

Kingdom Arts & Sciences Championship

Judging Form - Experimental Archaeology Entry

Categories of Entries

This Experimental Archaeology rubric is designed with four types of entries in mind:

- Controlled replication of archaeological artefacts or activities
- Testing the validity of archaeological assumptions based on known evidence
- 'Contextual' experiments dealing with the way archaeological sites are formed and how they deteriorate over time
- Ethnoarchaeology which collates information about how human behaviour relates to the environment and material culture

Competitors submitting entries to be assessed on this rubric should declare ahead of time which of these four approaches is most relevant to the project, so that judges can consider the entry in the proper light and assess it in the most constructive manner and with the greatest accuracy and consistency possible.

When the rubric makes reference to “the chosen Experimental Archaeology category”, the competitor’s declared choice of one of these four categories is what is intended by this- or similar phrasing.

Rationale

This rubric is intended to cater to projects which are not fully supported by other, related rubrics. The “A&S Object” rubric relies on there being a final material product, which experimentation might not produce, particularly if a working solution to the inquiry question is not found. Likewise, the “A&S Process” rubric tends to assume a known process exists which is replicated by the competitor; the purpose of experimental archaeology may in fact be to discover a process which is unknown. The other two rubrics prioritize either the final product or successful replication of a known process; this rubric prioritizes the experimental process and the journey of discovery, even (and perhaps especially) if that journey does not end at the expected destination.

Kingdom Arts & Sciences Championship

Judging Form - Experimental Archaeology Entry

Artist Name:	
Entry:	Total Score: /100
Branch:	Date:
Judge:	Judge's Email:

Instructions for judges:

- For each question, use a highlighter to mark any terms that apply to the artist's work and presentation.
- Then, circle the box in each row that indicates the point value you wish to assign for that question.
- Please do not use half points. They will be rounded down.

Historical Authenticity: Describes how the process is grounded in history. The logical and reasonable substitution of modern materials and/or methods will be taken into consideration when there are issues of safety, prohibitive cost, or material unavailability.							Bonus
		1	2	3	4	5	6
1. How well is the process grounded in history and is it expressed appropriately and fully?	No attempt made	An attempt at process was made but it is fully modern.	Some effort was made to allow for historical process, but predominately a modern process was used.	A roughly equal blend of modern and historical process. Moving towards fully authentic process.	The process may have slightly modern characteristics but is largely historical.	The process is historically accurate in all aspects and appears to be from history to all but the most rigorous of inspections.	The process would be perfectly at home in an historical context, a living history museum; shining example of experimental archeology.
2. To what extent were period appropriate tools used in the process?	No attempt made	An attempt was made to use historical tools but only a limited few were used in the process.	Some of the tools used in the process were historical.	Many of the tools used in the process were historical.	Most of the tools used in the process were historical.	All of the tools used in the process were historical.	The artist made their own historical tools used in the process.

Updated: February 17th, 2020

		1	2	3	4	5	6
3. To what extent were period appropriate materials used in the process?	No attempt made	A few of the materials used in the process were historical.	Some of the materials used in the process were historical.	Many of the materials used in the process were historical.	Most of the materials used in the process were historical.	All materials used in the process were historical.	The artist prepared their own historical materials to use in the process.
4. To what extent were period appropriate techniques used in the process?	No attempt made	A few of the techniques used in the process were historical.	Some of the techniques used in the process were historical.	Many of the techniques used in the process were historical.	Most of the techniques used in the process were historical.	All of the techniques used in the process were historical.	The techniques used in the process and the the tools and materials were also perfectly historical.
5. How well has the artist explained and compensated for the use of modern process and materials?	No attempt made	The artist attempted to explain and compensate for the use of modern process and materials.	The artist explained and compensated for the use of modern process and materials to some degree, but may not have covered this with much depth.	The artist explained and compensated for the use of modern process and materials enough to demonstrate some consideration of this aspect.	The artist explained and compensated for the use of modern process and materials enough to demonstrate deep consideration of this aspect.	The artist fully explained their reasonable use of modern process and materials, their methods, or all materials, process and methods were historical.	The artist is able to provide minute details about the materials, process and methods used historically, regardless if they were used in the process.
Comments on Authenticity:							

