

VIRTUAL HEALTH EDUCATION – Judge Rating Sheet

2021 Virtual Texas State Conference

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

Section # _____ Division: MS _____ 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	Event Name, team member names, HOSA division, chapter number, school name, state/association, Title of lesson, target audience age or grade level, number of participants. One page only.				Portfolio not submitted OR all requirements are not met.	
2. Reference Page	The reference page is included in the portfolio submission.	NA	NA	NA	Portfolio not submitted or no reference page is included in the portfolio.	
3. 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.	
A. Quality of	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor	JUDGE

Portfolio	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	0 points	SCORE
4. ALL PAGES are formatted correctly.	All requirements are met: Typed, one-sided, in 12 pt. Arial font, double-spaced, in English, with 1" margins on 8 ½" x 11" paper, and contain: Running header with last name, event and page number top right side of each page (not counting title page).	NA	NA	NA	Portfolio not submitted OR all requirements are not met.	
5. Max Pages (no pages above 20 will be judged)	Pages do not exceed 20 total.	NA	NA	NA	Portfolio not submitted OR portfolio exceeds maximum page limit.	
A. Quality of Portfolio	Excellent 8 points	Good 6 points	Average 4 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	
6. Lesson Plan Narrative	Narrative provides an outstanding description of the goal of the lesson, thoroughly outlining the instruction plan.	Narrative provides a good description of the goal of the lesson, mostly outlining the instruction plan	Narrative provides an adequate description of the goal of the lesson, fairly outlining the instruction plan.	The narrative somewhat describes the lesson plan goal and plan for instruction.	Portfolio not submitted OR The lesson plan narrative does not provide a description of the goal or plan for instruction.	
7. Lesson Outline	The lesson was clearly defined with key elements, a timed outline, and a detailed explanation of the execution of the lesson. Clear evidence of the lesson is provided. The evidence provided shows the lesson had a strong opening, delivery and closing.	The timed outline provides an explanation of the lesson format. Some details are provided to bring the instructional presentation to life.	The lesson outline adequately defines the details of the elements of the lesson.	Little evidence of a lesson plan outline is provided.	Portfolio not submitted OR outline is included in the lesson outline. No evidence of the instructional presentation were included.	
8. Materials	Exceptional examples of teaching materials (such as lesson handouts, scripts, worksheets, multimedia printouts, photos, etc.) are showcased in this portfolio that highlight the quality of instruction provided during this lesson.	The lesson plan materials are good quality. They add value to the portfolio.	The materials developed for this lesson are average. They have a basic level of quality.	The lesson plan materials need extra attention to make them average quality.	Portfolio not submitted OR the lesson plan materials were poor quality and did not enhance the portfolio.	
A. Quality of Portfolio	Excellent 8 points	Good 6 points	Average 4 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE

9. Feedback Tools	Exceptional examples of lesson feedback tools (such as tests, written evaluations, surveys, or other items to evaluate audience learning) are showcased in the portfolio and provided feedback from audience members.	Good examples of lesson feedback tools are provided in the portfolio.	The examples used to provide feedback were average and could use more attention to detail.	The feedback tools used to evaluate lesson plans were not effective.	Portfolio not submitted OR no feedback tools were provided.	
B. Presentation to Judges:	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 point	JUDGE SCORE
1. Objectives / accomplishments of project	The activities used in this lesson were detailed with clear objectives and several accomplishments were highlighted in the presentation.	The activities used in this lesson were mostly clear; objectives and accomplishments were highlighted.	The objectives and accomplishments in this lesson were somewhat highlighted in this presentation.	The objectives were somewhat clear, little demonstration of accomplishments was evident in the presentation.	Presentation not submitted OR the objectives in this lesson were not clear and there was little evidence of accomplishments made throughout the presentation.	
2. Inclusion of media/software	The team effectively described the inclusion of original and/or appropriate media / software in the presentation.	N/A	The team attempted to describe the original and /or appropriate media / software. More attention to detail is needed to be effective.	N/A	Presentation not submitted OR the team did not describe the use of media or software. to support their presentation.	
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 s 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.	No presentation submitted OR the 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 the 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 the audience. Limited use of gestures to reinforce verbal messages. 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.	No presentation 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 the presentation.	
C. Presentation Delivery	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 point	
3. Diction*, Pronunciation**	Delivery emphasizes and enhances	Delivery helps to enhance	Delivery adequate. Enunciation and	Delivery quality minimal. Regular	No presentation submitted OR many	

& Grammar	messages. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. No vocal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone heightened interest and complemented the verbal message.	messages. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. Minimal vocal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone complemented the verbal message	pronunciation suitable. Noticeable verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Tone seemed inconsistent at times.	verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Delivery problems cause disruption to messages.	distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal messages.	
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.	All but one person on the team was actively engaged in the presentation.	The team worked together relatively well. Some team members spoke more than others.	The team did not work effectively together.	No presentation submitted OR one team member dominated the presentation.	
D. Quality of the Lesson:	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 point	JUDGE SCORE
1. Health related	Lesson is health related.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Either presentation OR portfolio not submitted OR lesson is not health related.	
2. Meaningful, relevant, importance to audience	Lesson is exceptionally meaningful, relevant, and important for the audience. The topic is vital for this audience to know!	The lesson is relevant and important for the audience. The topic is beneficial for the audience.	The lesson offers some meaningful and important content but it is unclear if this topic is beneficial to the audience or not.	There is little value connected to this lesson for the audience.	Either presentation OR portfolio not submitted OR the lesson is not relevant and does not hold a sense of importance to the audience. The topic in no way connects to the audience.	
3. Engaging, interesting	The lesson is extremely engaging and will captivate the interest of the audience.	The lesson is engaging and interesting to the audience.	Some of the lessons are engaging and considered moderately interesting by the audience.	The lesson is slightly engaging to the audience	Either presentation OR portfolio not submitted OR the lesson does not appear to be engaging. More effort needed to hold the interest of the audience.	
4. Appropriateness to targeted audience	The quality of instruction was appropriate for the age of the audience. Much thought and consideration went into the instruction to assure the content would be well-received.	Instruction was appropriate to the targeted audience.	The instruction was moderately age-appropriate to the targeted audience.	Instruction was slightly appropriate for the targeted audience.	Either presentation OR portfolio not submitted OR the instruction was inappropriate for the targeted audience.	
5. Lesson creativity and originality	The lesson is highly creative, original, and incorporates real and authentic learning.	The lesson is unique and original in content.	The lesson plan was mostly creative and only somewhat original in content.	The lesson was fairly creative but lacked original content.	Either presentation OR portfolio not submitted OR the lesson lacked creativity and originality. More effort needed to connect with your audience.	
Total Points (147):						

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

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