

VIRTUAL EXPLORING MEDICAL INNOVATION Judge's Rating Sheet

Section # _____
Team # _____

Judge's Signature _____
Division: MS _____

A. Exploring Medical Innovation						JUDGE SCORE
<p>No partial points are given in Section A.</p> <p>All items MUST be completed to receive 35 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: http://www.hosa.org/judge</p>	<p>A. Points for following Guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Reference page is included in exhibit <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibit/equipment is safe and poses no hazards. <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation video link, pictures and reference page of exhibit uploaded to Wufoo by ONE Competitor by the scheduled deadline. <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibit/presentation is in English. <p style="text-align: center;">All or nothing:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">35 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p style="text-align: center;">0 points</p>					
B. EXHIBIT & PRESENTATION CONTENT	Excellent 15 points	Good 12 points	Average 9 points	Fair 6 points	Poor 3 points	JUDGE SCORE
<p>1. Balance of Information between Exhibit and Presentation</p>	<p>The content placed between the exhibit and presentation was balanced and effective. Anyone viewing the exhibit materials would be able to have a general idea of the medical innovation without having someone there to speak about it. The content shared in the presentation added value to the overall project. Overall, there was excellent balance between information shared in the exhibit and information shared in the presentation.</p>	<p>Overall, the balance was good and effective between information shared in the exhibit and information shared in the presentation.</p>	<p>Overall, the balance seemed okay between information shared in the exhibit and information shared in the presentation, but judges were left with a few questions unanswered in either the exhibit or presentation.</p>	<p>There was a somewhat imbalance of information shared. Either the exhibit or the presentation had more content than the other, which made it difficult to follow the overall project.</p>	<p>There was a clear imbalance of information shared. Either the exhibit or the presentation had the majority of the content, which made for an ineffective overall project.</p>	
	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 1 points	JUDGE SCORE
<p>2. Description of Innovation</p>	<p>The team provides an excellent description of the innovation, what it does and how it is used. The judges can clearly visualize what it is.</p>	<p>The team provides a good description of what the innovation is, what it does, and how it is used. The judge has a few unanswered questions.</p>	<p>The team provides an average description of what the innovation is, what it does, and how it is used, but the judge is left with many unanswered questions.</p>	<p>The description of the innovation does not describe what it is, does or how it is used.</p>	<p>No description or of the innovation was provided.</p>	

	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 1 points	JUDGE SCORE
3. Impact on Healthcare	The team provides a detailed and relevant description for how the medical innovation has or will change/impact healthcare.	The team provides good detail for how the medical innovation has or will change/impact healthcare.	An average description for how the future of healthcare will be/has been impacted by this innovation.	Little detail was provided on how the innovation has or will change/impact healthcare.	No description was provided on how the innovation will change/impact healthcare.	
4. Why this Innovation?	Compelling examples of why the team chose this medical innovation were given. Relevant and engaging stories were shared that brought the presentation to life and made it clear to the judges why this was the innovation chosen by the team.	The team provided engaging examples of why they chose the medical innovation. Stories were shared to add a personal touch why the medical innovation was selected, but the wow-factor was missing.	The team told the story for why they chose their medical innovation but were unable to provide relevant examples to bring the story to life.	The team attempted to tell a story of the significance of choosing their medical innovation, but the relevance of the story fell short of expectation.	The team was unable to connect the story for why they chose their medical innovation.	
5. History of the Innovation	Extensive history of the creation of the innovation was provided and included rich details about its creator(s) and how it was discovered.	A history on the creation of the innovation was provided, along with a description of who created it and how it was discovered.	A brief history was provided on the creation of the innovation. Some details about the creator(s) and background of discovery was provided.	Little history was provided about the history of the innovation, who created it or how it was discovered.	No history or details of how this innovation was founded were provided.	
6. Benefits & Challenges	Benefits and challenges associated with the innovation were highlighted in extensive detail by the team.	Benefits and challenges were shared by the team.	Benefits and challenges associated with the innovation were shared but did not go into great depth.	Benefits and challenges associated with the innovation were briefly mentioned.	No mention of the benefits or challenges of the innovation were included.	
7. Cost	Detailed information about the cost of the innovation for the consumer and/or the healthcare system was shared.	NA	Information was shared about the cost of the innovation but judges were left with unanswered questions.	NA	No relevant information was shared about the cost of the innovation.	
8. Career Implications	Detailed information was shared about how the innovation fits within the healthcare field and what practitioners / consumers are needed to implement it. It is clear how and what healthcare careers are affected by this innovation.	Mostly relevant information was shared about the career implications of this innovation.	Some information was shared about the career implications of this innovation.	A fair amount of information was shared about the career implications of this innovation, but more detail is needed to be relevant.	No information was shared about the career implications of this innovation.	

C. EXHIBIT	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 2 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Artistic Design	The artistic quality is exceptional. The artwork is vibrant, balanced, visually pleasing and pushes the boundaries of artistic expression. The design choices take the display to the next level.	The artistic quality is good; the artwork stands out. The design elements seem to be well-thought out and comprehensive.	The display incorporates balanced design choices, showcasing some artistic features. Some of the design lacks artistic details that took away from the overall visual of the display.	Basic levels of artistic design are incorporated into the display. Better design/color choices should be incorporated to assure the artwork on the display is pleasing to the eye,	The design is simplistic and not visually appealing.	
2. Creativity / Originality	The display incorporates creativity and innovation that make it unique. The display has the "wow-factor" and stands out in the room above all others.	The display is innovative and creative. It offers something unique but is missing the wow-factor.	The display has moderate levels of creativity and originality.	Basic elements of creativity and innovation were captured in this health career display. It blends in with the other competitors.	Little creativity or originality was captured in the display of this health care display. More effort needed.	
3. Appearance / Organization	The display is exceptionally neat, organized, and error-free. Information is clearly displayed and easy to understand and follow.	Display is neat and organized. The content has a logical flow with only minimal errors.	The display was basic and could use more organization and thought to be understood. .	The display lacked organization and/or contained several spelling errors. The flow of information seemed to be out of order.	The display is either too busy or lacks enough detail to support the content.	
D. PRESENTATION DELIVERY	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 1 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Voice Pitch, tempo, volume, quality	The speaker's voice was loud enough to hear. The speaker varied rate & volume to enhance the speech. Appropriate pausing was employed.	The speaker spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The speaker varied rate OR volume to enhance the speech. Pauses were attempted.	The speaker could be heard most of the time. The speaker attempted to use some variety in vocal quality, but not always successfully.	The Speaker's voice is 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.	
2. Stage Presence 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 speaker 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.	The speaker's posture, body language, and facial expressions indicated a lack of enthusiasm for the topic. with the speech. 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.	

D. PRESENTATION DELIVERY	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 1 points	JUDGE SCORE
3. Diction*, Pronunciation** and Grammar	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.	
4. Team Participation	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.	
Total Points (135):						

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

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