

MI – Medical Innovation 2020

Local Advisor “Event Manager”	
Event Location	Tuesday, March 10 (Please see schedule for time and location)
Personnel	1 Judge for Round One: 2 Judges for Round Two: Judges serve as timekeepers
Event Supplies	pens/pencils, calculators for judge, notepads for judge, clipboards, tape measure, stopwatch, interval times, flash card with 1 minute remaining
Event Supplies Brought by Competitor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Innovation and any associated materials/display items - All audio-visual equipment needed - Notes on index cards or electronic notecards for interview
Registration	Secondary = __ Teams
Dress Code	Official HOSA Uniform or Proper Business Attire
Orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Orientation should take no more than 5 minutes. - Explain the event to the students and how it will work - Ask for student questions - Team sets up and then does their presentation
Timing Overview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teams have 15 minutes to assemble their innovation and overall table display. - Assign timecards for teams to return for their presentations - 7 minute prepared oral presentation to the judges (Notecards are permitted) - 2 minutes for judges to ask questions - 2 minutes for judges to complete rating sheets
Event Overview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The TEAM must create an original innovation of their own design. They will learn everything they can about their own design, and then demonstrate or teach the judges about the innovation. A working model needs to be included. - The timekeeper will present a flash card advising the team of 1 minute remaining for the prepared presentation.
Scoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Round One Judge can remain in the room for scoring purposes during presentations. The Round One scores will be added to Round Two scores after the final team competes. • After each team leaves the room, judges will complete the rating sheet (2 minutes). • At the conclusion of the event, bring rating sheets to HOSA Headquarters
Special Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teams may not use flames, body fluids, living organisms, sharps, syringes, or potentially hazardous equipment/materials. Invasive procedures and skin puncturing are prohibited. - The work must be the work of the competitors, including the artistic aspects of the display. Any artwork or photographs must be in compliance with copyright laws. - Any sources used for data or information collection must be published on a reference page attached to the back of the display or on the table. One page only - There are different scoring sheets for Round One and Round Two

MEDICAL INNOVATION

Judge's Round 1 Rating Sheet – The Innovation Exhibit

Section # _____ Judge's Signature _____
 Team # _____ Division: SS _____ PS/Collegiate _____

A. Medical Innovation – The Innovation Exhibit – Round 1						JUDGE SCORE
<p>No partial points are given in Section A.</p> <p>All SEVEN items MUST be completed to receive 25 points.</p> <p>If any portion is missing, Section A is scored a 0.</p> <p>For more information on the all/none points, please visit: http://www.hosa.org/judge</p>	<p>A. Points for following Guidelines:</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 60%;"> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Exhibit is no more than 48" wide x 24" deep and safely stands on own on the table.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Reference page is included in exhibit.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Exhibit materials do not extend beyond the edge of the table.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Exhibit/equipment is safe and poses no hazards.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Exhibit is in English.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A prototype is included.</p> </div> <div style="width: 35%; text-align: center;"> <p>All or nothing:</p> <p>25 points</p> <p>or</p> <p>0 points</p> </div> </div>					
B. EXHIBIT CONTENT	Excellent 15 points	Good 12 points	Average 9 points	Fair 6 points	Poor 3 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.	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.	
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.	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.	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 2 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.	The design is simplistic and not visually appealing.	
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.	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.	The display is either too busy or lacks enough detail to support the content.	
Total Points (100):						

MEDICAL INNOVATION

Judge's Round 2 Rating Sheet – The Presentation

Section # _____ Judge's Signature _____
 Team # _____ Division: SS _____ PS/Collegiate _____

