

# Medical Reserve Corps

## 2023-2024 MICHIGAN HOSA EVENT MODIFICATIONS FOR REGIONAL CONFERENCES!



### New for 2023 – 2024

Tallo has been replaced with the HOSA Digital Upload System. Judge questions have been removed to create consistency between all competitive events. A new link to ASPR has been added as a suggested resource. Additional links to help teams contact their local MRC Unit have been updated. These guidelines are written for ILC. States may modify events or have different event processes and deadlines. Be sure to check with your Local/State Advisor (or state website) to determine how the event is implemented for the regional/area or state conference. Editorial updates have been made. **These**

**guidelines are specifically for Michigan HOSA members in preparation for the regional leadership conferences. For more information about regionals, please visit**

**[www.michiganhosa.org/regionals](http://www.michiganhosa.org/regionals).**

### Event Summary

MRC Partnership provides members with the opportunity to gain knowledge and skills required to initiate and maintain a partnership with their local/state Medical Reserve Corps units. This competitive event is designed for students to demonstrate the spirit and mission of both the MRC and HOSA in joint partnership activities. Each team consists of 2 to 6 competitors and teams will prepare a portfolio highlighting partnership activities that improve public health, increase emergency response capabilities, and strengthen the resiliency of local communities. This event aims to inspire members to engage with the Medical Reserve Corps to learn more about community-based groups committed to strengthening public health. **The portfolio will be pre-judged digitally prior to the regional conference. Please submit your digital upload (instructions here: <https://hosa.org/competitive-event-digital-uploads/>) by the upload date listed on the website: [www.michiganhosa.org/regionals](http://www.michiganhosa.org/regionals).**

### Sponsorship

This competitive event is sponsored by the [Medical Reserve Corps](#)



### Dress Code

Competitors must be in official HOSA uniform or in proper business attire. ~~Bonus points will be awarded for proper dress.~~ **At the regional level, bonus points will not be added for proper dress, but judges/event managers will make note if competitors are NOT in proper dress which could result in overall point deduction.**

### Competitors Must Provide:

- [Photo ID](#)
- ONE team member uploads the portfolio to the HOSA Digital Upload System by May 15 for ILC competition (see advisor regarding SLC requirements and deadlines)
- Index cards or electronic notecards (optional)
- Two #2 lead pencils (not mechanical) with erasers for evaluation

### General Rules

1. Competitors in this event must be active members of HOSA and in good standing.
2. **Eligible Divisions:** Secondary and Postsecondary/Collegiate divisions are eligible to compete in this event.
3. Competitors must be familiar with and adhere to the "[General Rules and Regulations of the HOSA Competitive Events Program \(GRR\)](#)."
  - Per the [GRRs](#) and [Appendix H](#), HOSA members may request accommodation in any competitive event. To learn the definition of an accommodation, please read [Appendix H](#). To request accommodation for the International Leadership Conference, [submit the request form here](#) by May 15 at midnight EST.
  - To request accommodation for any regional/area or state level conferences, submit the request form [here](#) by your state published deadline. Accommodations must first be done at state in order to be considered for ILC. **Regional accommodations MUST be submitted two weeks prior to your regional conference date. Email [Samantha.pohl@mhc.org](mailto:Samantha.pohl@mhc.org) for questions.**
4. All competitors shall report to the site of the event at the time designated for each round of competition. At ILC, competitor's [photo ID](#) must be presented prior to ALL competition rounds. **Event managers will be checking photo IDs at the regional level as well. A digital copy of a photo is appropriate (i.e., picture on phone of photo ID from school portal).**

### Suggested Event Resources

5. [MRC Website](#)
6. [Youth Engagement Toolkit \(HOSA Website\)](#)
7. [National Health Security Strategy](#)
8. [Surgeon General's Priorities](#)
9. [Disaster Risk Reduction](#)
10. [National Strategy for Youth Preparedness Education \(FEMA\)](#)
11. [ASPR Strategic Plan](#)

