

Authenticity: Methods & Tools/Equipment Used, 1-12 pts. <i>Are the methods & tools/equipment used in the creation of the project the same as those used in period, are they modern methods & tools/equipment that closely resemble/replicate period methods & tools/equipment, or are they obviously modern? How well do the modern substitutions mimic period methods & tools/equipment? Are the choices supported by documentation or explanation?</i>	
12	Methods & tools/equipment used are the same or very similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions closely replicate period methods/tools. All substitutions are well supported by the documentation.</i>
11	Methods & tools/equipment used are the same or very similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions closely replicate period methods/tools. Substitutions are somewhat supported by the documentation.</i>
10	Methods & tools/equipment used are similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions mostly replicate period methods/tools. All substitutions are supported in the documentation.</i>
9	Methods & tools/equipment used are similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions mostly replicate period methods/tools. Substitutions are somewhat supported by the documentation.</i>
8	Methods & tools/equipment used are the same or very similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions closely replicate period methods/tools. Substitutions are not supported by the documentation.</i>
7	Methods & tools/equipment used are similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions mostly replicate period methods/tools. Substitutions are not supported by the documentation.</i>
6	Methods & tools/equipment used are mostly modern but demonstrate an attempt to replicate period methods/tools. <i>Substitutions somewhat replicate period methods/tools. Rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
5	Methods & tools/equipment used are mostly modern but demonstrate an attempt to replicate period methods/tools. <i>Substitutions somewhat replicate period methods/tools. No rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
4	Methods & tools/equipment used are modern with minimal attempt to replicate period methods/tools. <i>Rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
3	Methods & tools/equipment used are modern with minimal attempt to replicate period methods/tools. <i>No rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
2	Methods & tools/equipment are modern with no attempt to replicate period methods/tools. <i>Rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
1	Methods & tools/equipment are modern with no attempt to replicate period methods/tools. <i>No rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
Total Score for Authenticity of Methods & Tools/Equipment Section.	

Workmanship: Skill Demonstrated with the Tools/Equipment Used, 1-5 pts. <i>Basic evaluation of the level of skill demonstrated with the chosen tools.</i>	
5	Entry demonstrates very high skill with the tools/equipment used.
4	Entry demonstrates high skill with the tools/equipment used. <i>Entrant has a very good understanding of the tools/equipment used and should focus on refining their technique for future projects.</i>
3	Entry demonstrates moderately high skill with the tools/equipment used. <i>Entrant has a good understanding of the tools/equipment used and should focus on improving and refining their technique for future projects.</i>
2	Entry demonstrates moderate skill with the tools/equipment used. <i>Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the tools/equipment in their future projects.</i>
1	Entrant would benefit from more practice with the tools/equipment used. <i>Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the tools/equipment in their future projects.</i>

Workmanship: Skill Demonstrated with the Method(s) Used, 1-5 pts. <i>Basic evaluation of the level of skill demonstrated with the chosen method(s).</i>	
5	Entry demonstrates very high skill with the method(s) used.
4	Entry demonstrates high skill with the method(s) used. <i>Entrant has a very good understanding of the tools/equipment used and should focus on refining their technique for future projects.</i>
3	Entry demonstrates moderately high skill with the method(s) used. <i>Entrant has a good understanding of the tools/equipment used and should focus on improving and refining their technique for future projects.</i>
2	Entry demonstrates moderate skill with the method(s) used. <i>Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the method(s) in their future projects.</i>
1	Entrant would benefit from more practice with the method(s) used. <i>Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the method(s) in their future projects.</i>
Workmanship: Overall Skill, Quality and Success of the Entry, 1-10 pts. <i>This is a summary evaluation of the skill the entrant in creating the finished project. How closely does the entry come to the ideal established by the Source(s) of Inspiration? In entries with multiple parts, look at the quality of the workmanship of the individual pieces as they add up to the finished item.</i>	
10 9	Entry demonstrates a very high level of skill and very high quality of workmanship. <i>All parts fit together smoothly. The resulting entry replicates or strongly resembles a period item in terms of skill and workmanship</i>
8 7	Entry demonstrates a high level of skill and high quality of workmanship. <i>All parts fit together with only minor flaws. The resulting entry has very few and/or only minor visible flaws.</i>
6 5	Entry demonstrates a moderately high level of skill and moderately high quality of workmanship. <i>Not all parts to fit together smoothly. The resulting entry has some visible flaws. Entrant is encouraged to refine their technique in future projects.</i>
4 3	Entry demonstrates a moderate level of skill and moderate quality of workmanship. <i>Parts do not fit together smoothly. The resulting entry has many minor visible flaws and/or some major visible flaws. Entrant is encouraged to increase their skill and workmanship with future projects.</i>
2 1	Entrant would benefit from greater familiarity with the skills and methods used to produce projects of this type. <i>Entrant is encouraged to continue to build their knowledge and skills with future projects.</i>
Total Score for Workmanship Section.	

