

ARTemisia Arts and Sciences Competition – Research Paper

Entrant:

Judge's Name _____

Item:

Judge's Signature _____

Category:

Authenticity:

Because there is not a useful equivalent to certain types of Non-Fiction Writing (such as Research Papers and How-To Guides) in our time period, the authenticity section will focus on the information contained within the writing, **not the writing style or format itself**. Efforts to include quality sources and to cover subject matter relevant to the SCA period will score best.

Note: This section deals only with the historical basis of the subject matter and the usage of sources. It does not cover formatting, organization, thesis or any other items.

1. Rate the overall authenticity of the subject matter: _____ (1-6)	
<input type="checkbox"/> How period appropriate (pre-1650) is the topic/subject of the paper? <input type="checkbox"/> How well does the paper place the topic/subject in the context of its time and place? <input type="checkbox"/> If there is a modern element, is it directly related to the SCA (Modern Middle Ages)? If the paper is primarily about the SCA, is there significant historical basis for the information presented. The writing must have a significant historical basis. Note: This is an overall question and does not specifically cover sources.	<p>1-2: The subject matter is modern (not related to the SCA), with little historical basis.</p> <p>3-4: The subject is somewhat period (or SCA related with some historical basis.)</p> <p>5-6: The subject matter is appropriate to period, with good context (or is SCA related with excellent historical basis.)</p>
2. Rate the quality and variety of sources used in the paper: _____ (1-6)	
<input type="checkbox"/> The paper includes (and references) good sources that support the writing. <input type="checkbox"/> Sources prominently include primary and secondary sources. <input type="checkbox"/> Beyond primary or secondary sources, the sources tend to be scholarly. <input type="checkbox"/> Sources do not include significant non-scholarly internet sites such as Wikipedia or Pinterest. <input type="checkbox"/> How well does the entry demonstrate familiarity with key sources and/or scholarship relevant to the topic? Note: This does not cover how sources are cited, only that they are good and support the work.	<p>1-2: No/few sources are used, or the sources used are largely non-scholarly.</p> <p>3-4: A variety of sources are used to support the subject with some use of scholarly or primary/secondary sources.</p> <p>5-6: Variety of sources used with the majority of them being scholarly with an emphasis on primary/secondary sources.</p>
3. Rate the internal consistency of the project: _____ (1-4)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Are elements in the writing (and the sources supporting) consistent with each other in time/place/topic? If the writing is an overview of multiple times/places, does the grouping make sense? <input type="checkbox"/> Examples: If supporting a 14 th century English weaving practice, is information kept to (reasonably) relevant time/place or is it referencing Norse and/or Middle Eastern practices? If covering glass techniques through time while largely focusing on the Italian peninsula, does including a German glass artifact make sense?	<p>1-2: Elements of the paper are very modern or have internal inconsistencies that detract from the overall subject matter.</p> <p>3-4: Information presented is aligned to be relevant to the subject and consistent with other information in the paper.</p>
4. Bonus: Does the authenticity of this project go above and beyond reasonable requirements? (check for areas that excelled) _____ (0-2)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Overall subject matter is extremely relevant to period, with the context of the piece well established. <input type="checkbox"/> The paper is somewhat or entirely on modern SCA practice but does an exceptionally good job lending historical information to the subject. <input type="checkbox"/> The sources are extremely good, with an impressive amount of relevant primary/secondary sources used. <input type="checkbox"/> The internal consistency of the paper is excellent, with information very well aligned and consistent.	<p>0: Authenticity showed no above and beyond efforts.</p> <p>1: Authenticity exceeded requirements in one bonus area</p> <p>2: Authenticity exceeded requirements in more than one bonus area</p>

Difficulty:

The goal here is to rate the difficulty of the attempt without considering the achieved result. Entries will do best here that are innovative and complex, that have breadth or depth to their topics. Length will also be taken into account (though extraneous details just to achieve length will not help.)

Note: Efforts to find/present entirely new information or conclusions can certainly score highly but is not a requirement for the criteria.

