

## Pennsic 47 Arts and Sciences War Point Rubric

Entrant SCA Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Item Description: \_\_\_\_\_

Judges: \_\_\_\_\_ Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_/48

*Please include the names of all judges assessing the entry, and at least one e-mail address for follow-up questions.*

CATEGORIES	6	5	4	3	2	1
<p><b>Materials</b> Work is evaluated on its use of materials which are similar or identical to historically appropriate materials. The material choices are supported with evidence and should be appropriate to the time, culture and purpose of the work. Substitutions should be appropriate, and justifiable. (E.g. not available in modern times, materials are hazardous)</p>	<p>Work uses exclusively historically appropriate materials, including obscure, expensive, or difficult-to-locate materials; materials may even be researched and reconstructed independently.</p> <p>No substitutions have been made except in the case of health and safety, or materials which are cost-prohibitive, or unavailable in their period form.</p> <p>Information on all materials is completely supported by reputable evidence.</p>	<p>Work uses historically appropriate materials, except for those extremely expensive or difficult to locate.</p> <p>Substitutions are minimized as much as possible, and all substitutions are thoroughly explained, appropriate, and justified.</p> <p>Ample evidence pertaining to materials and their historical accuracy is provided.</p>	<p>Work uses primarily historically appropriate materials.</p> <p>Substitutions are reasonably explained, appropriate, and justifiable.</p> <p>A good amount of evidence about historically accurate materials is provided.</p>	<p>Work uses a roughly even combination of historical and modern materials.</p> <p>Most substitutions are reasonably explained and justifiable.</p> <p>Some information is provided about historically accurate materials.</p>	<p>Work uses more modern materials than historically appropriate ones, but does use historically appropriate materials.</p> <p>Some substitutions may be explained and justifiable.</p> <p>Minimal information about historically accurate materials is present.</p>	<p>Work uses clearly modern or industrial materials.</p> <p>Substitutions are explained inadequately, or not at all.</p> <p>Information about historically accurate is vague or difficult to ascertain.</p>
<p><b>Methods</b> Work is evaluated on its use of processes, techniques or methods which are identical to or emulate those used in period. The processes and choices are supported with evidence and should be appropriate to the time, culture and purpose of the work. Use of modern processes or techniques should be appropriate, and justifiable. (E.g. not available in modern times, method is hazardous). This score is not to reflect the execution or success of the construction.</p>	<p>Work employs total use of period techniques, including ones that are obscure or the product of experimental archaeology.</p> <p>No substitutions made except for those that are cost-prohibitive or impact health and safety.</p> <p>Information on all period methods is completely supported by reputable evidence.</p> <p>Period tools are employed exclusively, and may themselves be researched and reconstructed independently</p>	<p>Work uses or emulates the same techniques that were used in period, save for those which are extremely expensive or unreasonably time-consuming.</p> <p>Substitutions are minimized as much as possible, and all substitutions are thoroughly explained, justifiable, and appropriate.</p> <p>Ample evidence pertaining to techniques and their period accuracy is provided.</p> <p>Work employs period tools wherever possible. Deviations from period tools are justified and explained.</p>	<p>Work uses or emulates mainly period techniques, but some modern techniques are used.</p> <p>Substitutions are reasonably explained, appropriate, and justifiable.</p> <p>A good amount of evidence related to period technique is provided.</p> <p>Period tools are employed in significant parts of the work; information on tool use informs process.</p>	<p>Work uses or emulates a combination of period and modern techniques.</p> <p>Most techniques employed are reasonably justified and explained.</p> <p>Some information is provided about period technique.</p> <p>Some attempt at period tool use is made, and most tool use is related to historical practice.</p>	<p>Work uses a majority of modern techniques with some use or emulation of period techniques.</p> <p>Some use of the modern techniques may be explained.</p> <p>Minimal information about period technique is supplied.</p> <p>Some tool use is discussed in relation to historical method, though tools are mostly modern.</p>	<p>Work uses modern techniques.</p> <p>Reason for the use of the modern technique is explained inadequately, or not at all.</p> <p>Information about the period technique is vague or difficult to ascertain. Tools used are entirely modern.</p>

