

## VIRTUAL COMMUNITY AWARENESS – Judge’s Rating Sheet

Section # \_\_\_\_\_ Division: SS \_\_\_\_\_ PS/Collegiate \_\_\_\_\_

Team Names & # \_\_\_\_\_ Judge’s Name \_\_\_\_\_

A. Community Awareness						JUDGE SCORE
<p><b>No partial points are given in Section A.</b></p> <p>All items <b>MUST</b> be completed to receive 30 points.</p> <p>If any portion is missing, Section A is scored a 0.</p> <p>For more information on the all/none points, please visit:  <a href="http://www.hosa.org/judge">http://www.hosa.org/judge</a></p>	<p><b>A. Points for following Guidelines:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Title Page – Event Name, Title of activity, target audience, team member names, HOSA chapter (name/number, and division), school and state/country. One page only.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> A .pdf of the portfolio was uploaded to Tallo (by EACH team member) by the published deadline.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> A copy of the presentation video link has been uploaded (by EACH team member) to Tallo by the published deadline.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>All or nothing:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>30 points</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>or</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0 points</b></p>					
B. Quality of Portfolio	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 1 point	JUDGE SCORE
<p><b>1. Page 2 of Portfolio: “Summary”</b></p>	<p>Summary provides an outstanding reflection of the project issue, goals, and objectives of the project. The accomplishments, effectiveness and impact of the project are clearly defined, thoughtful, and well-executed.</p>	<p>The summary of the project issue, goals &amp; objectives of the project are good, and provide a quality reflection of the project.</p>	<p>The summary of the project is adequate, an average level of summarization is provided on the accomplishments and effectiveness of the project.</p>	<p>More attention is needed in the summary of the selection of the project issue, goals &amp; objectives.</p>	<p>The summary did not do a sufficient job in reflecting the project issue, goals &amp; objectives, accomplishments, effectiveness &amp; impact of the project.</p>	
<p><b>2. Strength of publicity</b></p>	<p>High-level publicity and exposure helped to tell the story of this project throughout the community in four or more media sources (such as newspaper articles, flyers, etc...)</p>	<p>The publicity for this project was promoted in three forms of media.</p>	<p>The project was promoted in two forms of media.</p>	<p>The project received low-level visibility in one form of media.</p>	<p>The project was not promoted in any form of media.</p>	
<p><b>3. Evidence of student participation</b></p>	<p>Four or more forms of evidence (such as dated programs, pictures, etc.) were provided to demonstrate widespread student participation.</p>	<p>Three examples of significant student participation were provided in this project.</p>	<p>There are two examples of limited student participation in this project.</p>	<p>There is one form of evidence of little student participation in this project.</p>	<p>There is no evidence of student participation.</p>	

<b>B. Quality of Portfolio</b>	<b>Excellent 5 points</b>	<b>Good 4 points</b>	<b>Average 3 points</b>	<b>Fair 2 points</b>	<b>Poor 1 point</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>4. Items developed to support project</b>	Four or more high quality items (such as pamphlets, brochures, etc.) were developed to support this project.	Three good quality items were developed to support this project.	Two average quality items were shared to support the development of this project.	One item was developed to support this project and it was not of good quality.	No items were created to support this project.	
<b>5. Spelling, grammar, punctuation, neatness</b>	There are no spelling or grammatical errors throughout the entire portfolio. The portfolio is very neat and presentable.	There are a few minor misspellings or grammatical errors that will be easy to fix to make it appeal to the viewer. The portfolio is neat, with only minor examples where the pages could be better organized.	There is a mix of good spelling and poor spelling or proper grammar and improper grammar. The portfolio is presentable, although some pages appear to be cluttered or busy.	There are either several misspellings or there is very little correct grammar present in the portfolio. Portfolio needs more organization or attention to detail.	There are many misspellings and overall weakness within the portfolio. The portfolio looks unprofessional.	
<b>C. Presentation to Judges: Project and Process</b>	<b>Excellent 5 points</b>	<b>Good 4 points</b>	<b>Average 3 points</b>	<b>Fair 2 points</b>	<b>Poor 1 point</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>1. Purpose for selection/ development of project</b>	A clear purpose for the selection and development of the project was provided to the judges.	The purpose for the selection and development of the project was mostly clear in the presentation to judges.	The purpose for the selection and development of the project was moderately clear in the presentation to judges.	There was some detail provided for the purpose and selection of the project, however more information is needed.	The purpose and development of this project was unclear.	
<b>2. Project promotes community awareness of a health and/or safety issues</b>	Selected project clearly focuses on a health or safety issue of local, state, or national interest.	n/a	n/a	n/a	Selected project does not reflect a health or safety issue.	
<b>3. Objectives/ accomplishments of project</b>	The activities used to promote this project were detailed with clear objectives and several accomplishments were highlighted in the presentation.	The activities used to promote the project were mostly clear; objectives and accomplishments were highlighted.	The objectives and accomplishments of the project were somewhat highlighted in this presentation.	The objectives were somewhat clear, little demonstration of accomplishments were evident in the presentation of the project.	The objectives of the project were not clear and there was little evidence of accomplishments made throughout the presentation of the project.	
<b>4. Project impact</b>	Clear and informative demonstration of the positive impact the project had on the community.	The presentation was mostly clear on the positive impact made on the community.	The project displayed some impact in the community. More detail would have been appreciated.	A small impact on the community was demonstrated in the presentation of this project.	The project did not appear to make a strong impact on the community.	
<b>5. Evaluation of success/failure of project</b>	The team strongly highlighted the success and failure of the project and had evidence to back up their findings. Excellent reflection of the project.	The team highlighted the success and failure of the project with only some evidence. Good reflection of the project.	The team shared some feedback on the success and/or failure of the project.	The team presented very little on the evaluation process of the project. Few details were provided.	No evidence of evaluation of the project was presented.	
<b>6. Understanding of problem / health issue</b>	Demonstrates clear evidence of a deep, insightful understanding of the problem or health issue.	Shows a solid grasp of understanding of the problem or health issue.	Demonstrates an average understanding of the problem or health issue. Judges left with a few questions.	Shows a basic understanding of the problem or health issue. Judges left with more questions than answers.	Team is not able to demonstrate an understanding of the problem or health issue.	

