

VIRTUAL COMMUNITY AWARENESS – Judge Rating Sheet

2021 Virtual Texas State Conference

Items required for area conference: Pdf of Portfolio and Link to Video Presentation

How to submit: Upload to Tallo using these [INSTRUCTIONS](#)

Description: One member of each team will upload a pdf copy of the portfolio to Tallo. The team will also record a video of their team presentation for judges. Teams will be judged on both items uploaded to Tallo.

Portfolio Uploaded*: Yes ____ No ____

Presentation Uploaded*: Yes ____ No ____

**If the materials are not uploaded, please note that applicable items on the rubric below cannot be judged.*

Section # _____ Division: SS ____ PS/Collegiate ____

Team Names & # _____ Judge's Name _____

Digital submissions will only be judged up until the allotted timing allowed per the event guidelines. Any time in a digital submission over the allowed will not be scored and no points will be awarded for those sections of the rating sheet.

A. Quality of Portfolio	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Title Page	Title page contains ALL requirements: Event Name, Team Member Names, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, State/Assoc, Title of Campaign, Target Audience, Title page centered. One page only	N/A	N/A	N/A	Portfolio not submitted OR title page not included OR all requirements are not met.	
2. Narrative Pages Formatting	All pages one-sided, typed in 12 pt. Arial font, double-spaced, on 8 ½" x 11" paper with 1" margins, numbered on top right side of each page (not counting title page), and have a Running header with last name, & name of event.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Portfolio not submitted OR all requirements are not met.	

A. Quality of Portfolio	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
3. Max Pages (no pages above 12 will be judged)	Pages do not exceed 12 total.	NA	NA	NA	Portfolio exceeds maximum page limit OR portfolio not submitted.	
4. Reference Page	The reference page is included in the portfolio submission.	NA	E	NA	Portfolio not submitted OR no reference page is included in the portfolio.	
5. Summary	Summary provides an outstanding reflection of the campaign issue, goals, and objectives of the campaign. The accomplishments, effectiveness and impact of the campaign are clearly defined, thoughtful, and well-executed. The issue is thoroughly researched and the community partners engaged are explained.	The summary of the campaign issue, goals & objectives of the campaign are good, and provide a quality reflection of the campaign. Research is evident and some note is made of community partners.	The summary of the campaign is adequate, an average level of summarization is provided on the accomplishments and effectiveness of the campaign. Research is average and only a brief mention was made of community partners.	More attention is needed in the summary of the selection of the campaign issue, goals & objectives. Research is questionable or limited and it is not clear if community partners were engaged.	Portfolio not submitted OR the summary did not do a sufficient job in reflecting the campaign issue, goals & objectives, accomplishments, effectiveness & impact of the campaign. Research is missing.	
6. Strength of publicity	High-level publicity and exposure helped to tell the story of this campaign throughout the community in four or more media sources (such as newspaper articles, flyers, etc....)	The publicity for this campaign was promoted in three forms of media.	The campaign was promoted in two forms of media.	The campaign received low-level visibility in one form of media.	Portfolio not submitted OR the campaign was not promoted in any form of media.	
7. Evidence of student participation	Four or more forms of evidence (such as dated programs, pictures, etc.) were provided to demonstrate widespread student participation.	Three examples of significant student participation were provided in this campaign.	There are two examples of limited student participation in this campaign.	There is one form of evidence of little student participation in this campaign.	Portfolio not submitted OR there is no evidence of student participation.	
8. Items developed to support campaign	Four or more high quality items (such as pamphlets, brochures, etc.) were developed to support this campaign.	Three good quality items were developed to support this campaign.	Two average quality items were shared to support the development of this campaign.	One item was developed to support this campaign and it was not of good quality.	Portfolio not submitted OR no items were created to support this campaign.	
9. Spelling, grammar, punctuation, neatness	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.	Portfolio not submitted OR there are many misspellings and overall weakness within the portfolio. The portfolio looks unprofessional.	

