

Judges: You-Tube video (2 minor less)  
 should not contain any verbal  
 communication & should clearly show  
 all bulleted items on rubric.

Alabama SQE  
 Rubric

**HEALTH CAREER DISPLAY**  
**Judge's Round 1 Rating Sheet – The Display**

Section # \_\_\_\_\_  
 Team # \_\_\_\_\_

Judge's Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
 Division: SS \_\_\_\_ PS/Collegiate \_\_\_\_

should include

One PDF file with Reference Page and 1-3 photos of the display Uploaded Online\*: Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_  
 \*If the materials are not uploaded, please note that applicable items on the rubric below cannot be judged.

Health Career Display – Round 1						
A. Overview	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. No Power	Power is NOT used (electric, battery, etc...).	N/A	N/A	N/A	Display not submitted OR power was used.	
2. Health Related Career	Display reflects a health career or a cluster of related health careers.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Display not submitted OR does not reflect a health career or a cluster of related health careers.	
3. Safety	Display/ equipment is safe and poses no hazards.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Display not submitted OR equipment presents safety/hazard concern.	
4. Reference Page	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 Profession	N/A	N/A	N/A	Reference page is not included OR all requirements are not met.	
5. Display Setup	Display is no more than 36" high x 48" wide and 24" deep, with board made of foam or corrugated cardboard.	N/A	N/A	N/A	All requirements are not met.	
A. Overview	Excellent 20 points	Good 16 points	Average 12 points	Fair 8 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
6. Career Overview	Display provides an exceptional representation of the researched career / career cluster. Information is accurate, current, and presented in a logical manner.	The content of the display is mostly clear, ideas are sequenced in a logical manner. The display provides information that describes the career / career cluster.	The information on the display is somewhat vague and does not clearly define the career/cluster.	The sequencing of ideas throughout the display is unclear. The display includes little information with limited data to support the career or career cluster.	Display not submitted OR information on the display is unclear and does not provide understanding of the career or career cluster.	
B. Career Information	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 point	JUDGE SCORE

<b>Includes:</b>						
<b>1. Job responsibilities</b>	Detailed information on the job responsibilities is given along with an excellent description of five or more tasks specific to the health career.	Job responsibilities were provided. Good information on the job description were given with four specific tasks described.	A description of the job was provided. Three specific tasks were described.	A brief mention of the job responsibilities was given, and only one to two specific tasks were described.	Display not submitted OR no mention of job responsibilities or tasks associated with the job were provided.	
<b>2. Education requirements</b>	Detailed and thorough description of the educational requirements with information on any degrees with courses, certificates, licenses, or other special requirements. Estimated time required to complete requirement is also given.	There is a description of the educational requirements. It provides information on any degrees, certificates, licenses, or other special requirements.	There is a short description of the educational requirements.	There is an incomplete description of the educational requirements.	Display not submitted OR there is no description of the educational requirements.	
<b>3. Entry level salary at the local/ national/ global level</b>	A detailed and accurate description of the salary and wage information for this career is provided at the local, national and global levels. The team provides the yearly, monthly, and hourly rate for this position. Opportunities for advancement and future earnings are provided.	Salary at the local/ national/ global level is provided in the display along with a brief summary of the wage details.	A description of the salary range for this career is provided without specific details.	There is a vague description of the salary range for this career/cluster.	Display not submitted OR there is no description of the salary range for this career.	
<b>4. Benefits/ challenges associated with this career</b>	The display effectively highlights five or more benefits and challenges associated with this career.	The display shares highlights of four benefits or challenges commonly associated with this career.	The display describes three benefits or challenges with the career/ cluster.	The display mentions one or two benefits or challenges of the specific career or career cluster.	Display not submitted OR there was no mention of benefits or challenges with the career.	
<b>5. Additional relevant career information</b> Can discuss details/traits including (but not limited to): Career environment, technological needs, work schedule, personal characteristics, etc).	The display features five or more additional relevant details associated with the career/ career cluster.	The display features four additional details related to the career or career cluster.	The display features three additional details relevant to the career.	The display shares two additional details about the career.	Display not submitted OR no additional information on the career/career cluster was provided.	
<b>C. Display Visuals</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. 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 display 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 display incorporates balanced design choices, showcasing some artistic features. Some of the design lacks artistic details that took away from the overall visual of the display.	Basic levels of artistic design are incorporated into the display. Better design/color choices should be incorporated to assure the artwork on the display is pleasing to the eye,	Display not submitted OR the design is simplistic and not visually appealing.	

C. Display Visuals	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
2. Creativity and Originality	The display incorporates creativity and innovation that make it unique. The display has the "wow-factor" and stands out in the room above all others.	The display is innovative and creative. It offers something unique but is missing the wow-factor.	The display has moderate levels of creativity and originality.	Basic elements of creativity and innovation were captured in this health career display. It blends in with the other competitors.	Display not submitted OR little creativity or originality was captured in the display of this health care display. More effort needed	
3. Appearance / Organization	The display is exceptionally neat, organized, and error-free. Information is clearly displayed and easy to understand and follow.	Display is neat and organized. The content has a logical flow with only minimal errors.	The display was basic and could use more organization and thought to be understood. .	The display lacked organization and/or contained several spelling errors. The flow of information seemed to be out of order.	Display not submitted OR the display is either too busy or lacks enough detail to support the content.	
<b>Total Points (105):</b>						



Judges: A Youtube link less than 6 min  
 Should be uploaded describing the presentation.  
 : A pdf of the lesson plan narrative

Alabama SQE  
 Rubric

HEALTH EDUCATION – Judge’s Rating Sheet

Section # \_\_\_\_\_  
 Team # \_\_\_\_\_

Judge’s Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
 Division: MS \_\_\_\_ SS \_\_\_\_ PS/Collegiate \_\_\_\_

Whole Portfolio  
 NOT required  
 for SQE

One PDF file with Portfolio Uploaded Online\*: Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

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

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.	<b>Not For SQE</b>			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.	
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 <i>SOE</i>	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 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.	
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>B. Presentation to Judges:</b>	<b>Excellent 10 points</b>	<b>Good 8 points</b>	<b>Average 6 points</b>	<b>Fair 4 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 point</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
1. Objectives / accomplishments of project <i>SOE</i>	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.	The objectives in this lesson were not clear and there was little evidence of accomplishments made throughout the presentation.	
<b>B. Presentation to Judges:</b>	<b>Excellent 10 points</b>	<b>Good 8 points</b>	<b>Average 6 points</b>	<b>Fair 4 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 point</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>

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	The team did not describe the use of media or software. to support their presentation.	
<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 point</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
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.	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.	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.	Many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal message.	
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.	One team member dominated the presentation.	
<b>D. Quality of the Lesson:</b>	<b>Excellent 10 points</b>	<b>Good 8 points</b>	<b>Average 6 points</b>	<b>Fair 4 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 point</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
1. Health related	Lesson is health related.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Either presentation OR portfolio not	

\* SQE

					submitted OR lesson is not health related.	
<b>2. Meaningful, relevant, importance to audience</b>	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.	
<b>3. Engaging, interesting</b>	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 lesson is 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.	
<b>4. Appropriateness to targeted audience</b>	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 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.	
<b>5. Lesson creativity and originality</b>	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.	
<b>Total Points (147):</b>						

\* SQE

(98)

\* Definition of Diction – Choice of words especially with regard to correctness, clearness, and effectiveness.  
 \*\* Definition of Pronunciation – Act or manner of uttering officially.



Judges: pdf of 2 pictures / their written descriptions & their permission forms are required.

Alabama SQE Rubric

HEALTH CAREER PHOTOGRAPHY – Judge’s Rating Sheet  
Round 1 – The Photos

Section # \_\_\_\_\_ Division: \_\_\_\_\_ SS \_\_\_\_\_ PS/C \_\_\_\_\_  
Competitor # \_\_\_\_\_ Judge’s Signature \_\_\_\_\_

*a portion of the*  
One PDF file with Photography Portfolio Uploaded Online\*: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
\*If the materials are not uploaded, please note that applicable items on the rubric below cannot be judged.

A. Overall Portfolio	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Title Page	Title page includes event name, competitor's name, HOSA division, chapter number, school name, state/association, and all 3 career titles photographed.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Portfolio is not submitted OR title page does not include ALL requirements.	
2. Photos are numbered.	Photos are numbered one through three <i>&amp; two</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	Portfolio not submitted OR photos are not numbered.	
3. Narrative Description Formatting	Narratives for EACH photo are one-sided, typed, 12 pt. Arial font, double-spaced, in English, With 1" margins on 8 1/2" x 11" paper, Using a Running header with last name, event and page number on top right side of each page.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Portfolio not submitted OR pages do not meet ALL requirements	
A. Overall Portfolio	Excellent 15 points	Good 12 points	Average 9 points	Fair 6 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
4. The pictures must be of <i>two</i> <del>three</del> different health professionals in <i>two</i> <del>three</del> different fields (i.e.: nursing / pharmacy / physical therapy) NOT dentist / dental hygienist / dental assistant)	Photos clearly highlight <i>2</i> <del>3</del> different health professionals. No question that the competitor was able to explore <i>2</i> <del>3</del> different health careers through participating in this event.	Photos highlight <i>2</i> <del>3</del> different health professionals, but there is some ambiguity in articulating the differences between the <i>three</i> <del>two</del> .	<i>1</i> <del>2</del> of the <i>2</i> <del>3</del> photos submitted highlight different health professionals. There is question about whether or not the <i>one</i> <del>two</del> photo does. <i>2nd</i>	Judge is unsure if the <i>2</i> <del>3</del> photos highlight different health professionals	Portfolio not submitted OR photos are without question of the same health profession.	