Complexity: Level of Complexity, 1-4 pts. <i>This is an evaluation of the level of complexity of the entry as prepared by the entrant versus the level of complexity of a similar item created by an artisan in period. Did the entrant take shortcuts not available to a period artisan? Does the entry include examples of work that would have been produced by a variety of artisans and/or craftspeople in period? Did the entrant develop the entry from a period source, use a modern translation, or is this an original work? Were tools and materials purchased or handmade? Is there difficulty of execution of the techniques used in conjunction with the materials and tools chosen? Did the preparation of this entry require work that a period artisan would not have needed to do? Simple projects can receive high complexity scores –IF- the entrant completes all possible steps involved in an authentic manner and/or completes additional steps that a period artisan would not have needed to do.</i>	
4	Entry demonstrates a high level of complexity. <i>The entrant used no purchased/prepared materials that a period artisan would not have also purchased and took no shortcuts in the preparation of this entry.</i>
3	Entry demonstrates a moderately high level of complexity. <i>The entrant used very few purchased/prepared materials in place of items a period artisan would have made him/herself and/or took very few shortcuts in the preparation of this entry.</i>
2	Entry demonstrates a moderately low level of complexity. <i>The entrant used some purchased/prepared materials in place of items a period artisan would have made him/herself and/or took some shortcuts in the preparation of this entry.</i>
1	Entry demonstrates a low level of complexity. <i>The entrant used purchased/prepared materials in place of items a period artisan would have made him/herself and/or took many shortcuts in the preparation of this entry.</i>
Total Score for Complexity Section.	

Creativity: Level of Creativity, 1-4 pts. <i>This is an evaluation of the level of creativity demonstrated in the entry. Is the entry a straight copy of a period artifact? Is the entry an adaptation of a period artifact? Is the entry a new creation in the (documented) style of a period artifact? Did the entrant have to make any adaptations in size, decoration, materials, methods, tools, etc in order to complete this project and/or to adapt this item for use in the SCA or other circumstances? Was the entrant required to extrapolate information from a variety of sources in order to provide documentation for this entry? Did the entrant have any difficulties to overcome in the creation of this project? How did they overcome the difficulties and how successful were they?</i>	
4	Entry demonstrates a high level of creativity.
3	Entry demonstrates a moderately high level of creativity.
2	Entry demonstrates a moderately low level of creativity.
1	Entry demonstrates a low level of creativity.
Total Score for Creativity Section.	

Bonus Points:	
2	Awarded for using 100% period tools and/or methods in the creation of the entry.

Total Score for This Entry	Judge's Signature:
-----------------------------------	---------------------------

Trimaris Arts & Sciences Faire Static Entry

Artificer Comments Form

Turn this form in to the registrar.

ID #: _____ Division: _____ Category: _____

Title of Entry: _____

Judge's Name (please print): _____

Judge's Email Address and/or Telephone Number: _____

Documentation: Information. _____

Documentation: Sources. _____

Documentation: Source of Inspiration. _____

Authenticity: Overall Authenticity of Appearance. _____

Authenticity: Materials/Ingredients Used. _____

Authenticity: Methods & Tools/Equipment Used. _____

Workmanship: Skill Demonstrated with the Tools/Equipment & Method(s) Used. _____

Workmanship: Overall Skill, Quality and Success of the Entry. _____

Complexity: _____

Creativity: _____

Judge's Signature: _____

Trimaris Arts & Sciences Faire Static Entry Masterwork Scoring Form

Turn this form in to the registrar.

ID # : _____ Division: _____ Category: _____

Title of Entry: _____

Judge's Name (Please Print): _____

Each judge will receive their own Judging Form. To score an entry - please circle the score in each area. ½ points are acceptable when scoring. Discussion among judges is permitted prior to scoring, however your score pages should reflect your own impressions of the entry.