--

Documentation: Documentation tells how we know what is historically authentic, when and where it lives in history, and establishes the context of all aspects in relation to the processes.							Bonus
		1	2	3	4	5	6
<p>6. Organization:</p> <p>Overall, is the documentation coherent, well-organized, and easy to follow?</p> <p>(Include how well citations and references are incorporated into the text.)</p>	No attempt made	Documentation lacks organization or is difficult to follow, includes minimal in-text citations (or footnotes) and/or references	Documentation is somewhat organized and includes some in-text citations (or footnotes) and a reference list	Documentation is sufficiently organized, easy to follow, and includes in-text citations (or footnotes) and a reference list that follows a standard format	Documentation is well organized, easy to follow, and includes in-text citations (or footnotes) and a reference list that follows a standard format	Documentation is exceptionally well organized, easy to follow, and includes numerous in-text citations (or footnotes) and a reference list that follows a standard format	Documentation is of a publishable level in this area
<p>7. Research:</p> <p>Based on the evidence in the documentation, how thoroughly did the artist research this process?</p>	No attempt made	Documentation suggests only a cursory level of research, little depth or breadth Few or no primary or scholarly sources consulted. Little evidence of interpretation of sources	Documentation shows some evidence of either breadth or depth of research Majority of sources cited are secondary or non-scholarly. Little or some evidence of interpretation of sources	Documentation shows the artist is working toward depth and breadth of research At least some primary or reputable scholarly resources cited Some interpretation of sources is evident.	Documentation shows research with some depth and breadth Sources used are generally high-quality, including primary and scholarly sources. Some interpretation of sources is evident	Documentation shows very thorough research with both depth and breadth Sources used are consistently high-quality, with an abundance of primary sources The artist did extensive interpretation of sources	Documentation presents new research conducted that extends upon what is known in the field or draws upon sources that were previously not generally known of or available

		1	2	3	4	5	6
<p>8. Connection between documentation and entry:</p> <p>How well does this documentation support the entry?</p> <p>That is, is the entry itself clearly supported by the documentation given?</p> <p>Is the link between the research and the final entry clear?</p>	No attempt made	Documentation makes only oblique reference to the entry in question and may wander between topics without focus	<p>Documentation addresses the entry in only a superficial fashion.</p> <p>The artist makes a vague connection between their research and their process</p>	<p>Documentation is adequate to support the entry</p> <p>The artist makes a basic connection between their research and their process</p>	<p>Documentation is effectively used to support the entry</p> <p>The artist demonstrated a significant connection between their research and their process</p>	<p>The finished entry is clearly and thoroughly supported by the documentation</p> <p>The artist's process was remarkably informed by their research at every step, which is evident in reading the documentation</p>	Documentation is of a publishable level in this area
<p>9. Explanation of process:</p> <p>To what degree does the documentation describe the process used in the entry? Can the reader clearly interpret how this process was executed? Could another person recreate this process based on reading this documentation? Are choices explained clearly and justified thoroughly?</p>	No attempt made	Process documented is sparse with little details, or inconsistent, or contradictory with entry	Process is documented with some key areas missing or unclear	<p>Process is satisfactorily described, a reader can interpret the artist's process</p> <p>Some recreations choices explained</p>	<p>Process is satisfactorily described, a reader can interpret the artist's process, and could recreate it themselves.</p> <p>Most of the recreation choices are explained and justified</p>	<p>Process is clearly and completely described; a reader can easily interpret the artist's process, and could recreate it themselves</p> <p>All recreation choices are clearly explained and thoroughly justified</p>	Documentation is of a publishable level in this area

Comments on Documentation:							

Technical Ability: The level of awareness of the particular features and requirements of the chosen Experimental Archaeology category; the level of competency of the period appropriate skill set necessary to conduct the experiment; the level of craftsmanship demonstrated through the experiment; and the appropriate use of controls, repeatability, and other features of valid scientific experimentation.							Bonus
		1	2	3	4	5	6
10. How well does the artist demonstrate awareness of the particular features and requirements of the chosen Experimental Archaeology category?	No attempt made	The artist possesses only a basic sense of the key features of the chosen category and struggled to demonstrate their awareness.	The artist possesses some awareness of the key features of the chosen category and was able to demonstrate this to some extent.	The artist possesses a working knowledge of many aspects of the chosen category and was able to demonstrate this at a functional level.	The artist possesses a deep knowledge of most aspects of the chosen category, demonstrating this in a nuanced way with few flaws or omissions.	The artist possesses an insightful understanding of all aspects of the chosen category and was able to demonstrate this in a fully realized and nuanced way.	The artist has demonstrated complete mastery of all aspects of the chosen category and has demonstrated this flawlessly.
11. How well does the artist demonstrate competence with the necessary period skills, appropriate to the chosen Experimental Archaeology category?	No attempt made	The artist possesses only a rudimentary grasp of the appropriate skills and processes and they struggled to	The artist possesses a beginner's knowledge of the appropriate skills and processes and there are clear	The artist possesses a working knowledge of the appropriate skills and processes, but some flaws in execution are	The artist possesses a thorough knowledge of the appropriate skills and processes and conducts the experiment with	The artist possesses a thorough knowledge of appropriate skills and processes and is able to fully realize the	The artist has demonstrated complete mastery of the appropriate skills and processes through their flawless and