Not required for SQE

\*Judges – remember the purpose of this event is to encourage competitors to explore and analyze different health careers through the medium of photography. Three photos all of the same profession/field don't expand the competitor's perspective very much. Use your best judgement if the three photos used align with the event's overall purpose.

<b>B. PHOTO #1</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>
1. Focus of occupation within the photo	A clear center of interest is captured in the photo with a clearly defined subject (health professional) performing an aspect of their job. The health professional is clearly visible and identifiable in the photo.	The health professional is at the center of the photo and the career is easily defined. The job aspect the subject is performing is not clearly visible in the photo.	The photo highlights an individual in a health career but the career is not easily defined.	The photo is of a health career but does not focus on the individual performing the occupation.	Photo #1 not submitted OR the photo does not capture a health professional performing functions of their job. The career in this photo is unclear.	
2. Originality of photo	The photo is creative and unique which makes it memorable. The viewer can feel the emotion of the photo through the image alone. The photo brings the occupation "to life" through its imagery.	The photo is a unique image and brings the occupation to life. The "wow-factor" is missing.	The photo is creative but falls short of a unique and original presentation.	The photo has a limited amount of creativity. It does not spark emotion by viewing.	Photo #1 not submitted OR the photo is unoriginal. It does not bring the occupation to life or instill emotion by viewing.	
3. Narrative Description includes: a. the professional's job responsibilities, b. required education/training, c. benefits/challenges, d. and any other specific information from this experience	The competitor describes the experience in detail and brings the profession to life. Includes thorough information covering points a-d.  No spelling errors.	A positive description of the experience was captured. A creative description was offered. Information covers points a-d.  1-2 spelling errors	The description of the photo was average and does not leave the reader wanting to know more. Information from points a-d may be limited or vague.  3-4 spelling errors	The description of the photo is basic and does not provide context to the competitor's experience. Information from points a-d is missing.  5+ spelling errors	Photo #1 not submitted OR no description of the photo was provided.	
4. Proper Exposure / Framing  Exposure = "The amount of light which reaches your camera sensor or film"	The photo is high quality and contains proper exposure. The subject is focused/framed, the colors of the photo are vibrant, or effective use of black/white is used, the lighting is bright and captures the subject in action. The viewer's eye is drawn to the subject of the photo.  No graphics, backgrounds, or photo collages included.	The photo is high quality and contains proper exposure. The subject is mostly in-focus but could use some sharpening or light added to be pleasing to the eye.	The photo is focused correctly but needs some sharpening. The subject may or may not be framed properly.	The photo is slightly out of focus, the exposure and/or framing is slightly off.	Photo #1 not submitted OR the image in the photo is not properly framed. The exposure is out of focus, there is no focal center. Graphics, backgrounds, or photo collages are included (which is not allowed).	
<b>B. PHOTO #1</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>
5. Permission Forms	Permission forms for facility/subject are included for photo #1	N/A	N/A	N/A	Photo #1 not submitted OR permission forms for facility/subject are not included for photo #1.	

<b>C. PHOTO #2</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>
1. Focus of occupation within the photo	A clear center of interest is captured in the photo with a clearly defined subject (health professional) performing an aspect of their job. The health professional is clearly visible and identifiable in the photo.	The health professional is at the center of the photo and the career is easily defined. The job aspect the subject is performing is not clearly visible in the photo.	The photo highlights an individual in a health career but the career is not easily defined.	The photo is of a health career but does not focus on the individual performing the occupation.	Photo #2 not submitted OR the photo does not capture a health professional performing functions of their job. The career in this photo is unclear.	
2. Originality of photo	The photo is creative and unique which makes it memorable. The viewer can feel the emotion of the photo through the image alone. The photo brings the occupation "to life" through its imagery.	The photo is a unique image and brings the occupation to life. The "wow-factor" is missing.	The photo is creative but falls short of a unique and original presentation.	The photo has a limited amount of creativity. It does not spark emotion by viewing.	Photo #2 not submitted OR the photo is unoriginal. It does not bring the occupation to life or instill emotion by viewing.	
3. Narrative Description includes: a. the professional's job responsibilities, b. required education/training, c. benefits/challenges, d. and any other specific information from this experience	The competitor describes the experience in detail and brings the profession to life. Includes thorough information covering points a-d.  No spelling errors.	A positive description of the experience was captured. A creative description was offered. Information covers points a-d.  1-2 spelling errors	The description of the photo was average and does not leave the reader wanting to know more. Information from points a-d may be limited or vague.  3-4 spelling errors	The description of the photo is basic and does not provide context to the competitor's experience. Information from points a-d is missing.  5+ spelling errors	Photo #2 not submitted OR no description of the photo was provided.	
4. Proper Exposure / Framing  Exposure = "The amount of light which reaches your camera sensor or film"	The photo is high quality and contains proper exposure. The subject is focused/framed, the colors of the photo are vibrant, or effective use of black/white is used, the lighting is bright and captures the subject in action. The viewer's eye is drawn to the subject of the photo.  No graphics, backgrounds, or photo collages included.	The photo is high quality and contains proper exposure. The subject is mostly in-focus but could use some sharpening or light added to be pleasing to the eye.	The photo is focused correctly but needs some sharpening. The subject may or may not be framed properly.	The photo is slightly out of focus, the exposure and/or framing is slightly off.	Photo #2 not submitted OR the image in the photo is not properly framed. The exposure is out of focus, there is no focal center. Graphics, backgrounds, or photo collages are included (which is not allowed).	
<b>C. PHOTO #2</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>
5. Permission Forms	Permission forms for facility/subject are included for photo #2	N/A	N/A	N/A	Photo #2 not submitted OR permission forms for facility/subject are not included for photo #2.	

D. PHOTO #3	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Focus of occupation within the photo	A clear center of interest is captured in the photo with a clearly defined subject (health professional) performing an aspect of their job. The health professional is clearly visible and identifiable in the photo.	The health professional is at the center of the photo and the career is easily defined. The job aspect the subject is performing is not clearly visible in the photo.	The photo highlights an individual in a health career but the career is not easily defined.	The photo is of a health career but does not focus on the individual performing the occupation.	Photo #3 not submitted OR the photo does not capture a health professional performing functions of their job. The career in this photo is unclear.	
2. Originality of photo	The photo is creative and unique which makes it memorable. The viewer can feel the emotion of the photo through the image alone. The photo brings the occupation "to life" through its imagery.	The photo is a unique image and brings the occupation to life. The "wow-factor" is missing.	The photo is creative but falls short of a unique and original presentation.	The photo was a limited amount of creativity. It does not spark emotion by viewing.	Photo #3 not submitted OR the photo is unoriginal. It does not bring the occupation to life or instill emotion by viewing.	
3. Narrative Description includes: a. the professional's job responsibilities, b. required education/training, c. benefits/challenges, d. and any other specific information from this experience	The competitor describes the experience in detail and brings the profession to life. Includes thorough information covering points a-d.  No spelling errors.	A positive description of the experience was captured. A creative description was offered. Information covers points a-d.  1-2 spelling errors	The description of the photo was average and does not leave the reader wanting to know more. Information from points a-d may be limited or vague.  3-4 spelling errors	The description of the photo is basic and does not provide context to the competitor's experience. Information from points a-d is missing.  5+ spelling errors	Photo #3 not submitted OR no description of the photo was provided.	
4. Proper Exposure / Framing  Exposure = "The amount of light which reaches your camera sensor or film"	The photo is high quality and contains proper exposure. The subject is focused/framed, the colors of the photo are vibrant, or effective use of black/white is used, the lighting is bright and captures the subject in action. The viewer's eye is drawn to the subject of the photo.  No graphics, backgrounds, or photo collages included.	The photo is high quality and contains proper exposure. The subject is mostly in-focus but could use some sharpening or light added to be pleasing to the eye.	The photo is focused correctly but needs some sharpening. The subject may or may not be framed properly.	The photo is slightly out of focus, the exposure and/or framing is slightly off.	Photo #3 not submitted OR the image in the photo is not properly framed. The exposure is out of focus, there is no focal center. Graphics, backgrounds, or photo collages are included (which is not allowed).	
<b>C. PHOTO #3</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>
5. Permission Forms	Permission forms for facility/subject are included for photo #3	N/A	N/A	N/A	Photo #3 not submitted OR permission forms for facility/subject are not included for photo #3.	
<b>Total Points (115):</b>						

NOT required for S&E

**JOB SEEKING SKILLS – Judge’s Rating Sheet**

Section # \_\_\_\_\_ Judge's Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
 Competitor # \_\_\_\_\_ Division \_\_\_\_\_ SS \_\_\_\_\_ PSC \_\_\_\_\_

