

VIRTUAL CLINICAL SPECIALITY

Oklahoma 2020-2021 Virtual State Leadership Conference

Follow event guidelines from National HOSA to prepare for event

Description: Event will be judged on items uploaded to Tallo.

Items required for state conference:

PDF of Portfolio

URL of Skill Video

URL of Presentation Video

How to submit: Upload to Tallo per event guidelines from National HOSA

Tallo Submission Dates: February 15, 2021 (8am) through March 10, 2021 (5pm)

Portfolio Uploaded*: Yes ___ No ___

Skill Video Uploaded*: Yes ___ No ___

Presentation Uploaded*: Yes ___ No ___

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

Section # _____ Division: _____ SS _____ PS/Collegiate
 Competitor Name & # _____ Judge's Name _____

| A. 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, chosen health career, and chosen skill | N/A | N/A | N/A | Portfolio not submitted OR title page does not include all requirements OR is not present. | |
| A. Portfolio | Excellent 10 points | Good 8 points | Average 6 points | Fair 4 points | Poor 0 points | JUDGE SCORE |
| 2. Career Summary Content | The Career Summary provides complete, clear and comprehensive career information that is: 1. includes a description of the career 2. description of job duties, and 3. employment characteristics | The Career Summary provides 3 of the 4 criteria in the portfolio and/or The data provided is superficial, or vague | The Career Summary includes 2 of the 4 criteria in the portfolio and/or The data provided is superficial, or vague | The Career Summary includes 1 of the 4 criteria in the portfolio and/or The data provided is incorrect, or questionable | Portfolio not submitted OR the competitor does not include a career summary in the portfolio. | |

VIRTUAL CLINICAL SPECIALITY

| A. Portfolio | Excellent 10 points | Good 8 points | Average 6 points | Fair 4 points | Poor 0 points | JUDGE SCORE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------------|
| 3. Education, Training, Professional Association and Career Data Content | This data content provides complete, clear and comprehensive information about: 1. educational requirements and options 2. credentialing requirements 3. Professional Association info 4. related employment statistics 5. Additional career-related data. | The data content provides 5 out of 6 listed criteria in the portfolio and/or The data provided is superficial, or vague | The data content provides 4 of 6 listed criteria in the portfolio and/or The data provided is superficial, or vague | The data content provides 3 of 6 listed criteria in the portfolio and/or The data provided is incorrect, or questionable | Portfolio not submitted OR the competitor does not include educational, training, professional association or career data content in the portfolio. | |
| 4. Interview Summary <i>*Interview must be with a practicing health professional and may NOT include the competitor's instructor or HOSA advisor.</i> | The interview summary provides a complete, clear and comprehensive summary of: 1. a career-related interview with a professional in a specific health career field (including name, workplace & profession) 2. demonstrates thoughtful questioning and comprehension of the answers. 3. incorporates specific information that can only be learned through conversation or interaction with a professional | The interview summary provides 3 of the 4 criteria in column 1, but does not provide enough detail to gain full understanding of the interview. | The interview summary provides basic description of the interview with the professional. Includes mostly information that can be researched online. | The interview summary provides mostly information that can be researched online. It is questionable whether or not an interview took place. | Portfolio not submitted OR the competitor did not include details highlighting an interview with a professional in the portfolio OR it was obvious the local HOSA Advisor was used. | |
| 5. Work-based Learning Summary and Outcomes Content | This summary of a work-based learning experience included the following evidence: 1. documents proof of a minimum of 8 hours of job shadowing 2. description of who, what, where and when the experience took place 3. demonstrates insight and understanding of the work environment and career 4. a thoughtful list of learning outcomes (what the competitor learned) as a result of the experience. | The work-based learning summary includes 3 of the 4 criteria in the portfolio | The work-based learning summary includes 2 of the 4 criteria in the portfolio | The work-based learning summary includes 1 of the 4 criteria in the portfolio | Portfolio not submitted OR The candidate does not include a work-based learning summary. | |

VIRTUAL CLINICAL SPECIALITY

| A. Portfolio | Excellent 5 points | Good 4 points | Average 3 points | Fair 2 points | Poor 0 point | JUDGE SCORE |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|----------------|
| 6. Professional Verification Letter | The letter from the mentor Includes: 1. Mentor's credentials and area of practice 2. Submitted on professional stationery 3. includes comments on the competitor's attitude, enthusiasm, work performance, and career potential. 4. signed by the mentor. (May be in narrative form) | The mentor's letter must include 4 of the 5 criteria listed in the portfolio | The mentor's letter includes 3 of the 5 criteria listed in the portfolio | The mentor's letter includes 2 of the 5 criteria listed in the portfolio | Portfolio not submitted OR the competitor does not include a Personal Verification letter of recommendation in the portfolio. | |
| A. Portfolio | Excellent 10 points | Good 8 points | Average 6 points | Fair 4 points | Poor 0 points | JUDGE SCORE |
| 7. Skill Checklist | The competitor completes all 7 criteria: 1. Selected a skill that aligns with the chosen career 2. The skill can be performed/demonstrated by competitor. 3. The skill is not too invasive or sensitive. 4. The skill helps develop a career awareness. 5. The checklist includes at least 10 steps that would be performed as part of the skill. 6. The skill is broken down into logical subparts, including all necessary steps. | The competitor completes 6 of the criteria | The competitor completes 4-5 of the criteria, and/or some steps seem to be out of order. | The competitor completes 3 or fewer criteria and/or some steps seem to be incorrect. | Portfolio not submitted OR the competitor does not include the skill checklist | |
| A. Portfolio | Excellent 5 points | Good 4 points | Average 3 points | Fair 2 points | Poor 0 point | JUDGE SCORE |
| 8. Reference Page | The reference page is included in the portfolio. | NA | NA | NA | Portfolio not submitted or no reference page is included in the portfolio. | |
| 9. Neatness of Portfolio Overall | No errors in formatting, grammar or appearance were detected in the portfolio. | The portfolio had 1-2 errors- | 3-4 errors in formatting or grammar were detected in the portfolio. | 5-6 errors in formatting or grammar were detected in the portfolio. | Portfolio not submitted OR the portfolio had more than 6 errors in formatting or grammar and it was difficult to follow. | |