Documentation: Information, 1-5 pts. *Includes information pertinent to the entry provided for use by judges. Does the documentation include: ingredients, materials, recipes or period instructions, tools, & techniques appropriate to the stated time frame and geographic/cultural origins of the source(s) of inspiration? Have the entrant's ingredients, materials, recipes or instructions, tools, tools, & techniques been included? Have drawings, pictures, and diagrams been included? Is the documentation well organized and legible? Is the information provided relevant to the project? Does the information provided aid the judges in reviewing the project?*

- | | |
|---|--|
| 5 | Greatly exceeds judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated. |
| 4 | Exceeds judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated. |
| 3 | Meets judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated. |
| 2 | Falls slightly below judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated. |
| 1 | Falls well below judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated. |

Documentation: Sources, 1-5 pts. *Does the entrant cite examples and list sources? Is a bibliography included? (If no sources are listed, there will be no score for this category.) Do the sources listed support the entry? Are primary sources, if available, emphasized? Are primary sources from an appropriate time and place to support the entry? Are secondary, and possibly tertiary, sources used appropriately? Do these supplementary sources include information about the specific time and place of the entry?*

- | | |
|---|--|
| 5 | Greatly exceeds judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated. |
| 4 | Exceeds judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated. |
| 3 | Meets judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated. |
| 2 | Falls slightly below judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated. |
| 1 | Falls well below judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated. |

Documentation: Information About Source of Inspiration, 1-5 pts. *Information provided about the source of inspiration for the project. (If no source of inspiration is provided, there will be no score for this category. Source(s) of inspiration should date from 1650 or before unless justification is provided. Acceptable justification includes but is not limited to: projects modeled on other SCA projects that are themselves modeled on period items or dance, brewing or other entries where primary sources dating from prior to 1650 are extremely rare.) Does the documentation for the source(s) of inspiration include: Time frame & geographic/cultural origins of the model(s) for the entry; ingredients, materials, tools, & techniques used in creation of the model(s)?*

- | | |
|---|--|
| 5 | Greatly exceeds judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated. |
| 4 | Exceeds judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated. |
| 3 | Meets judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated. |
| 2 | Falls slightly below judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated. |
| 1 | Falls well below judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated. |

	Total Score for Documentation Section.
--	---

Overall Authenticity of the Entry, 1-20 pts. *How closely does the entry resemble a period artifact? How closely did the entrant followed pre-17th century techniques and how nearly did the entrant achieved a piece that would not have been out of place in a pre-17th century cultural setting? To what degree has the entrant gone to use pre-17th century tools, ingredients, and processes to make the entry? Are the ingredients and techniques used appropriate to the stated time frame and geographic/cultural origin of the entry? If modern substitutes were used, did the entrant explain why? Does the item give the appearance and impression of pre-17th century item?*

- | | |
|----|--|
| 20 | Entry could be mistaken for an outstanding period artifact. All design elements and decoration are/feel true to the period. There are no distinguishably modern elements. |
| 19 | |
| 18 | Entry could be mistaken for an above average, or good, period artifact. All design elements and decoration are/feel true to the period. There are no distinguishably modern elements. |
| 17 | |
| 16 | Entry could be mistaken for an average period artifact. All design elements and decoration are/feel true to the period. There are no distinguishably modern elements. |
| 15 | |
| 14 | Entry strongly resembles a period artifact. Most design elements and decoration are/feel true to the period. There are almost no distinguishably modern elements. |
| 13 | |
| 12 | Entry resembles a period artifact. Materials used resemble period materials. Most design elements and decoration are/feel true to the period. There are few distinguishably modern elements. |
| 11 | |
| 10 | Entry mostly resembles a period artifact. The design elements and decoration are/feel mostly true to the period. There are some distinguishably modern elements. |
| 9 | |
| 8 | Entry mostly resembles a period artifact. The design elements and decoration are/feel somewhat true to the period. There are some distinguishably modern elements. |
| 7 | |
| 6 | Entry somewhat resembles a period artifact. The design elements and decoration are not true to the period. There are many distinguishably modern elements. |
| 5 | |
| 4 | Entry does not resemble a period artifact. The design elements and decoration are not true to the period. Elements are mostly modern in look and feel. |
| 3 | |
| 2 | Entry does not resemble a period artifact and is blatantly modern in look and feel. |
| 1 | |