*required* →

One PDF file with Resume and Cover Letter Uploaded Online\*: Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

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

<b>A. Cover Letter</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. Length</b>	Cover Letter does not exceed one page.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Cover letter not included OR exceeds one page.	
<b>2. Neatness, spelling, grammar</b>	There are no spelling or grammatical errors throughout the entire cover letter.	There are 1-2 minor misspellings or grammatical errors that will be easy to fix to make it appeal to the viewer.	There are 3-4 spelling or grammatical errors in the cover letter.	There are 5-6 spelling or grammatical errors present in the cover letter.	Cover letter not submitted OR there are 7 or more spelling or grammatical errors in the cover letter.	
	<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. Organization</b>	Letter includes an organized introduction, body and conclusion paragraph. There is a proper salutation at the greeting with a precise contact name. The entire cover letter amounts to no more than one page in length.	Most of the organization is appropriate, but there are a few minor tweaks that could be made to make the cover letter flow better to the viewer.	Some of the organization is correct, but there are a couple major problems that are rather distracting to the viewer.	An attempt was made to organize the cover letter, but there are still significant problems that distract the viewer from reading it from top to bottom.	Cover letter not submitted OR the cover letter has little to no organization, which could mean inconsistent fonts, no separation of paragraphs, or improper ordering of topics.	
<b>4. Content</b>	The content within the main parts of the cover letter includes the necessary information about the competitor (qualifications and strengths that pertain to the job, how they found the job, and how they will impact the company in the future). It makes for a great introduction to the resume.	A few minor pieces of content are missing that are crucial to make the cover letter top-notch.	A lot of the information is present, but a few major, relevant pieces are missing.	There are significant parts of the cover letter that are missing or are inserted improperly.	Cover letter not submitted OR there is little to no content present in the cover letter. No effort was put forth in order to include the necessary information. It is missing all or almost all of the needed information about how they qualify for the job and their strengths pertaining to it, how they found the job, why they will be a good fit with the company.	

<b>B. Resume</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. Length</b>	Resume does not exceed one page.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Resume not submitted OR resume is more than one page in length.	
<b>2. Neatness, spelling, grammar</b>	There are no spelling or grammar errors throughout the entire resume.	There are 1-2 minor misspellings or grammatical errors that will be easy to fix to make it appeal to the viewer.	There are 3-4 spelling or grammatical errors in the resume.	There are 5-6 spelling or grammatical errors present in the resume.	Resume not submitted OR there are 7 or more spelling or grammatical errors in the resume.	
<b>B. Resume</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>3. Content/organization</b> The resume requirements include: a. Personal information in the heading b. Clearly stated career objective c. Education d. Work Experience e. Activities and awards	The competitor includes all five of the required components of the resume and organizes the document in a legible and professional manner.  The resume flows smoothly, and action verbs are used to describe the competitor's strengths.	The competitor includes four of the five required content areas of the resume.  The resume flows smoothly but lacks description of experience that allows the judges to gain a clear picture of the employment and educational history.	The competitor includes three of the five required content areas of the resume.  Some action verbs were used to describe the competitor's strengths.  Fair level of organization throughout the resume.	The required components may be included, but do not provide a clear description of the competitor's work or employment history. Little detail is provided.	Resume not submitted OR the resume does not flow or have experience documented that would relate the competitor to the position.	
<b>C. Interview</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. Introduction/first impression</b>	Greeting is excellent, shook hands and engaged professionally with the judge upon arrival. Great first impression!	Greeting is good, handshake was appropriate but didn't stand out amongst competition.	Greeting is appropriate, but didn't shake hands or didn't shake hands correctly, conversation is appropriate.	Average greeting did not shake hands with judge, conversation is not engaging or there was no conversation.	Poor first impression. Competitor did not shake hands or try to engage with the judge.	
<b>2. Content of answers</b> Judges are looking for answers to the following criteria: • Competitor shows willingness to volunteer information • Responds appropriately to every question. • Relates strengths and skills for the job. • Sounds professional in choice of vocabulary and description of personal strengths.	The competitor thoroughly showcased each of the 4 criteria in their answers with ease and conviction. The responses left the judges excited to know more about the experiences, strengths and skillsets of the competitor.	Most questions were answered honestly and thoughtfully using professional language and tone.  The competitor covers 3 of the interview answer criteria.	The competitor covers 2 of the 4 interview answer criteria but does not provide a clear picture of their work experience or strengths. .	Some questions were answered thoughtfully using professional language. The interview was underwhelming.  Covers 1 of the 4 interview criteria.	Most questions were answered inappropriately, didn't elaborate on answers  Covers 0 of the 5 interview criteria.	

2 of 3

C. Interview	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
3. Confidence, maturity, enthusiasm	Competitor exhibited confidence throughout their interview. Genuine excitement for the pending position and conducted themselves with maturity. They would make a great employee!	The competitor was confident but not convincing. They were excited for the pending position but need a little more polish to be offered the position.	The competitor exhibited some level of confidence in his/her interviewing ability but seemed a little nervous.	The competitor appeared to be nervous and anxious about the interview. It was evident they were excited to be here; they just need more practice with interviews.	The competitor's nerves got the best of them. They were not able to showcase their best work in the interview. Keep trying!	
4. Knowledge of Position Applied For	Competitor was knowledgeable about the position and related skills to the job, prepared and practiced interview questions and was prepared with company research. They answered all questions put forth by judges by showing confidence and understanding.	The competitor was mostly knowledgeable of the skills related to the job. They had researched the company and were able to answer most questions.	Competitor somewhat prepared with company research. Answered some of the questions from the judges. Some confidence	Competitor wasn't aware of the position they were hiring for. They were unable to answer questions asked by the judges.	Competitor lacks preparedness of company research. Lacks confidence in speaking with the judge.	
<b>C. Interview</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>
5. Closing	Competitor asked at least one question that was relevant to the position and left the judges with an overall positive impression.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Competitor did not ask any questions and the judges were left with a less than positive impression.	
<b>D. General Characteristics</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>
1. *Diction and **articulation	The competitor speaks clearly, enunciates words. Clear, crisp speech which is easy to hear and understand.	The competitor enunciates most words clearly and is easily understood.	The competitor speaks clearly, minimal instances when they mumble or do not enunciate their words.	The competitor mumbles some of the time and speaks at a low volume. The judges must ask the competitor to repeat themselves.	Competitor mumbles, speaks softly, and is hard to hear. Judge is unable to hear or understand all or part of the responses to the interview questions	
<b>D. General Characteristics</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>
2. Eye contact, poise and posture	The competitor displays comfortable eye contact, displays confidence in their demeanor; sits up straight throughout interview.	The competitor makes eye contact most of the time, sits up straight and conducts themselves with confidence.	The competitor displays some eye contact but looks down or to the side of the judges.	The competitor makes limited eye contact and does not display good posture.	The competitor does not make eye contact with the judges. They slouch during the interview	
<b>Total Points (115):</b>						

Not for

(55)





Judges: Upload requirement is a YouTube link no more than 2 min demonstrating display measurements (width & depth) & reference page

Alabama  
SQE  
Rubric

video & photos should allow scoring of rubric

**MEDICAL INNOVATION**  
**Judge's Round 1 Rating Sheet – The Innovation Exhibit**

Section # \_\_\_\_\_ Judge's Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
Team \_\_\_\_\_

Required →

One PDF file with Reference Page and 1-3 photos Uploaded Online\*:

Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

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

A. Medical Innovation – The Innovation Exhibit – Round 1						JUDGE SCORE
A. Overview	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	
1. Prototype	Prototype shown in uploaded photos	N/A	N/A	N/A	Prototype not shown in uploaded photos OR no photos uploaded.	
2. Safety	Exhibit/ equipment is safe and poses no hazards.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Exhibit not submitted OR equipment presents safety/hazard concern.	
3. Reference Page	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	N/A	N/A	N/A	Reference page is not included OR all requirements are not met.	
4. Innovation Setup	Exhibit materials do not extend beyond the edge of the table and safely stands on the table AND exhibit is no more than 48" wide x 24" deep.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Exhibit does not meet requirements.	
B. EXHIBIT CONTENT	Excellent 15 points	Good 12 points	Average 9 points	Fair 6 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Innovation Design	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.	

EXHIBIT CONTENT	Excellent 15 points	Good 12 points	Average 9 points	Fair 6 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
2. Innovation Impact / Relevance	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.	
3. Content / Information	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.	
C. EXHIBIT VISUALS	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Artistic Design	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.	
2. Creativity and Originality	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.	
3. Appearance / Organization	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 (95):</b>						

2 of 2

Judges: whole portfolio not required for SQE  
 : You Tube video link to describe activities  
 as per section B & C

Alabama  
 SQE Rubric

MRC PARTNERSHIP – Judge’s Rating Sheet

Section # \_\_\_\_\_ Division: \_\_\_\_\_ SS \_\_\_\_\_ PS/Collegiate  
 Competitor # \_\_\_\_\_ Judge's Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Portion of

Portfolio Uploaded Online\*: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
 \*If the materials are not uploaded, please note that applicable items on the rubric below cannot be judged.