	of the work in question.					
<p><b>Complexity</b> Work is evaluated on the difficulty and challenge of its creation, and on the sophistication of its goals.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates an extensive degree of time, research, creativity and/or commitment.</p> <p>Goals impel the artisan to explore new areas of knowledge in depth in order to enhance their understanding of the topic.</p> <p>Project is of a very high degree of difficulty, addressing unique or esoteric challenges.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a great degree of time, research, creativity and/or commitment.</p> <p>Goals drive the artisan to explore and expand their knowledge of the topic.</p> <p>Project is difficult for the artisan, and poses multiple engaging challenges.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a good degree of time, research, creativity and/or commitment.</p> <p>Goals force the artisan to expand their comfort zone.</p> <p>Project poses an interesting or new challenge for the artisan.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a moderate degree of time, research, creativity and/or commitment.</p> <p>Goals push the artisan somewhat.</p> <p>Project presents some challenge or risk of failure.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a basic degree of time, research, creativity and/or commitment.</p> <p>Goals are simplistic and “safe” for the artisan.</p> <p>Project is relatively easy for the artisan.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a minimal degree of time, research, creativity and/or commitment.</p> <p>Goals are unclear or vaguely expressed.</p> <p>Project is too easy for the artisan.</p>
<p><b>Execution</b> Work is evaluated on the skill, workmanship, or artistic ability evident in its creation; in addition, the artisan is evaluated in how well their execution achieved their goals, and how they handled shortfalls.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates an exceptional degree of skill, workmanship, and/or artistic ability.</p> <p>Not only does the artisan achieve their goals for this project, but their success informs other projects and goals as well.</p> <p>Mistakes or shortcomings are embraced, being discussed in thorough detail, and in comparison to mistakes evident in period examples, if relevant. Lessons learned and multiple future avenues of exploration are outlined.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates an advanced degree of skill, workmanship, and/or artistic ability.</p> <p>The work achieves all of the artisan’s goals for the project.</p> <p>Mistakes and/or shortcomings are discussed in detail, and the artisan presents several possible “next steps” to address what they’ve learned.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a good degree skill, workmanship, and/or artistic ability.</p> <p>The work achieves most of the artisan’s goals.</p> <p>Mistakes and/or shortcomings are discussed in some detail, and the artisan gives a concrete “next step” for their work.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a moderate degree skill, workmanship, and/or artistic ability.</p> <p>Work achieves many of the goals of the artisan.</p> <p>Mistakes and/or shortcomings are acknowledged, and some speculation for improvement is given.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a basic degree skill, workmanship, and/or artistic ability.</p> <p>Work achieves a few of the goals set by the artisan.</p> <p>Mistakes are acknowledged.</p>	<p>Work demonstrates a minimal degree skill, workmanship, and/or artistic ability.</p> <p>It is unclear if the goals of the project were achieved.</p> <p>Mistakes are disguised or misrepresented.</p>
<p><b>Sources</b> Work is evaluated on the use of evidence from many sources. Sources used should be a mixture of analytical (secondary) sources written by knowledgeable experts, and direct (primary) evidence, as available. Artisan should be able to discuss the significance of their sources.</p>	<p>An exhaustive variety of direct or analytical sources is employed.</p> <p>Quality is superlative, and may include unique sources or original research.</p> <p>Significance and authority of sources has been well established &amp; the limitations of sources used or available have been discussed in detail.</p>	<p>An extensive variety of direct or analytical sources is employed.</p> <p>Quality of sources is excellent.</p> <p>Significance and authority of sources has been well established &amp; the limitations of sources used or available have been discussed.</p>	<p>A good variety of direct or analytical sources are used.</p> <p>Quality of sources is generally good.</p> <p>Significance and authority of sources has been clearly established</p>	<p>A fair variety of direct or analytical sources are use</p> <p>Quality of sources is uneven.</p> <p>Significance and authority has been mostly established.</p>	<p>A minimal variety of direct or analytical sources used.</p> <p>Many of the sources are of inadequately or limited quality.</p> <p>Significance and authority has been minimally established.</p>	<p>Indirect or encyclopedic sources are used exclusively.</p> <p>The quality of the sources seems very inadequately or limited.</p> <p>The authority and significance of the sources has not been discussed.</p>