		demonstrate that vision.	opportunities for improvement.	evident.	few flaws or omissions.	vision of the experiment in their execution.	exceptional execution.
		1	2	3	4	5	6
12. How well does the artist demonstrate period-appropriate craftsmanship in the experiment? Consider the use of period techniques, tools and aesthetics.	No attempt made	The artist demonstrated minimal craftsmanship in a few areas of the experiment.	The artist demonstrated some craftsmanship in some areas of the experiment.	The artist demonstrated craftsmanship in many areas of the experiment.	The artist demonstrated significant craftsmanship in most areas of the experiment.	The artist demonstrated a high degree of craftsmanship in all areas of the experiment.	The artist demonstrated mastery in the craftsmanship evident in all areas of the experiment.
13. How well does the artist demonstrate competence in using scientific methods and techniques, such as the repeatability of the experiment and the use of experimental controls?	No attempt made	The artist demonstrated minimal competence, or competence in only a few relevant methods and techniques.	The artist demonstrated some general competence, or competence in some relevant methods and techniques.	The artist demonstrated competence in many relevant methods and techniques.	The artist demonstrated significant competence, or competence in most relevant methods and techniques.	The artist demonstrated mastery of some, and competence in all relevant methods and techniques.	The artist went beyond mastery of the relevant methods and techniques in some significant way.

Comments on Technical Ability:

<p>Complexity: Complexity is the difficulty, challenge, and level of ambition (apprentice, journeyman, master) represented by the experiment. The complexity of the experiment should be considered within the context of the genre of the work and the chosen category, rather than in terms of the complexity of other projects in the competition. In period different artisans performed different aspects or processes, many of which may have been undertaken by a single competitor in this context. Likewise normal laboratory conditions might see a team of researchers collaborating on an experiment undertaken here by a single person. Such things ought to be taken into account when assessing this section.</p>							Bonus
		1	2	3	4	5	6
14. How well does the artist achieve the vision of their project within the context of the chosen Experimental Archaeology category?	No attempt made	The artist did not achieve their vision within the relevant context.	The artist has approached success in terms of both vision and the chosen category or has achieved one but not the other	Success has been partially achieved by the artist in terms of both vision and the category chosen.	Success has been achieved by the artist in terms of both vision and the chosen category.	The artists has fully realized the vision of their experiment, and validates or eliminates theories about the inquiry topic.	The artist was able to exceed both the judges' and their own expectations with regard to the achievement of their vision and the chosen category of experiment.
15. What level of complexity does the experiment represent within its genre?	No attempt made	The experiment represents rudimentary levels of complexity within its genre.	The experiment represents beginner level of complexity within its genre.	The experiment represents a medium level of complexity within the genre.	The experiment represents a high level of complexity within the genre.	The experiment represents mastery level of complexity within its genre.	The artist was able to exceed both the judges' and their own expectations with regard to the complexity of the experiment within the genre.
16. Difficulty: How challenging are the techniques, processes, and or the materials	No attempt made	The techniques, processes, and materials used required basic skills.	The techniques, processes, and materials used were somewhat challenging.	Many of the techniques, processes, and materials used were	Most of the techniques, processes, and materials used provided a	All of the techniques, processes, and materials used provided a	All of the techniques, processes, and materials used provided an

used?				challenging.	significant challenge.	significant challenge.	extreme challenge and far exceed expectations.
		1	2	3	4	5	6
17. What level of preparation, skills, and knowledge were required to fully carry out the experiment?	No attempt made	The experiment required minimal preparation, a few skills, and little specialized knowledge.	The experiment involved some advance preparation, or some specialized skills or knowledge.	The experiment involved some advance preparation, and some specialized skills and knowledge.	The experiment required advance preparation, and a variety of skills and specialized knowledge.	The experiment required extensive preparation, a variety of skills, and a breadth of specialized knowledge.	The experiment also required years of practice and training to achieve the final result.

Comments on Complexity:

Presentation & Display							Bonus
		1	2	3	4	5	6
18. Communication: How well did the artist communicate their knowledge?	No attempt made	The artist communicated their breadth OR depth of knowledge with a few or basic details to demonstrate their knowledge.	The artist communicated their breadth OR depth of knowledge with some details of their knowledge.	The artist communicated breadth OR depth by providing details to demonstrate their knowledge.	The artist communicated breadth and depth by providing details to demonstrate their knowledge.	The artist communicated breadth and depth by providing many details to fully demonstrate their knowledge.	The artist communicated breadth and depth by thoroughly communicating their knowledge with many minor details and

							examples demonstrating their knowledge.
		1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Questions: How well did the artist answer questions and elaborate on issues the questions raised?	No attempt made	The artist was able to answer a few questions.	The artist was able to answer some questions and elaborate somewhat.	The artist was able to answer many questions and elaborate somewhat.	The artist was able to answer many questions and elaborate a great deal.	The artist was able to answer all questions posed and elaborate a great deal.	The artist's answers to questions demonstrated extraordinary fluency with their topic.
20. Display: How well did the display enhance the presentation and understanding of the experimental process?	No attempt made	The display minimally enhanced the presentation and understanding of the process.	The display somewhat enhanced the presentation and understanding of the process.	The display enhanced the presentation and understanding of the process.	The display significantly enhanced the presentation and understanding of the process.	The display perfectly enhanced the presentation and understanding of the process.	The display not only enhanced the presentation and understanding of the process but immersed and transported the viewer.
Comments on Presentation & Display:							