A. Portfolio	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
<del>1. Title Page</del>	<del>Title page contains ALL requirements: Event Name, Team Member Names, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, State/Assoc</del>	<del>N/A</del>	<del>N/A</del>	<del>N/A</del>	<del>All requirements are not met or portfolio not submitted.</del>	<del></del>
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.	
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.	
<del>4. Description of the HOSA/MRC partnership (items included)</del>	<del>The description features all three items: 1. Level of interactions 2. Quality of interactions 3. Quantity of interactions</del>	<del>NA</del>	<del>The description features 2 of 3 items</del>	<del>The description features 1 of 3 items.</del>	<del>No descriptions of the partnerships were provided OR Portfolio not submitted.</del>	<del></del>
	<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>
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.	
--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------	--

<b>A. Portfolio</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. A summary of partnership activities with a brief narrative. (Activities included)</b>	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 HOSA/MRC partnership features 1 of 3 descriptions.	No descriptions of the partnership activities were provided. OR Portfolio not submitted	
	<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>7. A summary of partnership activities with a brief narrative. (Quality of activities)</b>	The partnership activities documented in portfolio are excellent quality, scope, and value.	The partnership activities documented in portfolio are good quality, scope, and value.	The partnership activities documented in portfolio are average quality, scope, and value.	The partnership activities documented in portfolio are fair quality, scope, and value.	No summary of partnership activities is included OR Portfolio not submitted	
	<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>8. ALL PAGES of portfolio are neat, and error-free.</b>	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	
<b>9. ALL Narrative PAGES are formatted correctly.</b>	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).	NA	NA	NA	All requirements are not met OR portfolio not submitted.	
<b>10. Max Pages (no pages above 16 will be judged)</b>	Pages do not exceed 16 total.	NA	NA	NA	Portfolio exceeds maximum page limit OR portfolio not submitted.	
	<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>B. HOSA/MRC Partnership Overall Content</b>						
<b>1. Cooperative work with MRC to reach goals of activities</b>	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.	

Not for SQE

<b>2. Description and Understanding of the MRC Mission</b>	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>B. HOSA/MRC Partnership Overall Content</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. Impact on the local community</b>	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.	
<b>4. Impact on the HOSA chapter</b>	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	
<b>5. Imagination &amp; creativity of the activities</b>	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	
<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 point</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.	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.	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-	Delivery helps to enhance message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. Minimal vocal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-	Delivery adequate. Enunciation and pronunciation suitable. Noticeable verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present.	Delivery quality minimal. Regular verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Delivery problems cause	Many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or	

	knows"). Tone heightened interest and complemented the verbal message.	knows"). Tone complemented the verbal message	Tone seemed inconsistent at times.	disruption to message.	inappropriate variation of vocal 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 point</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>4. 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	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.	One person dominated the project.	
<del><b>5. Answered judge questions effectively</b></del>	<del>The team provided excellent answers to judge's questions, shared important details and maintained a high level of professionalism and poise throughout the presentation.</del>	<del>The team answered the judge's questions accurately and provided some important details about the MRC and their chapter's partnership.</del>	<del>The team was able to answer most of the questions effectively, could have provided more details regarding the MRC and/or their chapter's partnership.</del>	<del>The team answered some of the questions but failed to expound on the details of the MRC and/or their chapter's partnership.</del>	<del>The team had trouble answering the judge's questions. More evidence is needed to demonstrate a basic understanding of the MRC and/or their chapter's partnership.</del>	
<b>Total Points (145):</b>						
<b>(80)</b>						

Not for SQE

Judges: The uploaded video will be a 2min shortened version of the event speech. Should allow you to score ALL of the rubric main points.

Alabama  
SQE  
Rubric

PREPARED SPEAKING – Judge’s Rating Sheet

Section # \_\_\_\_\_  
Competitor # \_\_\_\_\_

Division: \_\_\_MS\_\_\_SS\_\_\_PS/Collegiate  
Judge’s Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Unlock Your Potential

A. Content	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Appropriate to the Conference Theme	The conference theme is clearly revealed and well-structured into speech.	The conference theme is stated and appropriate for speech.	The conference theme is apparent and not fully threaded into speech.	The conference theme is not clearly communicated throughout speech.	No statement of conference theme in speech.	
2. Coverage of Topic	Demonstrates command of the topic throughout the speech. Discusses the topic and its significance. Uses the topic as a path for the speech. Student offers explanations and insights that enhance the understanding of the topic.	Mentions topic and its significance. Uses the topic as a path for the speech. Student offers explanations and insights that link back to the topic.	Mentions topic and briefly explains its significance.	Briefly mentions a topic but does not provide any analysis or reasoning behind the topic.	Did not include much in the way of content or a topic.	
3. Clear focus and point of view	Speech was focused and compelling to the audience.	Speech is somewhat compelling; the audience might need stronger evidence in order to gain their support.	Speech evidence was weak, there were a few moments when the audience was compelled to the points being made.	While evidence is provided to prove the main points, the evidence is not compelling and leaves the audience unengaged.	Speech lacked focus and provided no compelling evidence.	
4. Impact Strong and meaningful message	Effectively appeals to audience emotions (anger, fear, compassion, humor etc.) to deliver the message of the speech. Vivid and emotive language effectively used to create imagery to engage audience emotionally.	Appeals to audience emotions (anger, fear, compassion, humor etc.) to achieve the goal. Creates some effective imagery through language.	While much of the speech was emotionless and a bit dry there were a few moments in which the author succeeded in engaging the audience emotionally.	Few attempts were made to connect to emotional appeals, the speech is dry and lacks emotion to support the message.	No attempt was made to focus the audience on the message through emotional appeals. Fails to appeal to audience emotions. No attempt to use vivid or descriptive language to capture audience emotions	
B. Organization	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Opening Statement	The competitor clearly establishes the occasion and purpose of the speech, grabs the audience's attention and makes the audience want to listen.	The competitor introduced the speech adequately, including an attention getter and established the occasion and purpose of the speech.	The competitor introduced the topic but did not clearly establish the occasion and/or purpose of the speech. Weak attention getter.	The competitor failed to introduce the speech. Or, the introduction was not useful in indicating what the speech was about.	The competitor did not provide an opening statement.	
2. Cohesion of Body of Speech	Logical, coherent organization helped convey the competitor's message clearly. It was easy to follow and understand. Transitions were appropriate to speech and helped audience follow along.	The competitor used a logical order to deliver the message but may have minor lapses in organization. Transitions were appropriate to speech but were not as helpful to audience understanding.	The competitor attempted to use an organizational pattern, but it was not always effective. Competitor rambled at times and/or did not stay on topic.	The competitor was difficult to follow due to a lack of organization and rambling. Some cohesion was demonstrated in the delivery.	The speech was not organized, and audience was not able to follow the message.	

<b>B. Organization</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. Closing</b>	The competitor prepares the audience for ending and ends memorably. They drew the speech to a close with an effective memorable statement. The competitor's message was clear.	The competitor adequately concluded the speech and ended the speech with a closing statement. Clear ending but ends with little impact.	The competitor concluded the speech in a disorganized fashion and/or did not have a closing statement. Competitor's message could have been clearer.	Audience has no idea conclusion is coming. Competitor's message was unclear.	The competitor ended the speech abruptly without an effective conclusion.  Competitor had no message.	
<b>C. DELIVERY</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. Voice</b> Pitch, tempo, volume, quality	The competitor's voice was loud enough to hear. The competitor varied rate & volume to enhance the speech. Appropriate pausing was employed.	The competitor spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The competitor varied rate OR volume to enhance the speech. Pauses were attempted.	The competitor could be heard most of the time. The competitor attempted to use some variety in vocal quality, but not always successfully.	The competitor's voice is 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.	
<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 competitor 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.	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 presentation.	
<b>C. DELIVERY</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. 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.	Many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal message.	
<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

2 of 2



**PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENT  
Judge's Rating Sheet**

Competitor # \_\_\_\_\_ Judge's Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
 Team # \_\_\_\_\_ Division: SS \_\_\_\_\_ PS/C \_\_\_\_\_

required

not for SQE

One PDF file with Reference Page, ~~Air Date Form~~, and Copyright Form Uploaded Online\*:  
 Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_  
 Link to the PSA 30 second video: YES \_\_\_ NO \_\_\_  
 \*If the materials are not uploaded, please note that applicable items on the rubric below cannot be judged.

