



# FOOD INNOVATIONS

## Rubric



Name(s) of Participant(s) \_\_\_\_\_

State \_\_\_\_\_ Team # \_\_\_\_\_ Group # \_\_\_\_\_ Category \_\_\_\_\_

DISPLAY							Points
<b>FCCLA Planning Process Summary Page</b> 0-5 points	<b>0</b> Planning Process summary not provided	<b>1</b> Inadequate steps in the Planning Process are presented	<b>2</b> All Planning Process steps are presented but not summarized	<b>3</b> All Planning Process steps are summarized	<b>4</b> Evidence that the Planning Process was utilized to plan project	<b>5</b> The Planning Process is used to plan the project. Each step is fully explained	
<b>Original Prototype Formula(s)</b> 0-10 points	<b>0</b> No prototype formula(s) provided/formula(s) are do not fit within the current food product scenario	<b>1-2</b> One or more versions of the prototype and final prototype presented and fit within the current food product scenario	<b>3-4</b> Original, each modified version, and final prototype formula(s) are presented and fit within the current food product scenario, but are written poorly	<b>5-6</b> Original, each modified version, within the current formula(s) are well-written, fit within the current food product scenario, and track changes from previous versions	<b>7-8</b> Prototype formula(s) are well-written, fits within the current food product scenario, and tracks changes. The final formula(s) meets product goals and represents an adequate understanding of scientific and culinary principles	<b>9-10</b> Prototype formula(s) are well-written, fits within the current food product scenario, and tracks changes. The final formula(s) meets product goals and represents an extensive understanding of scientific and culinary principles	
<b>Product Testing Method</b> 0-10 points	<b>0</b> No evidence of product testing provided	<b>1-2</b> Product testing does not follow the specifications	<b>3-4</b> Product testing followed specifications but the chosen method was not appropriate for the focus group audience	<b>5-6</b> Product was tested twice according to specifications with an appropriate evaluation method for the focus group. Samples of the method and results are presented	<b>7-8</b> Product was tested twice according to specifications with an appropriate evaluation method for the focus group. Samples of the method and results are presented. Most feedback from testing is implemented	<b>9-10</b> Product was tested twice according to specifications with an appropriate evaluation method for the focus group. Samples of the method and results are presented in a professional manner. Feedback from testing is well-implemented	
<b>Process Storyboard</b> 0-2 points	<b>0</b> No process storyboard presented	<b>1</b> Limited photographs, confusing arrangement		<b>2</b> Appropriate number of photographs, arranged well to tell a story			
<b>Nutrition Information</b> 0-5 points	<b>0</b> No nutrition information provided	<b>1</b> Nutrition information does not meet specification requirements	<b>2</b> Nutrition information is complete (see specifications for requirements) but most of the information is incorrect	<b>3</b> Nutrition information is complete (see specifications for requirements) and the majority of information is correct	<b>4</b> Nutrition information is complete (see specifications for requirements) and correct. Demonstrates an appropriate level of knowledge for participant category	<b>5</b> Nutrition information is complete (see specifications for requirements) and correct. Demonstrates an advanced level of knowledge for participant category	
<b>Equipment, Safety and Sanitation</b> 0-3 points	<b>0</b> No equipment list or safety and sanitation precautions	<b>1</b> Both the equipment list is incomplete AND safety and sanitation precautions are inappropriate	<b>2</b> The equipment list is incomplete OR safety and sanitation precautions are inappropriate		<b>3</b> The equipment list is complete and safety and sanitation precautions are appropriate		
<b>Product Summary</b> 0-2 points	<b>0</b> No product summary provided		<b>1</b> Product summary is lacking information and/or is poorly written		<b>2</b> Product summary is thorough and well-written		
<b>Actual and Suggested Pricing</b> 0-3 points	<b>0</b> No pricing information provided	<b>1</b> Actual cost of one serving and one package is missing or inaccurate AND suggested pricing is missing or inappropriate	<b>2</b> Actual cost of one serving and one package is missing or inaccurate OR suggested pricing is missing or inappropriate		<b>3</b> Actual cost of one serving and one package is accurate; suggested pricing is appropriate		
<b>Appearance</b> 0-3 points	<b>0</b> Display is illegible and unorganized	<b>1</b> Display is neat, but contains grammatical or spelling errors and is organized poorly	<b>2</b> Display is neat, legible, and professional, with correct grammar and spelling		<b>3</b> Neat and professional, correct grammar and spelling used; effective organization		