<b>C. Presentation to Judges</b>	<b>Excellent 5 points</b>	<b>Good 4 points</b>	<b>Average 3 points</b>	<b>Fair 2 points</b>	<b>Poor 1 point</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>7. Cooperative work with community partners</b>	The team provided four or more high quality examples of cooperative work with community partners to promote and reach the project goal.	Three quality examples of cooperative work with community partners to promote and reach the project goal were shared.	Two average quality examples of cooperative work with community partners to promote and reach the project goal were provided.	One example of cooperative work with a community partner to promote and reach the project goal was provided and it was not of high quality.	No evidence of cooperative work with community partners was provided.	
<b>D. Presentation Delivery</b>	<b>Excellent 5 points</b>	<b>Good 4 points</b>	<b>Average 3 points</b>	<b>Fair 2 points</b>	<b>Poor 1 point</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>1. Voice</b> Pitch, tempo, volume, quality	Each speaker's voice was loud enough to hear. The speakers varied rate & volume to enhance the speech. Appropriate pausing was employed.	Each speaker spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The speakers varied rate OR volume to enhance the speech. Pauses were attempted.	Each speaker could be heard most of the time. The speakers attempted to use some variety in vocal quality, but not always successfully.	Most of the speaker's voices were low. Judges have difficulty hearing the presentation.	Judge had difficulty hearing and/or understanding much of the speech due to low volume. Little variety in rate or volume.	
<b>2. Stage Presence</b> Poise, posture, eye contact, and enthusiasm	Movements & gestures were purposeful and enhanced the delivery of the speech and did not distract. Body language reflects comfort interacting with audience. Facial expressions and body language consistently generated a strong interest and enthusiasm for the topic.	The speakers maintained adequate posture and non-distracting movement during the speech. Some gestures were used. Facial expressions and body language sometimes generated an interest and enthusiasm for the topic.	Stiff or unnatural use of nonverbal behaviors. Body language reflects some discomfort interacting with audience. Limited use of gestures to reinforce verbal message. Facial expressions and body language are used to try to generate enthusiasm but seem somewhat forced.	Most of the speaker's posture, body language, and facial expressions indicated a lack of enthusiasm for the topic. Movements were distracting.	No attempt was made to use body movement or gestures to enhance the message. No interest or enthusiasm for the topic came through in presentation.	
<b>3. Diction*, Pronunciation** &amp; Grammar</b>	Delivery emphasizes and enhances message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. No vocal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone heightened interest and complemented the verbal message.	Delivery helps to enhance message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. Minimal vocal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone complemented the verbal message	Delivery adequate. Enunciation and pronunciation suitable. Noticeable verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Tone seemed inconsistent at times.	Delivery quality minimal. Regular verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Delivery problems cause disruption to message.	Many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal message.	
<b>4. Team Participation</b>	Excellent example of shared collaboration in the presentation of the project. Each team member spoke and carried equal parts of the project presentation.	N/A	The team worked together relatively well. Some team members spoke more than others.	N/A	One team member dominated the presentation.	
<b>Total Points (110):</b>						

\*Definition of Diction – Choice of words especially with regard to correctness, clearness, and effectiveness.

\*\*Definition of Pronunciation – Act or manner of uttering officially