Trimaris Arts & Sciences Faire Static Entry Artificer Scoring Form

Turn this form in to the registrar.

ID #	# :Division: Category:	
Titl	tle of Entry:	
Juc	idge's Name (Please Print):	
	ch judge will receive their own Judging Form. To score an entry - please circle the score in each area. ½ points are acceptable when scoring Eong judges is permitted prior to scoring, however your score pages should reflect your own impressions of the entry.	Discussion
materi charad and di	umentation: Information, 1-4 pts. Includes information pertinent to the entry provided for use by judges. Does the documentation include: ingredients, erials, recipes or period instructions, tools, & techniques appropriate to the stated time frame and geographic/cultural origins of the source(s) of inspiration; acteristics of the model(s)? Have the entrant's ingredients, materials, recipes or instructions, tools, tools, & techniques been included? Have drawings, pic diagrams been included? Is the documentation well organized and legible? Is the information provided relevant to the project? Does the information provideds in reviewing the project?	and, the tures,
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.	
this ca suppo	umentation: Sources, 1-4 pts. Did the entrant cite examples and list sources? Iis a bibliography included? (If no sources are listed, there will be no so category.) Do the sources listed support the entry? Are primary sources, if available, emphasized? Are primary sources from an appropriate time and plac fort the entry? Are secondary, and possibly tertiary, sources used appropriately? Do these supplementary sources include information about the specific to be of the entry?	ce to
4	Exceeds judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated.	
3	Meets judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated.	
2		
1	Falls well below judge's concept of "average" for the criterion evaluated. when the source of inspiration for the project. (If no source of Inspiration, 1-4 pts. Information provided about the source of inspiration for the project. (If no source of the project.)	
inspira justific where	iration is provided, there will be no score for this category. Source(s) of inspiration should date from 1650 or before unless justification is provided. Accept fication includes but is not limited to: projects modeled on other SCA projects that are themselves modeled on period items or dance, brewing or other entr re primary sources dating from prior to 1650 are extremely rare.) Does the documentation for the source(s) of inspiration include: Time frame & praphic/cultural origins of the model(s) for the entry; ingredients, materials, tools, & techniques used in creation of the model(s); and, the characteristics of t	table ries
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.	
Docı	cumentation: Information	
Docı	cumentation: Sources.	

Documentation: Source of Inspiration.			
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 15	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 13	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 11	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 9	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 7	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 5	Entry somewhat resembles a period artifact. The design elements and decoration are not true to the period. There are many distinguishably modern elements.		
4 3	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 1	Entry does not resemble a period artifact and is blatantly modern in look and feel.		
	Total Score for Overall Authenticity Section.		
Auth	nenticity: Overall Authenticity of Appearance.		
Authenticity: Materials/Ingredients Used, 1-12 pts. 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?			
12	Materials/Ingredients used are the same and/or very similar to those used in period. Substitutions closely replicate period materials. All substitutions are well supported by the documentation.		
11	Materials/Ingredients used are the same and/or very similar to those used in period. Substitutions closely replicate period materials. Substitutions are somewhat supported by the documentation.		
10	Materials/Ingredients used are similar to those used in period. Substitutions mostly replicate period materials. All substitutions are supported in the documentation.		
9	Materials/Ingredients used are similar to those used in period. Substitutions mostly replicate period materials. Substitutions are somewhat supported by the documentation.		
8	Materials/Ingredients used are the same and/or very similar to those used in period. Substitutions, if used, closely replicate period materials. Substitutions are not supported by the documentation.		
7	Materials/Ingredients used are similar to those used in period. Substitutions mostly replicate period materials. Substitutions are not supported by the documentation.		
6	Materials/Ingredients used are mostly modern but demonstrate an attempt to replicate period materials/ingredients. Substitutions somewhat replicate period materials. Rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.		
5	Materials/Ingredients used are mostly modern but demonstrate an attempt to replicate period materials/ingredients. Substitutions somewhat replicate period materials. No rationalization for chosen materials provided in the documentation.		

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

Workmans	ship: Skill Demonstrated with the Tools/Equipment Used, 1-5 pts. Basic evaluation of the level of skill demonstrated with the chosen tools.			
5 Entry demonstrates very high skill with the tools/equipment used.				
4	Entry demonstrates high skill with the tools/equipment used. Entrant has a very good understanding of the tools/equipment used and should focus on refining their technique for future projects.			
3	Entry demonstrates moderately high skill with the tools/equipment used. Entrant has a good understanding of the tools/equipment used and should focus on improving and refining their technique for future projects.			
2	Entry demonstrates moderate skill with the tools/equipment used. Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the tools/equipment in their future projects.			
1	Entrant would benefit from more practice with the tools/equipment used. Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the tools/equipment in their future projects.			
Workmans	ship: Skill Demonstrated with the Method(s) Used, 1-5 pts. Basic evaluation of the level of skill demonstrated with the chosen method(s).			
5	Entry demonstrates very high skill with the method(s) used.			
4	Entry demonstrates high skill with the method(s) used. Entrant has a very good understanding of the tools/equipment used and should focus on refining their technique for future projects.			
3	Entry demonstrates moderately high skill with the method(s) used. Entrant has a good understanding of the tools/equipment used and should focus on improving and refining their technique for future projects.			
2	Entry demonstrates moderate skill with the method(s) used. Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the method(s) in their future projects.			
1	Entrant would benefit from more practice with the method(s) used. Entrant should strive to become more familiar and comfortable with the method(s) in their future projects.			
	ship: Overall Skill, Quality and Success of the Entry, 1-10 pts. This is a summary evaluation of the skill the entrant in creating the finished project. How			
	es 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 ti	hey add up to the finished item.			
10 9	Entry demonstrates a very high level of skill and very high quality of workmanship. All parts fit together smoothly. The resulting entry replicates or strongly resembles a period item in terms of skill and workmanship			
8 7	Entry demonstrates a high level of skill and high quality of workmanship. All parts fit together with only minor flaws. The resulting entry has very few and/or only minor visible flaws.			
6 5	Entry demonstrates a moderately high level of skill and moderately high quality of workmanship. Not all parts to fit together smoothly. The resulting entry has some visible flaws. Entrant is encouraged to refine their technique in future projects.			
4 3	Entry demonstrates a moderate level of skill and moderate quality of workmanship. 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.			
2 1	Entrant would benefit from greater familiarity with the skills and methods used to produce project s of this type. Entrant is encouraged to continue to build their knowledge and skills with future projects.			
	Total Score for Workmanship Section.			
Morkma	anship: Skill Demonstrated with the Tools/Equipment & Method(s) Used			
VVOLKITIC	inship. Skill Demonstrated with the Tools/Equipment & Method(s) osed			
-				
Workmanship: Overall Skill, Quality and Success of the Entry.				

Complexity: Level of Complexity, 1-4 pts. 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.					
4	Entry demonstrates a high level of complexity. 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.				
3	Entry demonstrates a moderately high level of complexity. 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.				
2	Entry demonstrates a moderately low level of complexity. 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.				
1	Entry demonstrates a low level of complexity. 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.				
	Total Score for Complexity Section.				
Comp	lexity:				
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Creativity: Level of Creativity, 1-4 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? 4					
2 Awarded for using 100% period tools and/or methods in the creation of the entry.					
ı					
	Total Score for This Entry Judge's Signature:				
Judge's Email/Telephone:					