A. Overview	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Length	PSA is no longer than 30 seconds (not counting optional pure black lead in beginning and end of PSA).	N/A	N/A	N/A	PSA is longer than 30 seconds OR not submitted.	
2. <del>Air Date Form</del>	<del>Air Date Form is submitted.</del>	N/A	N/A	N/A	Air Date Form is not submitted.	
3. Copyright Form	Copyright Form is submitted.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Copyright form not submitted.	
4. Reference Page	Reference page is submitted.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Reference page not submitted.	
B. PSA TECHNICAL QUALITY	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Exposure/Focus/ Color	Quality of exposure was excellent; the images are sharp, in focus and the lighting is highly effective to accurately tell the story.	The quality of the exposure/focus was good, although a few shots were blurry or did not come across clearly.	The quality of the exposure was average, the lighting was good and most of the images came across clearly.	The quality of the exposure was basic, several images were blurry, or lighting was either too bright or too dark.	PSA not submitted OR The quality of the exposure is poor. The PSA is often out of focus or the lighting makes the images hard to see.	
2. Audio	Effective & balanced approach to sound throughout the PSA. Excellent judgement and appropriate use of silence and music / audio to capture the message of the PSA.	The audio balance between background music and speaking parts was effective. Good judgement and appropriate use of silence and music / audio to capture the message of the PSA.	Average use of background music, silence and speaking parts were used to shape the message of the PSA. The audio didn't stand out one way or another or impact the overall message.	Audio levels were too loud or too soft, or picked up a great deal of background noise which made it difficult for the viewer to hear.	PSA not submitted OR The PSA included too much background noise and the message is not able to be understood due to poor quality of the audio.	
3. Editing / clean transitions / synchronization***	Excellent use of video effects; editing and transitions are clear and there is high quality synchronization between the sound and video content.	Editing between scenes is strong, good transitions from scene to scene.	The editing and transitions between slides is average.	The editing was clunky. Inappropriate transitions between scenes.	PSA not submitted OR The scenes have too much movement causing distraction from the message. The editing and transitions between scenes is poor.	

NOT FOR SQE

<b>B. PSA TECHNICAL QUALITY</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>4. Camera Technique / Composition</b>	Excellent use of capturing the composition of movement and angles to make the story come to life. Advanced ability & unique perspective to allow the film to tell the story.	Camera technique is good and the composition of scenes tell a story. Angles and movement could be captured in a way to make the story come to life better.	The camera technique is of average skill and the composition does not stand out to the viewer.	Some evidence of thoughtful camera technique but captured intermittently throughout the PSA. Most scenes were filmed at a basic level.	PSA not submitted OR The camera technique was basic, front facing shots with no evidence of intentional composition of the angles of the camera technique.	
<b>C. PSA CONTENT</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. Effectiveness</b>	The message of the PSA did an extraordinary job at captivating the attention of the audience and activating a clear message that evokes emotion. It translates an important message. PSA aligns to annual topic of HOSA Making A Difference.	The message of the PSA did a good job capturing the attention of the audience. The message stood out and evoked emotion. The PSA was interesting and thoughtful.	The message and content captured the attention of the audience. More could have been done to evoke emotion and share the content theme.	The effectiveness of the message needed more attention to detail. The PSA could have done a better job at connecting to the audience and delivering the overall message.	PSA not submitted OR The message of the PSA was not effective. It did not capture the attention of the audience or deliver a critical message. The content did not evoke emotion or relay important information.	
<b>2. Impact</b>	The message is highly impactful for the target market and encourages a "call to action" in a positive manner.	The message is good but could have a more specific impact to the target market and could inspire behavior change slightly more effectively.	The message of the PSA was educational but did not impact the audience to action.	The impact of the message was not communicated clearly. The PSA did not inspire the audience to action.	PSA not submitted OR The PSA was not impactful and did not encourage positive behavior or elicit any emotion by the viewer.	
<b>3. Creativity and Originality</b>	The PSA is extremely creative, clever and original. Excellent!	The PSA is good. Creative messaging and original content were displayed.	The PSA provided an average amount of creativity and originality.	The creativity in the PSA was basic. Little originality was included.	PSA not submitted OR No original thoughts or creative concepts were used in this PSA.	
<b>4. PSA leaves judges wanting to know more</b>	When are you filming your next PSA? The judge is waiting on the edge of their seat to see your next work!	Great job! The judge wants to watch your next PSA.	Judge liked this PSA but may or may not be interested in seeing more.	This PSA was okay, but judge probably won't go looking for any more.	PSA not submitted OR Judge has seen enough.	
<b>C. PSA 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. Realistic visual imagery provided</b>	Visual imagery was believable and realistic, and enhanced the message being portrayed.	Most of the imagery was realistic and believable.	An average amount of realistic imagery was provided.	A fair amount of realistic visual imagery was provided.	PSA not submitted OR The visual imagery was not realistic.	

2 of 4

<b>C. PSA 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. Talent</b>	Actors were extremely talented and delivered a message that was believable and realistic. Professional-level quality of talent was delivered.	The actors did a good job delivering a message that was believable and realistic.	The talent in regard to the actors was average. The material seemed forced.	The actors could have used more rehearsing to create a more believable product.	PSA not submitted OR The actors were not believable in delivering their message. Much more effort needed.	
<b>7. Writing</b>	The word choices and placement on screen were of high quality and enhanced the message. No spelling/ grammatical errors.	The PSA did a good job highlighting the written words to emphasize the message. Few, if any, spelling/ grammatical errors.	The words written in the PSA were mostly clear (small lettering, too many words, text hard to read, etc). More accuracy would have enhanced the message.	The writing displayed in the PSA was of fair quality. More focus and accuracy needed. Spelling/ grammatical errors were distracting.	PSA not submitted OR The PSA writing was not appropriate or accurate in the project delivery.	
<b>D. PRESENTATION CONTENT</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. Creative process</b>	Exceptional description of the team's creative process outlining how they came up with their idea and how they developed the PSA.	Above average description of the team's creative process outlining how they came up with their idea and how they developed the PSA.	The description of the creation of the PSA was moderate and somewhat described the creative process.	The description of the creation of the PSA was only fairly effective and only briefly described the creative process.	The team was unable to effectively describe their journey of creating the PSA.	
<b>2. Public use of the PSA</b>	The team incorporated a thoughtful implementation strategy to showcase their PSA to a public audience. The team is able to describe their process to make this happen and the impact/response of the audience reaction.	The PSA was disseminated to a public audience and the team was able to share the impact of the public viewing.	The team adequately described the process of how the public viewed their work.	The team did not think through how they would launch their PSA to a public audience. The public use came across to the judges as an after-thought.	No mention of the public use of PSA was offered during the presentation.	
<b>3. Public Response</b>	Excellent description on how the PSA will change the public's opinion, action, or feelings on the topic. A strong emotional connection was present.	The competitors did a good job describing how the PSA will change the public's opinion, actions, or feelings. An emotional connection was attempted.	The team made a good attempt at describing how the PSA will change the public's opinion, actions or feelings, but fell short.	Team members vaguely described how the PSA will change the public's opinion, actions and feelings.	No mention of how the PSA will change the opinion of the public's thoughts, actions or opinions.	

*Not for SOE*

*3 of 4*

D. PRESENTATION CONTENT	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
4. Understanding of the subject/ theme and purpose of the PSA.	It is evident that this team has a clear understanding of the subject/theme and purpose of the PSA. Excellent Presentation.	Through most of the presentation, the team was able to demonstrate the purpose of the PSA. Good presentation.	Occasionally the team members were able to demonstrate a clear understanding of the subject, theme and purpose of the PSA.	The team did not demonstrate a clear understanding of the subject, theme and purpose of the PSA. More attention to detail is needed.	No mention of the purpose of PSA, Team members appeared unclear as to subject/theme and purpose of PSA.	
E. 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.	
E. PRESENTATION DELIVERY	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
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.	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.	Many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal message.	
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.	One team member dominated the project.	
<b>Total Points (175):</b>						
(110)						

\*\*\*Synchronization- the operation or activity of two or more things at the same time or rate.

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

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

4 of 4

Judges- pdf of the research poster template is required

Alabama SQ E Rubric

**Research Poster  
Judge's Rating Sheet – Secondary Division  
Poster Only**

Section # \_\_\_\_\_  
Division: SS \_\_\_\_\_

Competitor Name & # \_\_\_\_\_  
Judge's Name \_\_\_\_\_

A. Overview	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
<b>1. Research Question</b>	The Research Question posed is health-related, specific, and reflects a deep understanding of an issue that needs addressing in the competitor's local community. It is evident the competitor was thorough in developing the question.	The Research Question is health-related but could benefit from being more specific and more action-oriented. There is some detail lacking to make it stand out.	The Research Question sufficiently addresses a health topic, but leaves the judges wanting more clarification or information to fully understand the question posed.	The Research Question is confusing, not fully thought out, and/or not a good representation of a health issue.	The Research Question is drastically lacking substance or is not included at all.	
B. Poster Content	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
<b>1. Title</b>	A title is included and the poster contains: competitor's name, Division, Chapter #, School Name, and State/Association.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Poster not submitted OR  Title is missing or all requirements are not met	
<b>2. References</b>	At least one reference is included on the poster.	NA	NA	NA	Poster not submitted OR  No references are included on the poster.	
<b>3. Acknowledgements</b>	At least one person or community organization is acknowledged on the poster.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Poster not submitted OR  No acknowledgements are made on the poster	
B. Poster Content	Excellent 15 points	Good 12 points	Average 8 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
<b>4. Abstract</b>	The Abstract does an excellent job summarizing the research. It clearly describes the purpose of the research, the overall methods, major findings, and a succinct summary of the conclusions. The abstract leaves the judges excited about learning more!	The Abstract included sufficient details to the purpose of the research, some of the methods, some findings, and is a good summary of the conclusions. The judges are curious about learning more.	The information provided in the Abstract to summarize the purpose, methods, findings, and conclusions is limited and/or some of these components are missing.	Some information was provided in the Abstract but was mostly surface-level and key points were missing.	Poster not submitted OR  The Abstract is missing or did not describe all key items.	