# Food Innovations Rubric (continued)

Points

FOOD INNOVATIONS

<b>SUGGESTED PRODUCT PACKAGING</b>						
<b>Design Effectiveness</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Suggested product packaging not provided	<b>1</b> Packaging design does not exhibit creativity and innovation, and/or would not be effective in containing, shipping, and storing the product	<b>2</b> Packaging design exhibits creativity and innovation, and would be effective in containing, shipping, and storing the product	<b>3</b> Packaging design exhibits creativity and innovation, and would be effective in containing, shipping, and storing the product. Description of actual materials to be used is included		
<b>Marketability</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Suggested product packaging not provided	<b>1</b> Packaging is missing required information (see specifications) and/or lacks visual appeal for the intended audience	<b>2</b> Packaging contains all of the required information (see specifications) and has some visual appeal for the intended audience	<b>3</b> Packaging contains all of the required information (see specifications) and has high visual appeal for the intended audience		
<b>Appearance</b> 0–2 points	<b>0</b> Suggested product packaging not provided	<b>1</b> Packaging is unprofessional, not of high quality and/or contains grammatical or spelling errors	<b>2</b> Packaging is professional, of high quality and correct grammar and spelling used			
<b>ORAL PRESENTATION</b>						
<b>Organization/Delivery</b> 0–10 points	<b>0</b> Presentation is not done or speaks briefly and does not cover components of the project	<b>1–2</b> Presentation covers some topic elements	<b>3–4</b> Presentation covers all topic elements but with minimal information	<b>5–6</b> Presentation gives complete information but does not explain the project well	<b>7–8</b> Presentation covers information completely but does not flow well	<b>9–10</b> Presentation covers all relevant information with a seamless and logical delivery
<b>Explanation of Product Choice</b> 0–5 points	<b>0</b> No product choice explanation	<b>1</b> Product choice explanation was brief and product choice is not thought out or appropriate for scenario and audience	<b>2</b> Product choice explanation was brief but the product choice is appropriate for scenario and audience	<b>3</b> Product choice explanation was clear and thorough. Product choice is appropriate for scenario and audience	<b>4</b> Product choice explanation was clear and thorough. Some evidence that the product choice was thought out and it is appropriate for the current scenario and target audience	<b>5</b> Product choice explanation was clear and thorough. It is evident that the product choice was thought out and it is highly appropriate for the current scenario and target audience
<b>Knowledge of Subject Matter</b> 0–5 points	<b>0</b> Little or no evidence of knowledge	<b>1</b> Minimal evidence of knowledge	<b>2</b> Some evidence of knowledge	<b>3</b> Knowledge of subject matter is evident but not shared in presentation	<b>4</b> Knowledge of subject matter is evident and shared at times in the presentation	<b>5</b> Knowledge of subject matter is evident and incorporated throughout the presentation
<b>Use of Display and Visuals during Presentation</b> 0–5 points	<b>0</b> Display and visuals are not used during presentation	<b>1</b> Display and visuals are used to limit amount of speaking time	<b>2</b> Display and visuals are used minimally during presentation	<b>3</b> Display and visuals are incorporated throughout presentation	<b>4</b> Display and visuals are used effectively throughout presentation	<b>5</b> Presentation moves seamlessly between oral presentation and display/visuals
<b>Voice—pitch tempo, volume</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> No voice qualities are used effectively	<b>1</b> Voice quality is adequate	<b>2</b> Voice quality is good, but could improve	<b>3</b> Voice quality is outstanding and pleasing to listen to		
<b>Body Language/Clothing Choice</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Body language shows nervousness and unease/ inappropriate clothing	<b>1</b> Body language shows minimal amount of nervousness/ clothing is appropriate	<b>2</b> Body language is good and and clothing is professional	<b>3</b> Body language and clothing choice both enhance the presentation		
<b>Grammar/Word Usage/Pronunciation</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Extensive (more than 5) grammatical and pronunciation errors	<b>1</b> Some (3–5) grammatical and pronunciation errors	<b>2</b> Few (1–2) grammatical and pronunciation errors	<b>3</b> Presentation has no grammatical or pronunciation errors		
<b>Responses to Evaluators' Questions</b> 0–5 points	<b>0</b> Did not answer evaluators' questions	<b>1</b> Unable to answer some questions	<b>2</b> Responded to all questions, but without ease or accuracy	<b>3</b> Responded adequately to all questions	<b>4</b> Gave appropriate responses to evaluators' questions	<b>5</b> Responses to questions were appropriate and given without hesitation

**Evaluator's Comments:**

Evaluator Initial \_\_\_\_\_

Room Consultant Initial \_\_\_\_\_

**TOTAL**

(90 points possible)