

## VIRTUAL MEDICAL INNOVATION-Judge Rating Sheet Round One-The Innovation Exhibit

### 2021 Virtual Texas Area Conferences

**Items required for area conference:** Pdf of reference page and 1-3 photos of the exhibit; Link to video presentation

**How to submit:** Upload to Tallo using these INSTRUCTIONS

**Deadline to Submit:** January 13, 2021

**Description:** One member of each team will upload a pdf file containing the reference page and 1-3 photos of the exhibit to Tallo. Teams will also record a video of their team presentation for judges. Teams will be judged on both items uploaded to Tallo.

**1-3 photos of the Innovation and reference page PDF Uploaded\*:** Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

**Video Presentation Uploaded\*:** Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

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

Section # \_\_\_\_\_ Judge's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Team Names & # \_\_\_\_\_ Division: SS \_\_\_\_ PS/Collegiate \_\_\_\_

A. Overview	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
<b>1. Prototype is</b>	Prototype shown in uploaded photos	N/A	N/A	N/A	Prototype not shown in uploaded photos OR no photos uploaded.	
<b>2. Safety</b>	Exhibit/ equipment is safe and poses no hazards.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Exhibits not submitted OR equipment presents safety/hazard concern.	
<b>3. Reference Page</b>	Reference page is included as a digital upload - and contains Event name, Competitor/Team Member Names, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, State/Assoc, & Chosen Innovation				Reference page is not included OR all requirements are not met.	

<b>B. EXHIBIT CONTENT</b>	<b>Excellent 15 points</b>	<b>Good 12 points</b>	<b>Average 9 points</b>	<b>Fair 6 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>1. Innovation Design</b>	The quality of design of the innovation is exceptional. The unique design is comprehensive and original. The design pushes the boundaries of originality and takes innovation to the next level.	The innovation consists of mostly original design. The information appears to be well-designed and comprehensive.	The design innovation is moderately original showcasing some unique features. Some of the design lacked details that took away from the overall comprehension of the innovation	Information on the design seem to be missing key elements. More information is needed for the design innovation to be effective.	Exhibit not submitted OR the design is simplistic and does not offer an original approach to the content. Components of the design appear to be missing and judges are left with more questions than answers.	
<b>2. Innovation Impact / Relevance</b>	The relevance of this medical innovation is significant and timely. This product/process definitely has the potential to positively impact the future of healthcare, increase the quality of life or reduce healthcare costs.	This medical innovation exhibits promising indicators of having a positive impact on the future of healthcare but may or may not significantly affect quality of life or reduction of care costs.	This innovation suggests a minimal impact on the future of the healthcare industry, improvement of quality of life or reducing healthcare costs.	The impact on the healthcare industry by improving quality of life or reducing healthcare costs is questionable at best.	Exhibit not submitted OR this design is already in existence or does not add value to the global healthcare market.	
<b>3. Content / Information</b>	Content is written clearly and concisely with a logical sequence of ideas and supporting information. The exhibit gives the audience a clear understanding of the innovation. Information is accurate and current.	The content is mostly clear, and ideas are sequenced in a logical manner. The exhibit provides the audience with a general understanding of the innovation.	The content is vague in conveying a point of view and does not create a strong sense of purpose. Some of the information does not support understanding of the innovation.	Sequencing of ideas does not flow logically. Exhibit includes little information – only one or two details about the topic with little support for claims/ evidence.	Exhibit not submitted OR information on the exhibit is unclear and does not provide understanding of the innovation.	
<b>C. EXHIBIT VISUALS</b>	<b>Excellent 10 points</b>	<b>Good 8 points</b>	<b>Average 6 points</b>	<b>Fair 4 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>1. Artistic Design</b>	The artistic quality is exceptional. The artwork is vibrant, balanced, visually pleasing and pushes the boundaries of artistic expression. The design choices take the exhibit 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 exhibit incorporates balanced design choices, showcasing some artistic features. Some of the design lacks artistic details that took away from the overall visual of the exhibit.	Basic levels of artistic design are incorporated into the exhibit. Better design/color choices should be incorporated to assure the artwork on the exhibit is pleasing to the eye,	Exhibit not submitted OR the design is simplistic and not visually appealing.	
<b>2. Creativity and Originality</b>	The exhibit incorporates creativity and innovation that make it unique. The exhibit has the “wow-factor” and stands out in the room above all others.	The exhibit is innovative and creative. It offers something unique but is missing the wow-factor.	The exhibit has moderate levels of creativity and originality.	Basic elements of creativity and innovation were captured in this exhibit. It blends in with the other competitors.	Exhibit not submitted OR little creativity or originality was captured in the exhibit of this health care exhibit. More effort needed.	