<b>B. Poster Content</b>	<b>Excellent 15 points</b>	<b>Good 12 points</b>	<b>Average 8 points</b>	<b>Fair 4 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>5. Methods</b>	The research methods are explicitly explained, including: 1) target population 2) how data was collected 3) how data was analyzed 4) how data was shared 5) A review of possible errors and biases is also included.	The research methods were explained. Some supporting points needed more detail, but all 5 items were covered.	Some of the research methods were explained but included only 4 of the 5 requirements.	The research methods explanation was limited and only included 2 or 3 of the 5 requirements.	Poster not submitted OR  The research methods were not explained or included and/or left the judges with more questions than answers.	
<b>6. Results</b>	The results of the research are presented and explained in a way that makes sense and can be easily understood. It is clear what was discovered and an additional explanation about why the results matter is included.	The results of the research are presented and explained but some questions remain. It is clear what was discovered but additional explanation about why the results matter is needed.	The results of the research are presented but the explanation is not clear. There seems to be important information that should have been included. Minimal explanation about why results matter.	The results of the research are limited and significant gaps are evident. No explanation of why the results matter.	Poster not submitted OR  The results of the research are not included and no description given of why they matter.	
<b>7. Conclusions</b>	The conclusion provides a short and solid justification of the research question, explains the relevance of findings to the community and/or world, and explains why the results are conclusive.	The conclusion is mostly concise and does a good job of summarizing the justification of the research question, the relevance of the results, and why they are conclusive. More information is needed.	The conclusion provides minimal justification of the research question. Questions remain as to how the results can be used or why the results are conclusive.	There is not a solid justification of the research question nor how results are relevant nor if they are conclusive.	Poster not submitted OR  The competitor failed to include conclusions or the conclusions drawn were out of scope.	
<b>8. Images</b>	2-5 images (graphs, tables, illustrations, photos, logos, etc.) are included. Images used add excellent value to the overall poster, complimenting the text, illustrating the findings, and reflecting key research. They stand out above others.	2-5 images are included and they do a good job of adding overall value to the poster and accurately representing the details of the research and process. They however, lack the special "wow factor"	2-5 images are included that adequately connect to the research. They do not enhance nor distract from the poster.	2-5 images are included but their connection to the research and process is only fair. They distract from the overall appeal of the poster and/or do not accurately reflect the research project.	Poster not submitted OR  0-1, or more than 5 images are included	
<b>C. Poster Design</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. Poster Size</b>	Poster is 48" x 36" landscape orientation	N/A	N/A	N/A	Poster not submitted OR  Poster is not 48" x 36" and/or landscape orientation	

not for SQE

C. Poster Design	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
2. Artistic Design	The artistic quality is exceptional. The design is vibrant, balanced, visually pleasing and pushes the boundaries of artistic expression. The design choices take the poster to the next level and has that "wow factor"	The artistic quality is good; the design stands out. The design elements seem to be well-thought out and comprehensive.	The poster incorporates balanced design choices, showcasing some artistic features. Some of the poster lacks artistic details that took away from the overall visual of the poster.	Basic levels of artistic design are incorporated into the poster. Better design/color choices should be incorporated to assure the design of the poster is pleasing to the eye.	Poster not submitted OR  The design is simplistic and not visually appealing.	
C. Poster Design	Excellent 15 points	Good 12 points	Average 8 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
3. Appearance / Organization	The poster is exceptionally neat, organized, and error-free. Information is clearly displayed and easy to understand and follow. Content is strategically placed to enhance the research and the poster can easily be seen from 3 feet away.	Poster is neat and organized. The content has a logical flow with only minimal errors and does a good job enhancing the research process.	The poster was basic and could use more organization and thought to be understood.	The poster lacked organization and/or contained several spelling errors. The flow of information seemed to be out of order and it was difficult to read the poster from 3 feet away.	Poster not submitted OR  The poster is either too busy or lacks enough detail to support the content.	
<b>TOTAL POINTS (125)</b>						

TOTAL POINTS (125)
   
 ↳ (125)
   
 3 of 3





Judges: Competitors should submit a you-tube link with a video of their presentation. (no more than 4 minutes)

Alabama SQE Rubric

**PUBLIC HEATH – Judge’s Rating Sheet  
Round 1**

Section # \_\_\_\_\_ Level: \_\_\_\_\_ MS \_\_\_\_\_ SS \_\_\_\_\_ PS/Collegiate  
Team #: \_\_\_\_\_ Judge’s Signature \_\_\_\_\_

*Reducing Health Disparities: Social Determinants of Health Can Help*

A. Presentation Content	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Community Presentation Confirmed	Community presentation date and audience stated for judges prior to presentation.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Community presentation not confirmed.	
2. Understanding of issue/topic	The Public Health issue/topic is clearly defined and streamlined into the presentation. The team shared the complexity of the public health issue.	The public health issue/topic is stated and appropriate for the presentation. Understanding of the issue or topic is lacking small details.	The understanding of the public health issue/topic is average and not fully threaded into the presentation.	The public health issue/topic is not clearly communicated throughout the presentation.	No evidence of understanding of the public health issue or topic.	
3. Importance of information presented	The interpretation of the topic/issue was presented in a highly-effective and compelling manner that reinforced the information gathered on this year’s topic.	The interpretation of this year’s topic/issue was well-received by the audience.	The information presented was done in a way that somewhat connected to this year’s topic/theme.	The information presented provided a slight connection to this year’s topic/theme.	Information was not presented in a way that made sense to the audience or did not cover this year’s topic.	
4. Flow and logic of content	The team demonstrated command of the topic throughout the presentation, it flows in a logical, clear and informed manner. Excellent transitions between competitors.	The team mentions the topic and its significance. The flow is mostly smooth and provides an informed approach to the material. Proficient transitions between competitors.	The flow of the content is somewhat choppy and disjointed.	The flow of the content is out of order and does not make sense.	There is no evidence of flow or logic behind the presented content.	
5. Engagement	The team actively engaged the audience with a well-practiced and delivered opening and maintained the attention of the audience throughout the presentation.	The team used techniques to attempt to retain the interest of the audience.	The team attempted to engage audience interest, but the effort was incomplete, disorganized, or was negated by poor delivery.	The team did not use any techniques to engage audience interest, or the attempt was made in an incoherent and disorganized fashion	The team did not capture the attention of the audience.	
	<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>
6. Effectiveness/ Impact Was the presentation convincing? Do the judges want to see the team’s full community presentation?	The presentation was extremely effective and convincing. Judges absolutely want to see the team’s full community presentation.	The presentation was effective and appealing to judges. They are interested in seeing the team’s full presentation.	The presentation was somewhat effective and appealing. The judges might be interested in seeing the full presentation, but are having a hard time making up their mind.	Some of the presentation lacked effectiveness and did not leave a strong impact on the audience/ judges.	The judges do not want to see the full community presentation.	

B. Presentation Delivery	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 point	JUDGE SCORE
<p><b>1. Voice</b> Pitch, tempo, volume, quality</p> <p><b>2. Stage Presence</b> Poise, posture, eye contact, and enthusiasm</p> <p><b>3. Diction*, Pronunciation** and Grammar</b></p> <p><b>4. Team Participation</b></p>	<p>Each competitor's voice was loud enough to hear. The competitors varied rate &amp; volume to enhance the speech. Appropriate pausing was employed.</p> <p>Movements &amp; 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Excellent example of shared collaboration in the presentation of the project. Each team member spoke and carried equal parts of the project presentation.</p>	<p>Each competitor spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The competitors varied rate OR volume to enhance the speech. Pauses were attempted.</p> <p>The competitor 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.</p> <p>Delivery helps to enhance message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. Minimal vocal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone complemented the verbal message</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>Each competitor could be heard most of the time. The competitors attempted to use some variety in vocal quality, but not always successfully.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Delivery adequate. Enunciation and pronunciation suitable. Noticeable verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Tone seemed inconsistent at times.</p> <p>The team worked together relatively well. Some team members spoke more than others</p>	<p>Most of the competitor's voices were low. Judges have difficulty hearing the presentation.</p> <p>The competitor's posture, body language, and facial expressions indicated a lack of enthusiasm for the topic. Movements were distracting.</p> <p>Delivery quality minimal. Regular verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Delivery problems cause disruption to message.</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>Judge had difficulty hearing and/or understanding much of the speech due to low volume. Little variety in rate or volume.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal message.</p> <p>One team member dominated the presentation.</p>	
<b>Total Points (85):</b>						

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

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

2 of 2

Judges: 2 minute Maximum YouTube link video  
 Showcasing the innovation  
 - includes measurements  
 - explains innovation

Alabama  
 SQE  
 Rubric

**EXPLORING MEDICAL INNOVATION  
 Judge's Rating Sheet**

Section # \_\_\_\_\_  
 Team # \_\_\_\_\_

Judge's Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
 Division: MIDDLE SCHOOL ONLY

One PDF file containing Reference Page and 1-3 photos of the Display Uploaded Online\*:  
 Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_  
 \*If the materials are not uploaded, please note that applicable items on the rubric below cannot be judged.

