

# 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.*

| PRESENTATION CONTENT                            | Excellent<br>15 points   | Good<br>12 points   | Average<br>9 points   | Fair<br>6 points  | Poor<br>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>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>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</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>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>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><br>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><br>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   | The competitors maintained adequate posture and non-distracting movement during the speech. Some gestures were used. Facial                           | Stiff or unnatural use of nonverbal behaviors. Body language reflects some discomfort interacting with audience. Limited use of gestures to reinforce verbal message. Facial | 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. |                    |

|  |  |   |  |  |  |                    |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--------------------|
|  | body language consistently generated a strong interest and enthusiasm for the topic.   | expressions and body language sometimes generated an interest and enthusiasm for the topic.   | l expressions and body language are used to try to generate enthusiasm but seem somewhat forced.   |  |  |                    |
| <b>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 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 |                    |
| <b>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>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