B. Presentation to Judges	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Purpose for selection/ development of campaign	A clear purpose for the selection and development of the campaign was provided to the judges.	The purpose for the selection and development of the campaign was mostly clear in the presentation to judges.	The purpose for the selection and development of the campaign was moderately clear in the presentation to judges.	There was some detail provided for the purpose and selection of the campaign, however more information is needed.	Presentation not submitted OR the purpose and development of this campaign was unclear.	
2. Campaign promotes community awareness of a health and/or safety issues	Selected campaign clearly focuses on a health or safety issue of local, state, or national interest.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Presentation not submitted OR selected campaign does not reflect a health or safety issue.	
3. Objectives/ accomplishments of campaign	The activities used to promote this campaign were detailed with clear objectives and several accomplishments were highlighted in the presentation.	The activities used to promote the campaign were mostly clear; objectives and accomplishments were highlighted.	The objectives and accomplishments of the campaign were somewhat highlighted in this presentation.	The objectives were somewhat clear, little demonstration of accomplishments were evident in the presentation of the campaign.	Presentation not submitted OR he objectives of the campaign were not clear and there was little evidence of accomplishments made throughout the presentation of the campaign.	
4. Impact	The campaign is highly impactful for the target market and encourages a "call to action" in a positive manner.	The campaign is good but could have a more specific impact to the target market and could inspire behavior change slightly more effectively.	The campaign was educational but did not impact the audience to action.	The impact of the campaign was not communicated clearly. The campaign did not inspire the audience to action.	Presentation not submitted OR the campaign was not impactful and did not encourage positive behavior or elicit any change in the community.	
5. Evaluation of success/failure of campaign	The team strongly highlighted the success and failure of the campaign and had evidence to back up their findings. Excellent reflection of the campaign.	The team highlighted the success and failure of the campaign with only some evidence. Good reflection of the campaign.	The team shared some feedback on the success and/or failure of the campaign.	The team presented very little on the evaluation process of the campaign. Few details were provided.	Presentation not submitted OR no evidence of evaluation of the campaign was presented.	
6. Research- Understanding of problem / health issue	Research was in-depth and beyond the obvious. Demonstrates clear evidence of a deep, insightful understanding of the problem or health issue.	Research seemed to be in-depth. Shows a solid grasp of understanding of the problem or health issue.	The quality of the information was limited to support the topic. Demonstrates an average understanding of the problem or health issue. Judges left with a few questions.	Research provided was mostly surface-level. Shows a basic understanding of the problem or health issue. Judges left with more questions than answers.	Presentation not submitted OR information used in the campaign was unreliable. Team is not able to demonstrate an understanding of the problem or health issue.	
7. Cooperative work with community partners	The team provided four or more high quality examples of cooperative work with community partners to promote and reach the campaign goal.	Three quality examples of cooperative work with community partners to promote and reach the campaign goal were shared.	Two average quality examples of cooperative work with community partners to promote and reach the campaign goal were provided.	One example of cooperative work with a community partner to promote and reach the campaign goal was provided and it was not of high quality.	Presentation not submitted OR no evidence of cooperative work with community partners was provided.	

C. Presentation Delivery	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 point	JUDGE SCORE
1. Voice Pitch, tempo, volume, quality	Each competitor's voice was loud enough to hear. The competitors varied rate & volume to enhance the speech. Appropriate pausing was employed.	Each competitor spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The competitor varied rate OR volume to enhance the speech. Pauses were attempted.	Each competitor could be heard most of the time. The competitors attempted to use some variety in vocal quality, but not always successfully.	Most of the competitor's voices were low. Judges have difficulty hearing the presentation.	Presentation not submitted OR 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 competitors 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 competitor's posture, body language, and facial expressions indicated a lack of enthusiasm for the topic. Movements were distracting.	Presentation not submitted OR 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.	
3. Diction*, Pronunciation** & 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.	Presentation not submitted OR many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal message.	
4. Participation	Excellent example of shared collaboration in the presentation of the campaign. Each team member spoke and carried equal parts of the campaign	All but one person on the team was actively engaged in the presentation.	The team worked together relatively well. Some of the team members had little participation.	The team did not work effectively together.	Presentation not submitted OR one person dominated the project.	
Total Points (100):						

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

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