A. Exploring Medical Innovation						
A. Overview	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Display Requirement	Visual display is no more than 48" wide x 24" deep, safely stands on the table, and poses no hazard.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Visual display does not meet stated requirements.	
<del>B. DISPLAY &amp; PRESENTATION CONTENT</del>						
<del>1. Balance of Information between Display and Presentation</del>	<del>The content placed between the display and presentation was balanced and effective. Anyone viewing the display materials would be able to have a general idea of the medical innovation without having someone there to speak about it. The content shared in the presentation added value to the overall project. Overall, there was excellent balance between information shared in the display and information shared in the presentation.</del>	<del>Overall, the balance was good and effective between information shared in the display and information shared in the presentation.</del>	<del>Overall, the balance seemed okay between information shared in the display and information shared in the presentation, but judges were left with a few questions unanswered in either the display or presentation.</del>	<del>There was a somewhat imbalance of information shared. Either the display or the presentation had more content than the other, which made it difficult to follow the overall project.</del>	<del>There was a clear imbalance of information shared. Either the display or the presentation had the majority of the content, which made for an ineffective overall project.</del>	
		<b>Not for SQE</b>				
<del>B. DISPLAY &amp; PRESENTATION CONTENT</del>						
<del>2. Description of Innovation</del>	<del>The team provides an excellent description of the innovation, what it does and how it is used. The judges can clearly visualize what it is.</del>	<del>The team provides a good description of what the innovation is, what it does, and how it is used. The judge has a few unanswered questions.</del>	<del>The team provides an average description of what the innovation is, what it does, and how it is used, but the judge is left with many unanswered questions.</del>	<del>The description of the innovation does not describe what it is, does or how it is used.</del>	<del>No description of the innovation was provided.</del>	
			<b>Not for SQE</b>			

<b>B. DISPLAY &amp; 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>3. Impact on Healthcare</b>	The team provides a detailed and relevant description for how the medical innovation has or will change/impact healthcare.	The team provides good detail for how the medical innovation has or will change/impact healthcare.	An average description for how the future of healthcare will be/has been impacted by this innovation.	Little detail was provided on how the innovation has or will change/impact healthcare.	No description was provided on how the innovation will change/impact healthcare.	
<b>4. Why this Innovation?</b>	Compelling examples of why the team chose this medical innovation were given. Relevant and engaging stories were shared that brought the presentation to life and made it clear to the judges why this was the innovation chosen by the team.	The team provided engaging examples of why they chose the medical innovation. Stories were shared to add a personal touch why the medical innovation was selected, but the wow-factor was missing.	The team told the story for why they chose their medical innovation but were unable to provide relevant examples to bring the story to life.	The team attempted to tell a story of the significance of choosing their medical innovation, but the relevance of the story fell short of expectation.	The team was unable to connect the story for why they chose their medical innovation.	
<b>5. History of the Innovation</b>	Extensive history of the creation of the innovation was provided and included rich details about its creator(s) and how it was discovered.	A history on the creation of the innovation was provided, along with a description of who created it and how it was discovered.	A brief history was provided on the creation of the innovation. Some details about the creator(s) and background of discovery was provided.	Little history was provided about the history of the innovation, who created it or how it was discovered.	No history or details of how this innovation was founded were provided.	
<b>6. Benefits &amp; Challenges</b>	Benefits and challenges associated with the innovation were highlighted in extensive detail by the team.	Benefits and challenges were shared by the team.	Benefits and challenges associated with the innovation were shared but did not go into great depth.	Benefits and challenges associated with the innovation were briefly mentioned.	No mention of the benefits or challenges of the innovation were included.	
<b>7. 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	No relevant information was shared about the cost of the innovation.	
<b>8. 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.	No information was shared about the career implications of this innovation.	

C. Display	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Artistic Design	The artistic quality is exceptional. The artwork is vibrant, balanced, visually pleasing and pushes the boundaries of artistic expression. The design choices take the display 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 display incorporates balanced design choices, showcasing some artistic features. Some of the design lacks artistic details that took away from the overall visual of the display.	Basic levels of artistic design are incorporated into the display. Better design/color choices should be incorporated to assure the artwork on the display is pleasing to the eye,	Display photos not submitted OR The design is simplistic and not visually appealing.	
2. Creativity / Originality	The display incorporates creativity and innovation that make it unique. The display has the "wow-factor" and stands out in the room above all others.	The display is innovative and creative. It offers something unique but is missing the wow-factor.	The display has moderate levels of creativity and originality.	Basic elements of creativity and innovation were captured in this health career display. It blends in with the other competitors.	Display photos not submitted OR Little creativity or originality was captured in the display. More effort needed.	
3. Appearance / Organization	The display is exceptionally neat, organized, and error-free. Information is clearly displayed and easy to understand and follow.	Display is neat and organized. The content has a logical flow with only minimal errors.	The display was basic and could use more organization and thought to be understood. .	The display lacked organization and/or contained several spelling errors. The flow of information seemed to be out of order.	Display photos not submitted OR The display is either too busy or lacks enough detail to support the content.	
4. Reference Page	Reference page is included and contains Event name, Competitor/Team Member Names, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, State/Assoc, & Chosen Innovation	N/A	N/A	N/A	Reference page is not included OR reference page does not include all requirements.	
Q. 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	The competitor's voice was loud enough to hear. The competitor varied rate & volume to enhance the speech. Appropriate pausing was employed.	The competitor spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The competitor varied rate OR volume to enhance the speech. Pauses were attempted.	The competitor could be heard most of the time. The competitor attempted to use some variety in vocal quality, but not always successfully.	The competitor's voice is 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.	
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&enthusiasm for the topic.	The competitor 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.	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 presentation.	

D. 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 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.	Many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal message.	
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.	One team member dominated the presentation.	
5. Display Incorporated into Presentation	The display enhanced the messaging of the innovation and helped bring the presentation to life.	The display helped tell the story of the innovation. It complemented the presentation effectively.	The team did an adequate job of using the display to support the presentation.	The display somewhat enhanced the presentation on the innovation yet seemed to miss key points of emphasis.	The display seemed to be an "afterthought" to the presentation. There was a disconnect between what was featured on the display and the presentation.	
6. Answered judge questions effectively.	The team provided excellent answers to judge's questions, shared important details and maintained a high level of professionalism and poise throughout the presentation.	The team answered the judge's questions accurately and provided some important details about the medical innovation.	The team was able to answer most of the questions effectively, could have provided more details regarding the innovation process.	The team answered some of the questions but failed to expound on the details of the medical innovation.	The team had trouble answering the judge's questions. More evidence is needed to demonstrate a basic understanding of the medical innovation.	
<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

(50)

4 of 4

- completed on letter sized copy paper
- 60 min allowed time
- uploaded creation to wufoo link

Alabama  
SQE  
Rubric

**EXTEMPORANEOUS HEALTH POSTER – Judge’s Rating Sheet**

Section # \_\_\_\_\_ Division: MIDDLE SCHOOL ONLY  
 Competitor # \_\_\_\_\_ Judge’s Signature \_\_\_\_\_

	Excellent 20 points	Good 15 points	Average 10 points	Fair 5 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
<b>A. Eye-catching / stands out in a crowd</b>	The poster stands out from the other competitors and draws in the audience to want to learn more. It is unique, grabs your attention. You are intrigued and want to look more closely.	The poster is visually pleasing and eye-catching. The audience is intrigued and wants to know more.	Some aspects of the poster stand out. It is neat but lacks originality.	The poster does not stand out from the other submissions. It uses basic design principles.	The poster does not catch the viewer's eye and is not appealing.	
<b>B. Contains a clear message on topic</b>	The message of the poster covers this year's topic and is captured in a very clear and concise manner. Many relevant items from the supporting material in the secret topic are included	The message of the poster covers this year's topic and is mostly clear and concise. Some relevant items from the supporting material of the secret topic are included.	The poster's message relates to the secret topic but lacks the supporting details and is not especially clear.	The message is off topic and lacks clarity. Minimal supporting materials are referenced from the secret topic.	The message is off topic. The competitor missed the objective when demonstrating this topic.	
<b>C. Impact the poster leaves on the audience</b>	The poster leaves an impact on the audience, they learn something, are informed or called to action by viewing the poster. A sense of urgency to take action is felt by the audience.	The poster is informational and sends a message. The audience may be inspired to be "called to action" from viewing the poster	Some impact is felt by the audience after viewing this poster.	Minimal impact is made by the audience viewing the poster.	No impact or call to action is felt by the audience after viewing the poster.	
<b>D. Artistic Value / Artistic Skill</b>	The poster is aesthetically pleasing, displays great use of color, texture, shapes and spacing. Artwork demonstrates the competitor has exceptional talent to express ideas through art. The coloring and lettering were captured in a unique way and built the design into the theme.	Lots of color variation, shapes, and appealing design. Shows the competitor spent time creating an artistic piece. Color and lettering were used effectively within the poster.	The poster is moderately appealing. There are a few different mediums showcased on the poster. The use of color and lettering was mostly effective on the poster design. Would like to see more variation.	The poster does not appeal to the audience in a significant way. Limited use of creative materials. Minimal color/ shapes/ design. The artist used very little color variation on the poster. The message is lost in the basic design or choice of font.	Artistic skill lacks execution and overall aesthetics. Appearance is messy, lacks color and texture, and/or effort.	
<b>E. Overall appearance, neat and attractive.</b>	Not only is the artwork original, the design is high quality, unique and the ability to connect to the topic is creative. The competitor added information above what was required from the event criteria.	The poster is attractive and looks professional. The design connects to the topic and includes relevant information.	The poster includes mostly relevant information and generally neat in appearance.  Attention to detail may reduce overall score.	The poster needs more attention to detail. It looks as if it was prepared in a rush.	The poster is not formulated clearly, the content is hard to understand. A lack of effort was put into this poster.	
	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
<b>F. Spelling &amp; Punctuation</b>	Writing is neat and professional. Zero (0) errors in spelling and punctuation were found on this poster.	Writing is legible. 1-2 errors in spelling or punctuation were found on this poster.	Writing is somewhat legible. 3-4 errors in spelling or punctuation on this poster.	Writing is illegible. 5 errors in spelling or punctuation were found on this poster.	Writing is missing or illegible. More than 5 errors in spelling or punctuation were documented on this poster.	