5. Rate the difficulty attempted with respect to the purpose (thesis statement) of the entry: _____ (1-4)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Is the purpose of the paper (thesis statement) clear? <input type="checkbox"/> Is the entry covering a common subject (with material more readily available) or will it require significant research? <input type="checkbox"/> Is the purpose particularly innovative, interesting, complex?	<p>1-2: The purpose of the paper is not stated or unclear and the subject is quite common.</p> <p>3-4: The purpose of the paper is clear and the subject is quite complex/innovative.</p>
6. Rate the difficulty attempted with respect to the breadth or depth of the entry: _____ (1-6)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Does the entry show a good mix of depth and breadth? <input type="checkbox"/> If the entry is largely about an overview of a single item/person/event, is there additional difficulty in trying to either increase the breadth of the topic by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Finding more about the topic item/person/event to give significant details such as methods, materials and historical context? o Finding other items/persons/events that were linked to the first one and exploring how these topics are linked in a larger picture? o Other efforts to increase the scope that are relevant to the thesis statement. (Additional detail that don't support the purpose of the entry may not help here.) <input type="checkbox"/> Is the entry extremely broad, touching on many elements, is reasonable depth added in any particular area?	<p>1-2: The paper is focused tightly on a particular element with little or no additional details connecting to a broader picture OR a broad picture with little or no depth in any area.</p> <p>3-4: The paper has some mixture of depth and breadth.</p> <p>5-6: The paper has an excellent mixture of depth and breadth, including both details and a broader picture.</p>
7. Rate the difficulty attempted with respect to the length of the entry: _____ (1-6)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Overall, is the length a simple article (1-2 pages) a short paper (5-10 pages) or a longer paper (11-20 pages)? <input type="checkbox"/> Papers should be formatted similarly to 12 point font, double spaced with 1 inch margins. If papers are significantly different, estimate as best as possible the actual length.	<p>1-2: The entry is a simple article (1-4 pages).</p> <p>3-4: The entry is a short paper (5-10 pages).</p> <p>5-6: The entry is a long paper (11-20 pages).</p>
8. Bonus: Does the difficulty of this project go above and beyond reasonable requirements? (check for areas that excelled) _____ (0-2)	
<input type="checkbox"/> The purpose of the paper is extremely, complex or interesting. <input type="checkbox"/> The purpose of the paper is extremely innovative, with new information shown or conclusions reached. <input type="checkbox"/> There is an excellent mixture of depth and breadth, providing important details but doing a great job of placing the subject in its larger context.	<p>0: Difficulty showed no above and beyond efforts.</p> <p>1: Difficulty exceeded requirements in one bonus area</p> <p>2: Difficulty exceeded requirements in more than one bonus area!</p>

Workmanship:

The goal here is to rate the workmanship of the project without weight to difficulty or excessive weight to authenticity.

Note: While the quality of sources may affect Workmanship scores, the citing of those sources is not reflected here.

9. Rate the degree to which the entry conveyed its message/covered its thesis statement: _____ (1-6)	
<input type="checkbox"/> How well does the entry elaborate and clarify the main topic while establishing it within the context of other closely related topics? <input type="checkbox"/> To what extent does the entry demonstrate an understanding of knowledge of the topic? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the entry orient and educate the reader? <input type="checkbox"/> Is the information present generally relevant to the topic? Note: This score does not include spelling/grammar or significant emphasis on flow/organization.	1-2: Subject is not clear or not well covered, with gaps in the information presented or presenting significant non-relevant information. 3-4: Subject is somewhat covered or well-covered with extra information that is not generally relevant. 5-6: Entry is complete, saying everything necessary to explore and communicate the subject
10. Rate the degree to which the entry supported its message with flow and organization: _____ (1-4)	
<input type="checkbox"/> To what extent is the work clearly and adequately organized? <input type="checkbox"/> Is the language of the paper clear, including explaining discipline-specific terms and including translations where appropriate?	1-2: Organization is not easy to follow or many terms used are unclear. 3-4: Organization is good and easy to follow. Attention is paid to explain unclear terms.
11. Rate the degree to which the entry displays good editing: _____ (1-4)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Are the rules of grammar and spelling observed?	1-2: Significant grammar or spelling issues are present, detracting from overall readability. 3-4: No significant grammar or spelling issues are observed.
12. Rate the degree to which the entry uses its length to good effect: _____ (1-2)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Is length of the entry appropriate for the subject (and vice versa)? <input type="checkbox"/> Does a shorter entry feel properly paced with its purpose fully covered? <input type="checkbox"/> Does a longer entry exclude significant extraneous details not well tied into or supporting the overall purpose?	0: No 1: Somewhat 2: Yes
13. Bonus: Does the workmanship of this project go above and beyond reasonable requirements? (check for areas that excelled) _____ (0-2)	
<input type="checkbox"/> All information present is extremely relevant to the subject and the subject is covered excellently. <input type="checkbox"/> The paper is extremely well organized with the flow of information very easy to follow. <input type="checkbox"/> Editing is excellent with no issues. <input type="checkbox"/> Length is perfect for the subject, showing great pacing and few extraneous details.	0: Workmanship showed no above and beyond efforts. 1: Workmanship exceeded requirements in one bonus area 2: Workmanship exceeded requirements in more than one bonus area

Display:

As research papers are judged before the competition, no physical display element can be included. This section focuses on formatting and other visuals inside the writing.