### Relationship with MRC Unit

5. All HOSA chapter activities planned and implemented for this event MUST be done in partnership with the Medical Reserve Corps. To locate your local MRC Unit, visit: <https://aspr.hhs.gov/MRC/Pages/index.aspx> and click on "Join a Local MRC Unit". To identify your State Coordinator, visit: <https://aspr.hhs.gov/MRC/Pages/About-the-MRC.aspx>. If you have any challenges with identifying/contacting your MRC Unit Coordinator or State Coordinator, the applicable MRC Regional Liaison can assist: <https://aspr.hhs.gov/Pages/ContactUs.aspx>. There is no exception for activities to be eligible. A partnership with MRC outside the classroom must be in place for activities to be accepted.

### Activities

6. For each partnership activity in the competitive portfolio, three items are included:  
Michigan HOSA MRC Event Modifications (October 2023)

1. Activity Name
2. Impact on Community Category – one of the below categories will be listed
  - I. Strengthen public health
  - II. Serve a vulnerable population
  - III. Support a non-emergency community event
  - IV. Develop or strengthen the HOSA/MRC partnership
  - V. Improve community preparedness or resilience
  - VI. Train or exercise to improve community response capability
  - VII. Support an emergency response
3. HOSA/MRC Partnership Interaction Description
  - I. A description of how the HOSA chapter interacted with their local MRC in preparation and planning for the activity, as well as a description of the interaction between the MRC unit and HOSA, including the quantity (hours and people impacted) of each interaction.
  - II. *Examples include* but not limited to:
    - a. The MRC unit leader provided guidance and direction on the activity.
    - b. The MRC volunteers and HOSA members worked alongside each other at the activity.
    - c. MRC provided mentoring or shadowing opportunities for HOSA members.

7. **Timeline for Activities** - The chapter's MRC activities must be conducted within a one-year span. To qualify, the documented project covers only activities conducted from the last day of the International Leadership Conference until May 15, 2024.

### Sample Activities

8. Sample HOSA chapter activities that support this partnership could include:
  - A. Activity: Distributed 72-hour emergency kit supply lists at a local store during peak back-to school supply shopping.  
Impact: Improved community preparedness or resilience  
HOSA/MRC Partnership Interaction/Description: HOSA team members met with MRC unit leader who provided guidance on 72-hour kit contents needed specifically for our communities' hazards. The team spent 20 hours total on this project and distributed emergency kit supply lists to 100 people.
  - B. Activity: Shadowing/Mentoring Program  
Impact: Developed or strengthened HOSA/MRC partnership  
HOSA/MRC Partnership Interaction/Description: HOSA students were paired with MRC volunteers in the student's area of interest for a shadowing and mentoring experience. 5 team members participated in the mentoring program for a total of 30 hours each, or 150 hours.
  - C. Activity: Mock-disaster victims for school bus crash scenario  
Impact: Training or exercise to improve community response capability  
HOSA/MRC Partnership Interaction/Description: MRC unit leader invited HOSA members to participate in a mock disaster drill where students were moulaged and played the roles of patients injured in a school bus crash. 25 HOSA members participated in the mock disaster, which included training for 40 people. The team spent 4 hours each (100 total hours) on this activity.

### MRC Partnership Outline Steps

9. **Competitive Event Process:**
  - A. **Step 1:** Review Recommended Readings
  - B. **Step 2:** Discuss engagement with local MRC unit
    - i. **-Path A:** Membership in local MRC unit
    - ii. **-Path B:** Partnership with local MRC unit
  - C. **Step 3:** Complete Partnership Verification Form & Partnership Logistics Document
  - D. **Step 4:** Begin partnership activities and demonstrate impact. Take photographs at events.
  - E. **Step 5:** Track activities and prepare descriptions for portfolio.
  - F. **Step 6:** At the conclusion of the project, MRC Unit Leader should review the completed portfolio and sign the Partnership Verification Form again indicating they have reviewed the portfolio.