	Total Score for Overall Authenticity Section.
--	--

Authenticity: Materials/Ingredients Used, 1-15 pts. <i>Are the materials/ingredients used in the creation of the project the same as those used in period, are they modern materials/ingredients that closely resemble/replicate period materials/ingredients, or are they obviously modern? Are substitutions for period materials documented? Do the substitutions used complement the authenticity of appearance or detract from it?</i>	
15	Materials/Ingredients used are the same as those used in period. <i>Substitutions, if used, are only used to replace period materials/ingredients that are poisonous, illegal, prohibitively dangerous or prohibitively expensive. . All substitutions are well supported by the documentation.</i>
14	Materials/Ingredients used are the same as those used in period. <i>Substitutions, if used, are only used to replace period materials/ingredients that are poisonous, illegal, prohibitively dangerous or prohibitively expensive. All substitutions replicate period materials. All substitutions are somewhat supported by the documentation.</i>
13	Materials/Ingredients used are the same and/or very similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions closely replicate period materials. All substitutions are well supported by the documentation.</i>
12	Materials/Ingredients used are the same and/or very similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions closely replicate period materials. Substitutions are somewhat supported by the documentation.</i>
11	Materials/Ingredients used are similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions mostly replicate period materials. All substitutions are supported in the documentation.</i>
10	Materials/Ingredients used are similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions mostly replicate period materials. Substitutions are somewhat supported by the documentation.</i>
9	Materials/Ingredients used are the same as those used in period. <i>Substitutions, if used, are only used to replace period materials/ingredients that are poisonous, illegal, prohibitively dangerous or prohibitively expensive. All substitutions replicate period methods/tools. Substitutions are not supported by the documentation.</i>
8	Materials/Ingredients used are the same and/or very similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions, if used, closely replicate period materials. Substitutions are not supported by the documentation.</i>
7	Materials/Ingredients used are similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions mostly replicate period materials. Substitutions are not supported by the documentation.</i>
6	Materials/Ingredients used are mostly modern but demonstrate an attempt to replicate period materials/ingredients. <i>Substitutions somewhat replicate period materials. Rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
5	Materials/Ingredients used are mostly modern but demonstrate an attempt to replicate period materials/ingredients. <i>Substitutions somewhat replicate period materials. No rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
4	Materials/Ingredients used are visibly modern with minimal attempt to replicate period materials. <i>Rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
3	Materials/Ingredients used are visibly modern with minimal attempt to replicate period materials. <i>No rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
2	Materials/Ingredients are visibly modern with no attempt to replicate period materials. <i>Rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
1	Materials/Ingredients are visibly modern with no attempt to replicate period materials. <i>No rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
Total Score for Authenticity of Materials Section.	