<p><b>Historicity</b> Work is evaluated on the depth of its connection to an historic time and place, including the cultural context of the work (purpose of the item, its audience, and its social meaning or significance).</p>	<p>Work presents a clear and compelling connection to a specific time and place in history.</p> <p>Discussion and analysis of historical and cultural context is deep, insightful, and nuanced; use, meaning, and value of the work are extensively discussed, creating a complex view of the work including the limitations of interpretation.</p>	<p>Work builds a connection to a historic time and place.</p> <p>Discussion and analysis of historical and cultural context argues for the use, meaning, and value of the work.</p>	<p>Work is mostly successful at building a connection to a historic time or place.</p> <p>Discussion or analysis of historical and cultural context is thoughtful. Insight into probable use, meaning, or value is provided.</p>	<p>Work attempts to build a connection to a historical time or place.</p> <p>Discussion or analysis of historical and cultural context is clear. Plausible use, meaning, or value is investigated.</p>	<p>Connection of work to historical time or place is vague, covering a broad range of possibilities.</p> <p>Discussion or analysis of historical and cultural context is developing. Possible use, meaning, or value is subject to some speculation.</p>	<p>Connection of work to historical time or place is tenuous at best.</p> <p>Discussion or analysis of historical and cultural context is weak. Use, meaning, or value of the work is not clear.</p>
<p><b>Utility</b> Work is evaluated on whether the item accomplishes its intended purpose. The item or set of items should fit into the culture for which it was created while demonstrating that it may be used as a tool, worn by a member of that culture, displayed decoratively in a home. Church, monastery, palace, etc.</p> <p>Documentation should include discussion of the context and intended usage, including a demonstration of usage or fit as appropriate.</p>	<p>The item appears and functions exactly as one created in the time and place to which it is tied historically.</p> <p>Someone of the time period would immediately recognize the item, its use, and meaning.</p>	<p>Item appears and functions as one created in the time and place to which it is tied historically.</p> <p>Someone from the time and culture would not find the item out of time or place.</p>	<p>Item is a very close approximation of the historical piece in usage, fit, appearance, technique, etc.</p>	<p>Item is a good quality reproduction of the historical piece in usage, fit, appearance, technique, etc.</p> <p>Proportion and/or function fall somewhat outside historic parameters.</p>	<p>Item does not function as intended, although appearance is generally close to historic example, if any.</p>	<p>Item does not function or fit or looks modern if decorative</p>
<p><b>Ingenuity</b> Work is evaluated for the ingenuity of the entry.</p> <p>Work is judged as to the entrant's resourcefulness and inventive approach in creating their entry.</p> <p>Original thought and interpretation are used to develop a final product that fits into historic time and place.</p>	<p>Entry reflects period context while demonstrating exhaustive thought processes in developing techniques and choosing historically appropriate materials except where prohibited by cost, safety, etc.</p>	<p>Entry reflects period context while demonstrating extensive thought processes in developing techniques and choosing appropriate materials or determining reasonable substitutes.</p>	<p>Entry reflects period context while demonstrating significant thought processes in developing techniques and choosing appropriate materials or determining reasonable substitutes.</p>	<p>Entry is an item that demonstrates thought processes and development of techniques, however, the entry relies to some extent on the research or patterns of others.</p>	<p>Entry uses patterns or research developed by another, modified by the artisan.</p>	<p>Entry is primarily rote-copied, using other's work and/or research.</p>

COMMENTS
<b>Materials:</b>
<b>Methods:</b>
<b>Complexity:</b>
<b>Execution:</b>
<b>Sources:</b>
<b>Historicity:</b>

### **Guidelines for use of the Pennsic Rubric**

The goal of this rubric is to provide a set of common criteria for arts and sciences entries which will provide concrete guidance and feedback to artisans about their work, and facilitate development of a more consistent judging experience in competition. We understand that there are subjective judgements involved when evaluators use rubrics, and that there could be variances between results from evaluator to evaluator. It is the goal of the Kingdom's Arts and Sciences office to work with evaluators to promote consistent use of the rubric by offering guidelines on how to use the rubric, and by working to familiarize evaluators with the rubric whenever possible.

- This rubric uses an assumed ideal as its goal - the recreation of a piece from a specific time and place in the pre-17th century world. Artisans should aim to produce an item equivalent to a high quality museum reproduction piece, one that has been constructed using historically appropriate methods and materials. An item's performance in this rubric assumes that an artisan is striving for that ideal and wants to move

their work in that direction. Some projects, depending on their goals, the nature of historic evidence available, or the practicality of using period construction methods, will be unable to attain certain levels in this rubric, and that's OK.

- While the rubric does not require detailed formal written documentation, it does require that an artisan supply evidence to support their work. The evidence should be drawn from relevant and authoritative sources and then analyzed and synthesized by the artisan to support their project. While written documentation is probably the most common vehicle for conveying evidence, artisans may provide evidence in other ways, including verbally. In face-to-face judging situations where written documentation is not required by competition rules, please consider both verbal and written documentation equally when judging. If you have a question and information is not provided by the artisan, please ask, and consider the artisan's answer when assessing the entry. Don't penalize an entrant for not supplying the information, if they know and can *fully* articulate and support the answer.
- To provide a consistent judging experience for all entrants, please apply the rubric categories as written while judging each entry.
- There should be no 1/2 scores given when using the rubric. If an entrant does not meet *almost* all criteria for a particular score, their entry should not be assigned that score.
- When considering between two scores, be advised that the first element in a section is considered the essential defining element of that section; the remaining elements provide support.
- The top score in the rubric should be very hard to achieve, and this score should be reserved for truly exemplary entries.
- When assessing an entry, start by reading the leftmost score. If that describes what you see, that is the score you assign. If it doesn't, please move to the right and repeat.
- If you are having difficulty using the rubric with a particular entry in a competition, please notify the competition organizers so discussion can take place about how to work around this issue, and so that feedback can be given to the organizers so the rubric can be modified in the future.