

Virtual Texas Area Conferences 2020-2021

Items required for state conference: Pdf of portfolio and link to video presentation

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

Deadline to Submit: January 13, 2021

Description: Teams will upload the portfolio and video presentation to Tallo for the judges. Only **one** member of the team is required to upload the materials to Tallo. Teams will be judged on both items.

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.*

MRC PARTNERSHIP – Judge’s Rating Sheet – Virtual Conference

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. 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	N/A	N/A	N/A	All requirements are not met OR portfolio not submitted.	
2. HOSA/MRC Partnership Verification Form	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 does not include all 3 required criteria OR was not submitted.	

A. Portfolio	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
3. Partnership Logistics Document	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 was not submitted.	
	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
4. Description of the HOSA/MRC partnership (items included)	The description features all three items: 1. Level of interactions 2. Quality of interactions 3. Quantity of interactions	NA	The description features 2 of 3 items	The description features 1 of 3 items.	No descriptions of the partnerships were provided OR Portfolio not submitted.	
	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
5. Description of the HOSA/MRC partnership (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 absent OR Portfolio not submitted.	
	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
6. A summary of partnership activities with a brief narrative. (Activities included)	The partnership features all-three of the descriptions: 1. Activity description 2. Impact category (as outlined in the event descriptions) 3. HOSA/MRC Partnership description	NA	The partnership features 2 of 3 descriptions	The partnership features 1 of 3 descriptions.	No descriptions of the partnership activities were provided OR Portfolio not submitted	

	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
7. A summary of partnership activities with a brief narrative. (Quality of activities)	The partnership activities documented in the portfolio are excellent quality, scope, and value.	The partnership activities documented in the portfolio are good quality, scope, and value.	The partnership activities documented in the portfolio are average quality, scope, and value.	The partnership activities documented in the portfolio are fair quality, scope, and value.	No summary of partnership activities is included OR Portfolio not submitted	
	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
8. ALL PAGES of the portfolio are neat, and error-free.	No errors in grammar or appearance were detected in the submission.	The submission had 1-2 errors within the entry.	3-4 errors in grammar or neatness were detected in the submission.	5 or more errors in grammar or neatness were detected in the submission.	Portfolio was not submitted	
9. ALL Narrative 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 1/2" x 11" paper, and contain: Running header with last name, event and page number top right side of each page (not counting title page). Pages do not exceed 16 total.	NA	NA	NA	All requirements are not met OR portfolio not submitted.	
10. Max Pages (no pages above 16 will be judged)		NA	NA	NA	Portfolio exceeds maximum page limit OR portfolio not submitted.	
B. HOSA/MRC Partnership Overall Content	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 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 very limited or inconsistent.	The connection between MRC/HOSA is non-existent.	
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.	

B. HOSA/MRC Partnership Overall Content	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
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	
C. Presentation Delivery	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	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 competitors 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.	Judge had difficulty hearing and/or understanding much of the speech due to low volume. Little variety in rate or volume. OR No presentation submitted.	
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 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 OR No presentation submitted.	

C. Presentation Delivery	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
3. Diction*, Pronunciation** and Grammar	Delivery emphasizes and enhances messages. 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 messages. 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 messages.	Many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal messages. OR No presentation submitted.	
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	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.	No presentation submitted OR one person dominated the project.	
Total Points (140):						