Medical Innovation – The Presentation – Round 2						JUDGE SCORE
<p>No partial points are given in Section A.</p> <p>Both items MUST be completed to receive 35 points.</p> <p>If any portion is missing, Section A is scored a 0.</p> <p>For more information on the all/none points, please visit: http://www.hosa.org/judge</p>	<p>A. Points for following Guidelines:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Nothing shown to judges except exhibit items.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Team participated in <u>required</u> Display Time</p> <p style="text-align: center;">All or nothing:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">35 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p style="text-align: center;">0 points</p>					
B. PRESENTATION CONTENT	Excellent 15 points	Good 12 points	Average 9 points	Fair 6 points	Poor 3 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Explain & Teach	Presenters shared exceptional depth of knowledge on the innovation content and effectively taught the judges about their innovation.	Presenters shared knowledge and understanding of the original innovation with the judges.	Presenters shared an average amount of knowledge on the original medical innovation.	Presenters demonstrated some command of the knowledge but failed to effectively teach the judges about the original innovation.	Presenters shared little to no knowledge of the medical innovation with the judges or repeated information.	
2. Demonstration of Prototype	The team did an outstanding job demonstrating the medical innovation prototype. The audience feels competent about how to use the prototype.	The team did a good job demonstrating the innovation prototype.	The presentation of the medical innovation prototype was mediocre.	The team attempted to demonstrate the innovation prototype but experienced challenges.	The presentation of the medical innovation prototype was poor. The prototype did not function correctly.	
3. Why this Innovation? Value & Benefit	The team provided clear rationale for the purpose behind the innovation, why it is needed and how it will add value and benefit the healthcare system.	The team was able to explain the value and benefit of the medical innovation to the healthcare industry.	The team provided a short explanation for how the medical innovation will benefit the healthcare industry.	Little demonstration for why this innovation will add value or benefit the healthcare system was given.	The team was unable to explain or demonstrate why this medical innovation will add value or benefit to the healthcare system.	
4. Overall Innovation	The exhibit and presentation are an excellent combination to get people excited about the innovation and could have a profound effect on the future of healthcare.	The exhibit and presentation resonated with the audience and made a positive impact. The audience left feeling positive about the new innovation.	The overall effectiveness of the innovation demonstrates some potential to impact the future of healthcare.	The medical innovation needs additional focus in order to gain excitement	The presentation and exhibit need more polish and attention to detail in order to improve the delivery of healthcare. The overall innovation lacks effectiveness and attention to detail.	

B.PRESENTATION CONTENT	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 1points	JUDGE SCORE
5. Cost	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.	
6. Training Requirements	A detailed description of the training requirements to use or implement the medical innovation was shared.	A description of the training requirements was provided.	A short description of the training requirements was provided.	An incomplete description of the training requirements was provided.	There is no description of the training requirements for the medical innovation.	
7. Career Implications	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.PRESENTATION DELIVERY	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 1points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Voice Pitch, tempo, volume, quality	Each speaker's voice was loud enough to hear. The speakers varied rate & volume to enhance the speech. Appropriate pausing was employed.	Each speaker spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The speakers varied rate OR volume to enhance the speech. Pauses were attempted.	Each speaker could be heard most of the time. The speakers attempted to use some variety in vocal quality, but not always successfully.	Most of the speaker'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 speakers 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 speaker'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** 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.	

C.PRESENTATION DELIVERY	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 1 points	JUDGE SCORE
4. Organization and Flow	The presentation was exceptionally organized, clear and coherent. It flowed seamlessly.	The presentation was well-organized, clear and included sufficient detail.	Information shared by presenters was somewhat organized and presented fairly well. The presentation included some details to help with the delivery.	Presentation was not delivered in a clear and concise manner.	The presentation was scattered and unclear; did not flow, and left judges with more questions than answers.	
5. 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.	N/A	The team worked together relatively well. Some team members spoke more than others.	N/A	One team member dominated the presentation.	
6. Exhibit Incorporated into Presentation	The exhibit enhanced the messaging of the innovation and helped bring the presentation to life.	The exhibit helped tell the story of the innovation. It complemented the presentation effectively.	The team did an adequate job of using the exhibit to support the presentation.	The exhibit somewhat enhanced the presentation on the innovation yet seemed to miss key points of emphasis.	The exhibit seemed to be an "afterthought" to the presentation. There was a disconnect between what was featured on the exhibit and the presentation.	
7. 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.	
Total Points (145):						

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

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