Total Points (110)





Judges: YouTube video (2 min or less)  
 - should not contain verbal comments  
 - should allow for rubric to be scored

Alabama  
 SQE  
 Rubric

HEALTH CAREER DISPLAY MIDDLE SCHOOL  
 Judge's Rating Sheet

Section # \_\_\_\_\_ Judge's Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
 Team # \_\_\_\_\_ Division: Middle School Only

One PDF file with Reference Page and 1-3 photos Uploaded Online\*:  
 Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

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

required →

Items Evaluated						JUDGE SCORE
A. Overview	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. No Power	Power is NOT used (electric, batter, etc...).	N/A	N/A	N/A	Display not submitted OR power was used.	
2. Health Related Career	Display reflects a health career or a cluster of related health careers.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Display not submitted OR does not reflect a health career or a cluster of related health careers.	
3. Safety	Display/ equipment is safe and poses no hazards.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Display not submitted OR equipment presents safety/hazard concern.	
4. Reference Page	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 Profession	N/A	N/A	N/A	Reference page is not included OR all requirements are not met.	
5. Display Setup	Display is no more than 36" high x 48" wide and 24" deep, with board made of foam or corrugated cardboard.	N/A	N/A	N/A	All requirements are not met.	
A. Overview	Excellent 20 points	Good 16 points	Average 12 points	Fair 8 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
5. Career Overview	Display provides an exceptional representation of the researched career / career cluster. Information is accurate, current, and presented in a logical manner.	The content of the display is mostly clear, ideas are sequenced in a logical manner. The display provides information that describes the career / career cluster.	The information on the display is somewhat vague and does not clearly define the career/cluster.	The sequencing of ideas throughout the display is unclear. The display includes little information with limited data to support the career or career cluster.	Display not submitted OR information on the display is unclear and does not provide understanding of the career or career cluster.	

1 of 4

<b>B. Career Information Includes:</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. Job responsibilities</b>	Detailed information on the job responsibilities is given along with an excellent description of five or more tasks specific to the health career.	Job responsibilities were provided. Good information on the job description were given with four specific tasks described.	A description of the job was provided. Three specific tasks were described.	A brief mention of the job responsibilities was given, and only one to two specific tasks were described.	Display not submitted OR no mention of job responsibilities or tasks associated with the job were provided.	
<b>2. Education requirements</b>	Detailed and thorough description of the educational requirements with information on any degrees with courses, certificates, licenses, or other special requirements. Estimated time required to complete requirement is also given.	There is a description of the educational requirements. It provides information on any degrees, certificates, licenses, or other special requirements.	There is a short description of the educational requirements.	There is an incomplete description of the educational requirements.	Display not submitted OR there is no description of the educational requirements.	
<b>3. Entry level salary at the local/ national/ global level</b>	A detailed and accurate description of the salary and wage information for this career is provided at the local, national and global levels. The team provides the yearly, monthly, and hourly rate for this position. Opportunities for advancement and future earnings are provided.	Salary at the local/ national/ global level is provided in the display along with a brief summary of the wage details.	A description of the salary range for this career is provided without specific details.	There is a vague description of the salary range for this career/cluster.	Display not submitted OR there is no description of the salary range for this career.	
<b>4. Benefits/ challenges associated with this career</b>	The display effectively highlights five or more benefits and challenges associated with this career.	The display shares highlights of four benefits or challenges commonly associated with this career.	The display describes three benefits or challenges with the career/ cluster.	The display mentions one or two benefits or challenges of the specific career or career cluster.	Display not submitted OR there was no mention of benefits or challenges with the career.	
<b>5. Additional relevant career information</b> Can discuss details/traits including (but not limited to): Career environment, technological needs, work schedule, personal characteristics, etc).	The display features five or more additional relevant details associated with the career/ career cluster.	The display features four additional details related to the career or career cluster.	The display features three additional details relevant to the career.	The display shares two additional details about the career.	Display not submitted OR no additional information on the career/career cluster was provided.	
<b>C. Display Visuals</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. 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 display 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 display incorporates balanced design choices, showcasing some artistic features. Some of the design lacks artistic details that took away from the overall visual of the display.	Basic levels of artistic design are incorporated into the display. Better design/color choices should be incorporated to assure the artwork on the display is pleasing to the eye,	Display not submitted OR the design is simplistic and not visually appealing.	

	<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>2. Creativity and Originality</b>	The display incorporates creativity and innovation that make it unique. The display has the "wow-factor" and stands out in the room above all others.	The display is innovative and creative. It offers something unique but is missing the wow-factor.	The display has moderate levels of creativity and originality.	Basic elements of creativity and innovation were captured in this health career display. It blends in with the other competitors.	Display not submitted OR little creativity or originality was captured in the display of this health care display. More effort needed	
<b>3. Appearance / Organization</b>	The display is exceptionally neat, organized, and error-free. Information is clearly displayed and easy to understand and follow.	Display is neat and organized. The content has a logical flow with only minimal errors.	The display was basic and could use more organization and thought to be understood. .	The display lacked organization and/or contained several spelling errors. The flow of information seemed to be out of order.	Display not submitted OR the display is either too busy or lacks enough detail to support the content.	
<b>D. Presentation 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. Understanding of the Career</b>	The presenters shared exceptional insight and depth of knowledge on the career or career cluster.	The presenters shared knowledge and understanding of the career or career cluster.	The presenters demonstrated some command of the knowledge of the career/ career cluster.	The presenters shared knowledge of the career/ career cluster but failed to effectively teach the judges.	The presenters shared little to no knowledge of the career/ career cluster. The judges were left with more questions than answers.	
<b>2. Why This Career?</b>	Compelling examples of the significance of the presenter's choice of career field. Relevant, engaging stories were shared that brought the presentation to life.	The team shared engaging examples of why they selected their career field. Stories were shared to add a personal touch to the career selection.	The team told the story for why they chose their career field but were unable to provide relevant examples to bring the story to life.	The team attempted to tell a story of the significance of choosing their career field, but the story was irrelevant to the career field.	The team was unable to connect a story for why they chose their career field of interest.	
<b>3. Presentation of Career Information</b>	The presentation of the career information was exceptionally organized, clear, and included relevant details to highlight the career/ career cluster.	The content and messaging of the career information were presented in a clear and concise manner.	Information shared by presenters was mostly organized and included few details of the career/ career cluster.	Presenters shared little knowledge of the career field, and the information shared was not delivered in a clear and concise manner.	Little to no information was presented to the judges on the career information.	
	<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. Display Incorporated into Presentation</b>	The display enhanced the messaging of the career/ career cluster and helped bring the presentation to life.	The display helped tell the story of the career/ career cluster. It complemented the presentation effectively.	The team did an adequate job of using the display to support the presentation.	The display somewhat enhanced the presentation on the career/ career cluster yet seemed to miss key points of emphasis.	The display seemed to be an "afterthought" to the presentation. There was a disconnect between what was featured on the display and the presentation.	
<b>5. How the Career Fits into the Healthcare System</b>	The team effectively presented the relevance of how the career aligns to the healthcare system and the outlook for the career.	The team moderately highlighted the significance of how the career fits into the healthcare system.	The team shared how the career fits into the healthcare system but did not provide significant detail.	The team briefly mentioned how the career fits into the healthcare system.	The team did not share how the career fits into the healthcare system.	

<b>E. Presentation Delivery</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>
1. <b>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.	Judge had difficulty hearing and/or understanding much of the speech due to low volume. Little variety in rate or volume.	
2. <b>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.	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. <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.	Many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal message.	
	<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>
4. <b>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	N/A	The team did not work effectively together.	One team member dominated the project.	
<b>Total Points (195):</b>						

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

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

(105)

4 of 4