

VIRTUAL MRC PARTNERSHIP – Judge’s Rating Sheet

Section # _____ Division: _____ SS _____ PS/Collegiate

Team Names & # _____ Judge’s Name _____

A. Items Evaluated	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor	JUDGE SCORE
<p>No partial points are given in Section A.</p> <p>All items MUST be completed to receive 40 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>Points for following Guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Portfolio not exceeding 16 pages, with numbers on lower right of each page <input type="checkbox"/> Portfolio submitted in English <input type="checkbox"/> Portfolio copy uploaded to Tallo by EACH member of the team – by the published deadline <input type="checkbox"/> Partner Verification Form uploaded to Tallo by EACH member of the team – by the published deadline <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation video link uploaded to Tallo by EACH member of the team – by the published deadline <input type="checkbox"/> Title page includes event name, MRC Chapter Leadership, HOSA chapter, HOSA division, school name, advisor name, team member names, school address and school phone <p style="text-align: center;">All or nothing: 40 points or 0 Points</p>					
B. Portfolio	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 1 point	JUDGE SCORE
1. HOSA/MRC Partnership Verification Form (page 2)	The Partnership Verification Form includes: 1. MRC Unit full address 2. MRC leader’s signature at the beginning of the project 3. MRC leader’s signature at the conclusion of the project	NA	NA	NA	The Partnership Verification form is missing or does not include all 3 required criteria	
2. Partnership Logistics Document (pages 3-4)	The Partnership Logistics Document includes: 1. Description of how the HOSA chapter and MRC unit will maintain communication 2. How frequently the HOSA chapter and MRC unit will be in contact 3. Who is responsible for maintaining and initiating contact 4. MRC leader’s full mailing address	The Partnership Logistics Document includes answers to 3 of the 4 questions.	The Partnership Logistics Document includes answers to 2 of the 4 questions.	The Partnership Logistics Document includes answers to 1 of the 4 questions.	The Partnership Logistics Document is blank or not included	
3. Description of the HOSA/MRC partnership (pages 5-6) (items included)	The description features all four items: 1. Level of interactions 2. Quality of interactions 3. Quantity of interactions 4. 2-page maximum	The description features 3 of 4 items	The description features 2 of 4 items.	The description features 1 of 4 items.	No descriptions of the partnerships were provided.	

B. Portfolio	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 2 point	JUDGE SCORE
4. Description of the HOSA/MRC partnership (pages 5-6) (Quality of Items)	The strength and articulation of the HOSA/MRC partnership description is excellent.	The strength and articulation of the HOSA/MRC partnership description is good	The strength and articulation of the HOSA/MRC partnership description is average	The strength and articulation of the HOSA/MRC partnership description is fair	The strength and articulation of the HOSA/MRC partnership description is poor	
Portfolio	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 1 point	JUDGE SCORE
5. A summary of partnership activities with a brief narrative (pages 7-16). (Activities included)	The partnership features all four of the descriptions: 1. Activity description 2. Impact category (as outlined in the event descriptions) 3. HOSA/MRC Partnership description 4. 10- page maximum	The partnership features 3 of 4 descriptions	The partnership features 2 of 4 descriptions	The featured HOSA/MRC relationship consists of 1 of 4 factors.	No descriptions of the partnerships were provided.	
Portfolio	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 2 point	JUDGE SCORE
6. A summary of partnership activities with a brief narrative (pages 7-16). (Quality of activities)	The partnership activities documented in portfolio are excellent quality, scope, and value. No more than 3 additional items are included that the team developed to support their project (such as pamphlets, publicity items, articles, photographs, or brochures, etc.)	The partnership activities documented in portfolio are good quality, scope, and value. No more than 3 additional items are that the team developed to support their project.	The partnership activities documented in portfolio are average quality, scope, and value. No more than 3 additional items are that the team developed to support their project..	The partnership activities documented in portfolio are fair quality, scope, and value. No more than 3 additional items are that the team developed to support their project..	The partnership activities documented in portfolio are poor quality, scope, and value. No more than 3 additional items are that the team developed to support their project.	
Portfolio	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 1 point	JUDGE SCORE
7. ALL PAGES of portfolio are neat, formatted correctly, and error-free	No errors in formatting, grammar or appearance were detected in the submission.	The submission had 1-2 errors within the entry.	3-4 errors in formatting or grammar were detected in the submission.	4-5 errors in formatting or grammar were detected in the submission.	The submission had more than 5 errors in formatting or grammar and it was difficult to follow.	
C. HOSA/MRC Partnership Overall Content	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 2 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. MRC/HOSA Partnership	Level of MRC/HOSA Partnership is strong, with MRC/HOSA working together to support each other's missions	Partnership with MRC/HOSA clearly exists, with MRC/HOSA communicating to support each other's missions, but is not overly strong.	The connection between MRC/HOSA is there.	The connection between MRC/HOSA is inconsistent.	The connection between MRC/HOSA is very limited or non-existent	

HOSA/MRC Partnership Overall Content	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 2 points	JUDGE SCORE
2. Cooperative work with MRC to reach goals of activities	The team exceeded the collaborative goals of working with the MRC.	The team met the collaborative goals of working with the MRC.	The team's goals were of average effort and impact.	The team did not put forth much collaborative effort to reach the goals of the proposed activities.	The team did not meet the collaborative goals of the MRC activities.	
3. Description and Understanding of the MRC Mission	Strong evidence was provided to prove the understanding of the MRC Mission. Four or more examples of the mission were provided.	Evidence of understanding the MRC mission was evident in three examples provided in the portfolio.	Basic evidence of understanding the MRC mission was provided in two examples within the portfolio.	One example was provided to prove understanding of the MRC mission.	No evidence was provided of understanding of the MRC mission.	
4. Impact on the local community	Strong evidence (4+ examples) reflects the partnership demonstrated a high level of impact on the community and created positive change.	Some evidence (3 examples) reflects The partnership had a good impact on the community.	The partnership's impact was average. Little evidence (2 example)s of change occurred as a result of this project.	Very little impact occurred from the result of this project. Only one example shared.	No change or impact occurred as a result of this project implementation. No examples shared.	
5. Impact on the HOSA chapter	Strong evidence (4+ examples) reflects the partnership demonstrated a high level of impact on the HOSA chapter and created positive change.	Some evidence (3 examples) reflects The activity had a good impact on the HOSA chapter.	The impact on the HOSA chapter was average. Little evidence (2 examples) of change occurred as a result of this project.	Very little impact on the HOSA chapter occurred as a result of this project. Only one example shared	No change or impact occurred as a result of this project. No examples shared	
6. Imagination & creativity of the activities	The partnership activities demonstrated a high level of imagination & creativity.	The partnership activities demonstrated a moderate level of imagination & creativity.	The partnership activities demonstrated an average level of imagination & creativity	Very little imagination & creativity were included in the activities.	No imagination & creativity were included in the activities	
D. Presentation Delivery	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 1 point	JUDGE SCORE
1. Voice 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.	
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 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.	

D. Presentation Delivery	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 1 point	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. Participation:	All team members took an active role in the presentation	All but one person on the team was actively engaged in the presentation	The group's participation was average.	One or two of the members led the work while the rest of the team had little participation.	The team did not work effectively together. Participation was dominated by one person on the team.	
Total Points (165):						