- G. **Step 7:** One member of the team uploads the portfolio to the HOSA Digital Upload System by the published deadline.

### The Portfolio – Documentation of Project – Pre-judged Digitally

10. The team's portfolio is limited to a maximum of sixteen (16) numbered single-sided pages and will contain the following, in order:
- A. **Title page** includes the Event name, Team Member Names, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, Chartered Association; Title page is centered. (A creative design or pictures may be used but will not affect the score.)
  - B. **HOSA/MRC Partnership Verification Form**  
Teams MUST have the MRC unit leader and HOSA chapter representative sign the Partnership Verification Form included in the team portfolio. This form will outline the partnership agreement between the MRC unit and the HOSA chapter participating in this event. It will be signed by the MRC leader following their review of the finalized portfolio, before the regional, state, and international conferences, as applicable. (Partnership Verification Form included at the end of these guidelines).
  - C. **Partnership Logistics** Document signed by MRC leader at the beginning of the partnership and again following review of the finalized portfolio. The MRC leader's full mailing address is required.
  - D. A description of the HOSA/MRC partnership and the level, quality, and quantity of interactions during the partnership (e.g., number of hours and people impacted).
  - E. **Summary Section** of partnership activities with brief narrative that identifies the following: (as outlined in item #6 above)
    - 1. Activity description
    - 2. Impact category
    - 3. HOSA/MRC Partnership description  
The Summary Section may include:
      - a. Publicity regarding the partnership. The date of the publicity should be shown with a copy of the article, radio or TV spot and the program script.
      - b. Programs, photographs or other verification of partnership activities should be included and dated.
      - c. The team may include copies of items they developed to support their project such as pamphlets or brochures.
  - F. All narrative pages:
    - 1. are typed, one-sided, in 12 pt. Arial font, double-spaced, in English,
    - 2. have 1" margins on 8 ½" x 11" paper, and
    - 3. contain a running header with last name and event on top left side of page, and page number on top right side of each page (not counting title page)
11. Teams may choose to bring a hard copy of their portfolio to ILC competition, to reference during the presentation if they wish, but it is not required nor judged.

### REQUIRED Digital Uploads

12. The following item(s) **MUST** be uploaded by ONE member of the team to the HOSA Digital Upload System by May 15: **For regionals, you must upload by your region's upload deadline listed on the website [www.michiganhosa.org/regionals](http://www.michiganhosa.org/regionals)**
- a. Portfolio – as one combined pdf file.

**May 15** at midnight EST is the **final deadline** and there will be **NO EXCEPTIONS** to receipt of the required materials after the deadline.

13. Detailed instructions for uploading materials can be found at:  
<https://hosa.org/competitive-event-digital-uploads/>
14. State Leadership Conference (SLC) vs. HOSA's International Leadership Conference (ILC)
  - a. **State Leadership Conferences.** It is the competitor's responsibility to check with their Local Advisor for all state-level processes used for competition as digital uploads may or may not be a requirement. **For regionals, you must upload by your region's upload deadline listed on the website [www.michiganhosa.org/regionals](http://www.michiganhosa.org/regionals)**
  - b. **International Leadership Conference.**
    - i. If a competitor uses the HOSA Digital Upload System as a requirement at the SLC, the competitor **MUST upload an ADDITIONAL time for ILC by May 15.**
    - ii. If the HOSA Digital Upload System is NOT used at the competitor's SLC, it is still the competitor's responsibility to upload the product for HOSA's ILC no later than May 15. Not using the HOSA Digital Upload System at a competitor's State Leadership Conference is not an exception to the rule.
15. The FINAL ILC digital upload deadline is May 15. We STRONGLY suggest not waiting until the last minute to upload online to avoid user-challenges with the system.
16. For ILC, the digital materials uploaded by May 15 will be PRE-JUDGED. Competitors who do not upload materials are NOT eligible for the presentation portion of competition and **will NOT be given a competition appointment time at ILC.** All digital content uploaded as of May 15 is what will be used for pre-judging at ILC. **At the regional level, the digital materials uploaded will be pre-judged. Competitors who do not upload materials can still participate in the presentation portion of the event but will have ZERO points for the pre-judged content.**