Authenticity: Methods & Tools/Equipment Used, 1-15 pts. <i>Are the methods & tools/equipment used in the creation of the project the same as those used in period, are they modern methods & tools/equipment that closely resemble/replicate period methods & tools/equipment, or are they obviously modern? How well do the modern substitutions mimic period methods & tools/equipment? Are the choices supported by documentation or explanation?</i>	
15	Methods & tools/equipment used are the same as those used in period. <i>Substitutions, if used, are only used to replace period methods/tools that are poisonous, illegal, prohibitively dangerous or prohibitively expensive. All substitutions are well supported by the documentation.</i>
14	Methods & tools/equipment used are the same as those used in period. <i>Substitutions, if used, are only used to replace period methods/tools that are poisonous, illegal, prohibitively dangerous or prohibitively expensive. All substitutions replicate period methods/tools. All substitutions are somewhat supported by the documentation.</i>
13	Methods & tools/equipment used are the same or very similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions closely replicate period methods/tools. All substitutions are well supported by the documentation.</i>
12	Methods & tools/equipment used are the same or very similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions closely replicate period methods/tools. Substitutions are somewhat supported by the documentation.</i>
11	Methods & tools/equipment used are similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions mostly replicate period methods/tools. All substitutions are supported in the documentation.</i>
10	Methods & tools/equipment used are similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions mostly replicate period methods/tools. Substitutions are somewhat supported by the documentation.</i>
9	Methods & tools/equipment used are the same as those used in period. <i>Substitutions, if used, are only used to replace period methods/tools that are poisonous, illegal, prohibitively dangerous or prohibitively expensive. All substitutions replicate period methods/tools. Substitutions are not supported by the documentation.</i>
8	Methods & tools/equipment used are the same or very similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions closely replicate period methods/tools. Substitutions are not supported by the documentation.</i>
7	Methods & tools/equipment used are similar to those used in period. <i>Substitutions mostly replicate period methods/tools. Substitutions are not supported by the documentation.</i>
6	Methods & tools/equipment used are mostly modern but demonstrate an attempt to replicate period methods/tools. <i>Substitutions somewhat replicate period methods/tools. Rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
5	Methods & tools/equipment used are mostly modern but demonstrate an attempt to replicate period methods/tools. <i>Substitutions somewhat replicate period methods/tools. No rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
4	Methods & tools/equipment used are modern with minimal attempt to replicate period methods/tools. <i>Rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
3	Methods & tools/equipment used are modern with minimal attempt to replicate period methods/tools. <i>No rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
2	Methods & tools/equipment are modern with no attempt to replicate period methods/tools. <i>Rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
1	Methods & tools/equipment are modern with no attempt to replicate period methods/tools. <i>No rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.</i>
Total Score for Authenticity of Methods & Tools/Equipment Section.	

Workmanship: Skill Demonstrated with the Tools/Equipment Used, 1-5 pts. <i>Basic evaluation of the level of skill demonstrated with the chosen tools.</i>	
5	Entry demonstrates very high skill with the tools/equipment used.
4	Entry demonstrates high skill with the tools/equipment used. <i>Entrant has a very good understanding of the tools/equipment used and should focus on refining their technique for future projects.</i>
3	Entry demonstrates moderately high skill with the tools/equipment used. <i>Entrant has a good understanding of the tools/equipment used and should focus on improving and refining their technique for future projects.</i>
2	Entry demonstrates moderate skill with the tools/equipment used. <i>Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the tools/equipment in their future projects.</i>
1	Entrant would benefit from more practice with the tools/equipment used. <i>Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the tools/equipment in their future projects.</i>
Workmanship: Skill Demonstrated with the Method(s) Used, 1-5 pts. <i>Basic evaluation of the level of skill demonstrated with the chosen method(s).</i>	
5	Entry demonstrates very high skill with the method(s) used.
4	Entry demonstrates high skill with the method(s) used. <i>Entrant has a very good understanding of the tools/equipment used and should focus on refining their technique for future projects.</i>
3	Entry demonstrates moderately high skill with the method(s) used. <i>Entrant has a good understanding of the tools/equipment used and should focus on improving and refining their technique for future projects.</i>
2	Entry demonstrates moderate skill with the method(s) used. <i>Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the method(s) in their future projects.</i>
1	Entrant would benefit from more practice with the method(s) used. <i>Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the method(s) in their future projects.</i>
Workmanship: Skill Demonstrated with Research & Documentation, 1-5 pts. <i>Basic evaluation of the level of skill demonstrated with research and documentation.</i>	
5	Entry demonstrates very high skill with research and documentation.
4	Entry demonstrates high skill with research and documentation.
3	Entry demonstrates moderately high skill with research and documentation.
2	Entry demonstrates moderate skill with research and documentation.
1	Entrant would benefit from more practice with research and documentation.
Workmanship: Overall Skill, Quality and Success of the Entry, 1-10 pts. <i>This is a summary evaluation of the skill the entrant in creating the finished project. How closely does the entry come to the ideal established by the Source(s) of Inspiration? In entries with multiple parts, look at the quality of the workmanship of the individual pieces as they add up to the finished item.</i>	
10	Entry demonstrates a very high level of skill and very high quality of workmanship. <i>All parts fit together smoothly. The resulting entry replicates or strongly resembles a period item in terms of skill and workmanship</i>
9	
8	Entry demonstrates a high level of skill and high quality of workmanship. <i>All parts fit together with only minor flaws. The resulting entry has very few and/or only minor visible flaws.</i>
7	
6	Entry demonstrates a moderately high level of skill and moderately high quality of workmanship. <i>Not all parts fit together smoothly. The resulting entry has some visible flaws. Entrant is encouraged to refine their technique in future projects.</i>
5	
4	Entry demonstrates a moderate level of skill and moderate quality of workmanship. <i>Parts do not fit together smoothly. The resulting entry has many minor visible flaws and/or some major visible flaws. Entrant is encouraged to increase their skill and workmanship with future projects.</i>
3	
2	Entrant would benefit from greater familiarity with the skills and methods used to produce projects of this type. <i>Entrant is encouraged to continue to build their knowledge and skills with future projects.</i>
1	
	Total Score for Workmanship Section.