VIRTUAL CLINICAL SPECIALITY

| A. Portfolio | Excellent 5 points | Good 4 points | Average 3 points | Fair 2 points | Poor 0 point | JUDGE SCORE |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|------------------------|
| 10. Formatting | All portfolio pages have a running header, are numbered in top right corner, typed, single-sided, arial 12 pt font, double spaced, 1" margins | N/A | N/A | N/A | Portfolio not submitted OR all requirements are not met. | |
| 10. Max Pages (no pages above 14 will be judged) | Pages do not exceed 14 total. | N/A | N/A | N/A | Portfolio exceeds maximum page limit OR portfolio not submitted. | |
| <i>Digital submissions will only be judged up until the allotted timing allowed per the event guidelines. Any time in a digital submission over the allowed will not be scored and no points will be awarded for those sections of the rating sheet.</i> | | | | | | |
| B. Presentation Content | Excellent 10 points | Good 8 points | Average 6 points | Fair 4 points | Poor 0 points | JUDGE SCORE |
| 1. Understanding of the career (job responsibilities, training, employment opportunities) | The competitor thoroughly and accurately understands the requirements that go into the job, is able to explain how to prepare for training and how to access opportunities for employment. | The competitor understands the job requirements and how to prepare for the job but fails to address how to access opportunities for employment. | The competitor demonstrates an average understanding of the career highlighted in the presentation and struggles to make a connection to job responsibilities, training or future employment opportunities. | The competitor demonstrates a basic understanding of the roles of the career. Very little detail is provided. | Presentation not submitted OR the competitor does not provide evidence of understanding the job responsibilities, training required or future employment opportunities within their presentation. | |
| 2. Ability to relate personal strengths and preferences to the career | The competitor was able to relate personal strengths and preferences to the selected career by identifying several (4 or more) strong connections to the characteristics of the job requirements and their own attributes and abilities. | The competitor was able to make 3 or more somewhat strong connections between their own personal strengths and the preferences to the career of choice. | The competitor made 2 fairly weak connections to personal attributes and the preferences to the career of choice | The competitor identified 1 weak connection between their own personal strengths and the aptitudes required of the career of choice. | Presentation not submitted OR the competitor was not able to make any connections between their own aptitudes and abilities and the career of choice. | |
| 3. Ability to articulate how the career fits into the healthcare system | The competitor demonstrated a strong understanding of how the chosen career fits into the healthcare system. | The competitor understands how the chosen career fits into the healthcare system but struggled to articulate this well. | The competitor vaguely addressed how the career fits into the healthcare system | The competitor does not appear to understand how the career fits into the healthcare system | Presentation not submitted OR the competitor did not provide any connection between the career and the healthcare system. | |
| C. 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. | Presentation not submitted OR judge had difficulty hearing and/or understanding much of the speech due to low volume. Little variety in | |

VIRTUAL CLINICAL SPECIALITY

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|--------------------|
| | | | | | rate or volume. | |
| C. 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 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. | Presentation not submitted OR no attempt was made to use body movement or gestures to enhance the message. No interest or enthusiasm for the topic came through in presentation. | |
| 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. | Presentation not submitted OR many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal message. | |
| D. Skill Performance Video | Excellent 10 points | Good 8 points | Average 6 points | Fair 4 points | Poor 0 points | JUDGE SCORE |
| 1. Video Submission & Inclusion in the Presentation | The submission includes a digitally recorded video that: 1. contains high-quality audio 2. is of high quality visual appearance and effective angle 3. shows the competitor performing the actual skill 4. is utilized as intended during presentation to reflect a deep understanding of chosen career | The submission includes all of the criteria required but is not as strong as it could be. | The submission includes 2 of the 4 criteria required and/or submission is of average quality. | The submission includes 1 of the 4 criteria required and/or The competitor is not seen in the video | Presentation not submitted OR the skill video was not shared during the presentation. | |
| 3. Skill Not Duplicated | Does NOT duplicate a skill in an existing HOSA Event (judges refer to listing) | N/A | N/A | N/A | Skill duplicates an existing HOSA skill | |
| Total Points (140): | | | | | | |

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

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