#### **The Competitive Process - Presentation with Judges**

17. Competitors will report to the event site at their appointed time for a five (5) minute presentation with judges. The timekeeper will present a flash card advising the competitors and judges of the time remaining at one (1) minute. **There may or may not be a timekeeper in your event depending on the number of volunteers. In many cases, the judge will also act as time keeper and will be instructed to stop the presentation after five minutes.**
18. **The purpose of the presentation is to communicate information about the partnership activities to the judges. The presentation MUST include:**
  - A. a brief description of the activities used to promote the partnership;
  - B. the accomplishment of goals and objectives of the partnership; and the impact of the partnership and activities.
  - C.
19. Use of index card notes during the presentation are permitted. Electronic notecards (on a tablet, smart phone, laptop, etc...) are permitted, but may not be shown to judges. Only the team's portfolio may be shown to the judges during the presentation. Please refer to [GRR #31](#).
20. Teams may choose to bring their original portfolio to ILC competition, to reference during the presentation, but no points are awarded on the rating sheet for doing so. All team members must take an active role in the presentation.

#### **Final Scoring**

21. Scores from pre-judged portfolios will be added to the presentation score to determine the final results.
22. In the event of a tie, a tiebreaker will be determined by the areas on the rating sheet section(s) with

the highest point value in descending order.

## **HOSA/MRC Partnership Verification Form**

1. This form **must** be completed and added to the portfolio which will be uploaded to the HOSA Digital Upload System by ONE member of the team by the published regional and chartered association deadlines, and by May 15<sup>th</sup> for the International Leadership Conference.
2. MRC Unit Leaders should review the HOSA MRC Partnership Event Guidelines prior to engaging in a partnership.

Involved organizations include:

Michigan HOSA MRC Event Modifications (October 2023)

HOSA Chapter:	
Team Member Names:	
School Address:	
Advisor Name:	
Advisor E-Mail Address:	

MRC Unit Name:	
Address:	
MRC Unit Leader Name:	
Unit Leader E-Mail Address:	
Unit Leader Phone Number:	
Unit Leader Mailing Address:	

By signing here, I verify that I have read the HOSA MRC Partnership Event Guidelines and agree to the attached agreed upon terms of the partnership, as presented in the Partnership Logistics Document:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Competitor Signature: Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
MRC Unit Leader Signature: Date

**HOSA / MRC Impact Data:** HOSA teams will fill-in the below data items. Include all activities and volunteer hours completed by all team members throughout the entire MRC project year.

- Total hours volunteered with the MRC: \_\_\_\_\_
- Total number of people impacted by the activities: \_\_\_\_\_

At the conclusion of the project period, the HOSA team should share their portfolio with the MRC unit leader for review. A signature is required before each applicable regional, chartered association or international conference.

By signing here, I verify that I have reviewed the HOSA team’s portfolio and find it to be an accurate representation of the HOSA/MRC partnership activities:

\_\_\_\_\_  
MRC Unit Leader Signature (before regional conference, if applicable): Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
MRC Unit Leader Signature (before state chartered association conference): Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
MRC Unit Leader Signature (before international conference): Date

## HOSA/MRC Partnership Logistics Document

**Agreed Upon Terms of the HOSA/MRC Partnership:**

Please address the following questions in no more than two (2) pages.