14. Rate the degree to which the entry used good formatting: _____ (0-2)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Is the formatting, including font and layout, effective? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the formatting help enhance the readability and content?	0: No 1: Somewhat 2: Yes
15. Rate the degree to which the entry included supporting images/tables: _____ (0-2)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Are useful tables, drawings or pictures included and are they clear? <input type="checkbox"/> Do included tables, drawings or pictures support the purpose of the entry?	0: No 1: Somewhat 2: Yes
16. Bonus: Does the display of this project go above and beyond reasonable requirements? (check for areas that excelled) _____ (0-2)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Formatting and layout is extremely well done and effective. <input type="checkbox"/> Tables, drawings and/or pictures are extremely clear and are very effective in supporting the subject.	0: Display showed no above and beyond efforts. 1: Display exceeded requirements in one bonus area 2: Display exceeded requirements in more than one bonus area

Documentation:

Since the entire research paper is technically "Documentation", scores in this section focus on citation of sources.

17. Rate the extent that the entry cites supporting information within the main body: _____ (1-6)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Are all the points presented in the paper well supported by appropriate and relevant sources? <input type="checkbox"/> Are any quotations, facts or paraphrasing that comes from another source cited inline, footnoted, end noted, or otherwise? (Any method is acceptable as long as it is clear.)	1-2: Little to no supporting information is cited to relevant sources. 3-4: Some supporting information is cited to relevant sources. 5-6: All supporting information is well cited to relevant sources.
18. Rate the extent that the entry includes a bibliography (or works cited) section: _____ (0-2)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Does the entry include a bibliography? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the bibliography contain all of the relevant information such that sources could be checked and verified? (name(s) of author(s), source title, publication date, name and place of publication, page being referenced if appropriate) Notes: No specific format is required for the bibliography. Any format is acceptable as long as it contains the required information and is consistent.	0: No 1: Somewhat 2: Yes
19. Rate the extent that the entry uses clear and consistent citation protocol: _____ (0-2)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Is the method used to cite information included from other sources clear and consistent throughout the entry? <input type="checkbox"/> Methods can include inline, footnoted, end noted or other methods. Notes: No specific format is required for the citation. Any format is acceptable as long as it contains the required information and is consistent.	0: No 1: Somewhat 2: Yes
20. Bonus: Does the documentation of this project go above and beyond reasonable requirements? (check for areas that excelled) _____ (0-2)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information in the paper is exceptionally well cited to good sources. <input type="checkbox"/> The bibliography is extremely thorough and well organized with all necessary information. <input type="checkbox"/> Citation protocol is very effective and added to the readability of the paper.	0: Documentation showed no above and beyond efforts. 1: Documentation exceeded requirements in one bonus area 2: Documentation exceeded requirements in more than one bonus area

Overall / Judges Observations:

The goal here is to allow for judge's observations. Points may be awarded here as desired.

21. Rate your overall impression of the entry: _____ (1-6)
This is the judge's subjective score. Things that you might consider: ➤ Do you like the entry? ➤ Is the subject of the entry interesting and informative? ➤ Does the entry make connections that are innovative or not well-known? ➤ Is the entry exceptionally readable or well-organized? ➤ Would you like to see the entry in a newsletter or otherwise widely spread? ➤ Does the entry show real dedication to research and technical writing? ➤ Entrant made an outstanding impression and an exceptional product. WOW!! ➤ Do any aspect of the judging areas (Documentation, authenticity, difficulty, workmanship) impress you as above and beyond?

Average scores for achievement ranking (multiply times number of judges):

Rank	With Doc score	Without Doc score included
Notable	1-48	1-41
Exceptional	49-55	42-47
Superior	56-62	48-53
Masterpiece	63-70	54-60

Total Score: _____ **out of 70**

Score Check

Feedback:

Please let the entrant know about the following:

- Elements that were well done/that you would like to see more of.
- Top suggestions that would help the entrant's *next entry or future efforts* score even better.
- Resources that may help the entrant on in their work.

Note: Do not use this area to justify your score (i.e. why points were taken off) since that is typically taken poorly.

A large rectangular box containing 25 horizontal lines for writing feedback.