Complexity: Level of Complexity, 1-5 pts. <i>This is an evaluation of the level of complexity of the entry as prepared by the entrant versus the level of complexity of a similar item created by an artisan in period. Did the entrant take shortcuts not available to a period artisan? Does the entry include examples of work that would have been produced by a variety of artisans and/or craftspeople in period? Did the entrant develop the entry from a period source, use a modern translation, or is this an original work? Were tools and materials purchased or handmade? Is there difficulty of execution of the techniques used in conjunction with the materials and tools chosen? Did the preparation of this entry require work that a period artisan would not have needed to do? Simple projects can receive high complexity scores –IF- the entrant completes all possible steps involved in an authentic manner and/or completes additional steps that a period artisan would not have needed to do.</i>	
5	Entry demonstrates a very high level of complexity. <i>The entrant used no purchased/prepared materials that a period artisan would not have also purchased and made some of the tools or materials that a period artisan would have purchased. The entrant took no shortcuts in the preparation of this entry.</i>
4	Entry demonstrates a high level of complexity. <i>The entrant used no purchased/prepared materials that a period artisan would not have also purchased and took no shortcuts in the preparation of this entry.</i>
3	Entry demonstrates a moderately high level of complexity. <i>The entrant used very few purchased/prepared materials in place of items a period artisan would have made him/herself and/or took very few shortcuts in the preparation of this entry.</i>
2	Entry demonstrates a moderately low level of complexity. <i>The entrant used some purchased/prepared materials in place of items a period artisan would have made him/herself and/or took some shortcuts in the preparation of this entry.</i>
1	Entry demonstrates a low level of complexity. <i>The entrant used purchased/prepared materials in place of items a period artisan would have made him/herself and/or took many shortcuts in the preparation of this entry.</i>
	Total Score for Complexity Section.

Creativity: Level of Creativity, 1-5 pts. *This is an evaluation of the level of creativity demonstrated in the entry. Is the entry a straight copy of a period artifact? Is the entry an adaptation of a period artifact? Is the entry a new creation in the (documented) style of a period artifact? Did the entrant have to make any adaptations in size, decoration, materials, methods, tools, etc in order to complete this project and/or to adapt this item for use in the SCA or other circumstances? Was the entrant required to extrapolate information from a variety of sources in order to provide documentation for this entry? Did the entrant have any difficulties to overcome in the creation of this project? How did they overcome the difficulties and how successful were they?*

5	Entry demonstrates a very high level of creativity.
4	Entry demonstrates a high level of creativity.
3	Entry demonstrates a moderately high level of creativity.
2	Entry demonstrates a moderately low level of creativity.
1	Entry demonstrates a low level of creativity.

	Total Score for Creativity Section.
--	--

Bonus Points:

2	Awarded for using 100% period tools and methods in the creation of the entry.
---	---

Total Score for This Entry	Judge's Signature:
-----------------------------------	---------------------------

Trimaris Arts & Sciences Faire Static Entry

Masterwork Comments Form

Turn this form in to the registrar.

ID # : _____ Division: _____ Category: _____

Title of Entry: _____

Judge's Name (please print): _____

Judge's Email Address and/or Telephone Number: _____

Documentation: Information. _____

Documentation: Sources. _____

Documentation: Source of Inspiration. _____

Authenticity: Overall Authenticity of Appearance. _____

Authenticity: Materials/Ingredients Used. _____

Authenticity: Methods & Tools/Equipment Used. _____

Workmanship: Skill Demonstrated with the Tools/Equipment & Method(s) Used. _____

Workmanship: Research and Documentation. _____

Workmanship: Overall Skill, Quality and Success of the Entry. _____

Complexity: _____

Creativity: _____

Judge's Signature: _____