1. Describe how HOSA chapter and MRC unit will maintain contact throughout this competitive events year.

2. How frequently will MRC and HOSA chapter be in contact with each other?
3. Who is responsible for initiating and maintaining contact?
4. Please describe how HOSA will support the MRC Unit Leader in submitting the completed activities, either as they occur or several similar activities consolidated, in the MRC Activity Reporting System throughout the year (e.g., what information will be required, identify preferred format, frequency, etc..). MRC Unit Leaders should also submit the first meeting between HOSA and MRC in the MRC Activity Reporting System. Identify if the HOSA chapter will be considered volunteers with the MRC Unit.

Please include any specific details or additional requirements for the partnership moving forward.

### MRC PARTNERSHIP – Judge’s Rating Sheet

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

<i>Portfolio Uploaded Online*:</i> Yes ___ No ___
---



For ILC, the digital materials uploaded by May 15 will be PRE-JUDGED. Competitors who do not upload materials are NOT eligible for competition and **will NOT be given a competition appointment time at ILC**. All digital content uploaded as of May 15 is what will be used for pre-judging at ILC.

A. Portfolio	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
<b>1. Title Page</b>	Title page contains ALL requirements: Event Name, Team Member Names, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, Chartered Assoc	N/A	N/A	N/A	All requirements are not met or portfolio not submitted.	
<b>2. HOSA/MRC Partnership Verification Form</b>	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 4. HOSA / MRC Impact Data Summary Numbers	N/A	N/A	N/A	The Partnership Verification does not include all 4 required criteria OR was not submitted.	
<b>3. Partnership Logistics Document</b>	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 5. How the HOSA chapter supported the MRC Unit Leader in reporting activities	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.	
<b>4. Description of the HOSA/MRC partnership (items included)</b>	The description features all three items: 1. Level of interactions 2. Quality of interactions 3. Quantity of interactions	N/A	The description features 2 of 3 items	The description features 1 of 3 items.	No descriptions of the partnerships were provided OR Portfolio not submitted.	

<b>A. Portfolio</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>5. Description of the HOSA/MRC partnership (Quality of Items)</b>	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	N/A	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>A. Portfolio</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>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>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>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 ½" x 11" paper, and contain: —Running header with last name & event name top left, and page number top right (not counting title page).	N/A	N/A	N/A	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.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Portfolio exceeds maximum page limit OR portfolio not submitted.	
<b>Subtotal Points for Pre-Judging Portfolio (60)</b>						

<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>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.	
<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>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 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>
<b>1. Voice</b> Pitch, tempo, volume, quality	The team's voice was loud enough to hear. The competitors varied rate & volume to enhance the speech. Appropriate pausing was employed.	The team spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The competitors varied rate OR volume to enhance the speech. Pauses were attempted.	The team could be heard most of the time. The competitors attempted to use some variety in vocal quality, but not always successfully.	The team'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>C. 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 point</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>

<p><b>2. Stage Presence</b> Poise, posture, eye contact, and enthusiasm</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>The team 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>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>The team's posture, body language, and facial expressions indicated a lack of enthusiasm for the topic. Movements were distracting.</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><b>3. Diction*, Pronunciation** and Grammar</b></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>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>Delivery adequate. Enunciation and pronunciation suitable. Noticeable verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Tone seemed inconsistent at times.</p>	<p>Delivery quality minimal. Regular verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Delivery problems cause disruption to message.</p>	<p>Many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal message.</p>	
<p><b>C. Presentation Delivery</b></p>	<p><b>Excellent 10 points</b></p>	<p><b>Good 8 points</b></p>	<p><b>Average 6 points</b></p>	<p><b>Fair 4 points</b></p>	<p><b>Poor 0 point</b></p>	<p><b>JUDGE SCORE</b></p>
<p><b>4. Team Participation</b></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>All but one person on the team was actively engaged in the project presentation.</p>	<p>The team worked together relatively well. Some of the team members had little participation.</p>	<p>The team did not work effectively together.</p>	<p>One person dominated the project presentation.</p>	
<p align="right"><b>Subtotal Points for Presentation (90)</b></p>						
<p align="right"><b>Total Points (150):</b></p>						

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

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