<b>C. EXHIBIT VISUALS</b>	<b>Excellent 10 points</b>	<b>Good 8 points</b>	<b>Average 6 points</b>	<b>Fair 4 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>3. Appearance / Organization</b>	The exhibit is exceptionally neat, organized, and error-free. Information is clearly displayed and easy to understand and follow.	Exhibit is neat and organized. The content has a logical flow with only minimal errors.	The exhibit was basic and could use more organization and thought to be understood.	The exhibit lacked organization and/or contained several spelling errors. The flow of information seemed to be out of order.	Exhibit not submitted OR the exhibit is either too busy or lacks enough detail to support the content.	
<b>Total Points (90):</b>						

## VIRTUAL MEDICAL INNOVATION-Judge Rating Sheet Round Two-The Presentation

Section # \_\_\_\_\_ Judge's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Team Names & # \_\_\_\_\_ Division: SS \_\_\_\_ PS/Collegiate \_\_\_\_

*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.PRESENTATION CONTENT	Excellent 15 points	Good 12 points	Average 9 points	Fair 6 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
<b>1. Explain &amp; Teach</b>	The team shared exceptional depth of knowledge on the innovation content and effectively taught the judges about their innovation.	The team shared knowledge and understanding of the original innovation with the judges.	The team shared an average amount of knowledge on the original medical innovation.	The team demonstrated some command of the knowledge but failed to effectively teach the judges about the original innovation.	Presentation not submitted OR the team shared little to no knowledge of the medical innovation with the judges or repeated information.	
<b>2. Demonstration / Discussion of Prototype</b>	The team did an outstanding job demonstrating the medical innovation prototype. The audience feels competent about how to use the prototype.	The team did a good job demonstrating the innovation prototype.	The presentation of the medical innovation prototype was mediocre.	The team attempted to demonstrate the innovation prototype but experienced challenges.	Presentation not submitted OR The presentation of the medical innovation prototype was poor. The prototype did not function correctly.	
<b>3. Why this Innovation? Value &amp; Benefit</b>	The team provided clear rationale for the purpose behind the innovation, why it is needed and how it will add value and benefit the healthcare system.	The team was able to explain the value and benefit of the medical innovation to the healthcare industry.	The team provided a short explanation for how the medical innovation will benefit the healthcare industry.	Little demonstration for why this innovation will add value or benefit the healthcare system was given.	Presentation not submitted OR the team was unable to explain or demonstrate why this medical innovation will add value or benefit to the healthcare system	
<b>4.Overall Innovation</b>	The exhibit and presentation are an excellent combination to get people excited about the innovation and could have a profound effect on the future of healthcare.	The exhibit and presentation resonated with the audience and made a positive impact. The audience left feeling positive about the new innovation.	The overall effectiveness of the innovation demonstrates some potential to impact the future of healthcare.	The medical innovation needs additional focus in order to gain excitement	Presentation not submitted OR the presentation and exhibit need more polish and attention to detail in order to improve the delivery of healthcare. The overall innovation lacks effectiveness and attention to detail.	
B.PRESENTATION CONTENT	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE

<b>5. Cost</b>	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	Presentation not submitted OR no relevant information was shared about the cost of the innovation.	
<b>B.PRESENTATION CONTENT</b>	<b>Excellent 5 points</b>	<b>Good 4 points</b>	<b>Average 3 points</b>	<b>Fair 2 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>6. Training Requirements</b>	A detailed description of the training requirements to use or implement the medical innovation was shared.	A description of the training requirements was provided.	A short description of the training requirements was provided.	An incomplete description of the training requirements was provided.	Presentation not submitted OR there is no description of the training requirements for the medical innovation.	
<b>7. Career Implications</b>	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.	Presentation not submitted OR no information was shared about the career implications of this innovation	
<b>C.PRESENTATION DELIVERY</b>	<b>Excellent 5 points</b>	<b>Good 4 points</b>	<b>Average 3 points</b>	<b>Fair 2 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>1. Voice</b> 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.	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.	
<b>2. Stage Presence</b> 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.	
<b>3. Diction*, Pronunciation** and Grammar</b>	Delivery emphasizes and enhances message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. No vocal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone	Delivery helps to enhance message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. Minimal vocal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone	Delivery adequate. Enunciation and pronunciation suitable. Noticeable verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Tone	Delivery quality minimal. Regular verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Delivery problems cause	Presentation not submitted OR many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal	

	heightened interest and complemented the verbal message.	complemented the verbal message	seemed inconsistent at times.	disruption to message.	characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal message	
<b>C.PRESENTATION DELIVERY</b>	<b>Excellent 5 points</b>	<b>Good 4 points</b>	<b>Average 3 points</b>	<b>Fair 2 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>4. Organization and Flow</b>	The presentation was exceptionally organized, clear and coherent. It flowed seamlessly.	The presentation was well-organized, clear and included sufficient detail.	Information shared by presenters was somewhat organized and presented fairly well. The presentation included some details to help with the delivery.	Presentation was not delivered in a clear and concise manner.	Presentation not submitted OR The presentation was scattered and unclear; did not flow, and left judges with more questions than answers.	
<b>5. Team Participation</b>	Excellent example of shared collaboration in the presentation of the project. Each team member spoke and carried equal parts of the project presentation.	Only 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 team member dominated the project.	
<b>Total Points (100):</b>						

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

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