

# FOOD INNOVATIONS

## FOOD INNOVATIONS

An individual or *team event* recognizes participants who demonstrate knowledge of the basic concepts of food product development by creating an original *prototype formula*, testing the product through *focus groups* and developing a marketing strategy. Participants will demonstrate their knowledge of food science, nutrition, food preparation safety and product marketing. Participants must prepare a *display*, suggested product packaging and an oral presentation.

## ELIGIBILITY & GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Review "Eligibility and General Rules for All Levels of Competition" on page 8 prior to event planning and preparation.
2. Participants are encouraged to bring fully charged devices, such as laptops, tablets etc., to use for audiovisual *electronic portfolio* presentation at competition.
3. Chapters with multiple entries in this event must submit different projects for each entry. All projects must be developed and completed during a one-year span beginning July 1 and ending June 30 of the school year before the National Leadership Conference (NLC) and must be the work of the participant(s) only.
4. **Online Orientation** - National Leadership Conference (NLC) participants are required to view the online orientation video and submit the STAR Events *Online Orientation Form* by the deadline to receive their one (1) point on the STAR Events Point Summary Form. The video and form will be on the FCCLA Student Portal and can be found under Surveys Applications. The video and form cannot be completed through the FCCLA Adviser Portal. Only one form per entry is required. **Contact your State Adviser for orientation procedures for competitions held prior to the National Leadership Conference (NLC).**
5. **STAR Events Schedule Confirmation** - Chapter Advisers are required to confirm National Leadership Conference competitors' STAR Events Schedule in the FCCLA Portal by the date outlined on the FCCLA Website (Competitive Events Dates & Deadlines) for competitors to receive their one (1) point on the Points Summary Form. This must be completed in the FCCLA Adviser Portal by visiting the Meetings & Events tab, selecting the National Leadership Conference, and choosing "Confirm STAR Competition."
6. Participants who do not follow the event guidelines or the definition of the event, or if they create an item that does not align with the current event topic, their project will not be considered for evaluation. However, the participant can still participate in the competition by giving an oral presentation and will only be evaluated based on that presentation.

[CLICK TO VIEW NATIONAL DEADLINES](#)

## CAREER PATHWAYS ALIGNMENT

Human Services	Hospitality & Tourism	Education & Training	Visual Arts & Design
	■		

## EVENT LEVELS

Level 1: Through Grade 8	Level 2: Grades 9–10	Level 3: Grades 11–12	Level 4: Postsecondary
■	■	■	■

Review the "Event Description and Levels" section of the policies in the front of the guidelines for more information on event levels.

## GENERAL INFORMATION

Number of Participants per Entry	Prepare Ahead of Time	Equipment Provided for Competition	Competition Dress Code
1–3	<i>Display</i> , Product Packaging and Oral Presentation	Table—Yes Electrical Access—No Wall Space—No Supplies—No Wi-Fi – No	FCCLA Official Dress

## PRESENTATION ELEMENTS ALLOWED

Audio	Easel(s)	File Folder	Flip Chart(s)	Portfolio	Props/ Pointers	Skits	Presentation Equipment	Visuals
■	■				■		■	■

## ANNUAL TOPIC

ANNUAL TOPIC	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVELS 3 & 4
<b>Nutritional Beverages</b>	Superfoods are gaining popularity for their nutritional benefits. Your challenge in this Food Innovations event is to develop a diverse line of nutritional drinks each featuring a unique superfood ingredient while focusing on strict nutritional guidelines and appealing to students of all ages.		
<b>Event Criteria</b>	Develop an innovative, healthy superfood drink including at least one (1) superfood ingredient limiting added sugars to 10% of total daily calories.	Develop an innovative, healthy superfood drink including at least one (1) superfood ingredient limiting added sugars to 10% of total daily calories and has an added health benefit (e.g., energy boost, immune support, digestion aid)	Develop an innovative, healthy superfood drink including at least one (1) superfood ingredient limiting added sugars to 10% of total daily calories with an added health benefit (e.g., energy boost, immune support, digestion aid) and does not include artificial coloring or flavors.

## COMPETITION PROCEDURES & TIME REQUIREMENTS

TIME	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVELS 3 & 4
5 minutes	At the designated participation time, participant(s) will have 5 minutes to set up their <i>display</i> . Other persons may not assist.		
10 minutes	The oral presentation may be up to 10 minutes in length. A 1-minute warning will be given at 9 minutes. Participants will be stopped at 10 minutes. If audio or audiovisual recordings are used, they are limited to a 3-minute playing time during the presentation. <i>Presentation equipment</i> , with no audio, may be used during the entire presentation.		
5 minutes	Following the presentation, evaluators will have 5 minutes to interview participant(s).		
5 minutes	Following the interview, evaluators will have 5 minutes to review the <i>display</i> .		
5 minutes	Evaluators will have up to 5 minutes to use the rubric to score and write comments for participant(s).		
Total Time: 30 Minutes			

## PROJECT FORMAT

PRESENTATION FORMAT	
<b>Display</b>	A <i>display</i> must be used to document and illustrate the work of one project, using <i>clearly defined presentation surfaces</i> . The <i>display</i> may be either freestanding or tabletop. Freestanding <i>displays</i> must not exceed a space 48" deep by 60" wide by 72" high, including <i>audiovisual equipment</i> . Tabletop <i>displays</i> must not exceed a space 30" deep by 48" wide by 48" high, including any <i>audiovisual equipment</i> . Information or <i>props</i> outside the <i>display</i> will be considered part of the <i>display</i> and subject to penalty (tablecloths, storage items, boxes below the table, etc.). <i>Displays</i> may not have items on the back of the board. Each <i>display</i> must include the following elements:

## CONTENTS OF DISPLAY (SPECIFICATIONS)

SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVELS 3 & 4
<b>Project Identification Page</b>	Must include participant's name(s), chapter name, school, city, state, event name, level, and project title. Page can be up to 1 - 8 ½" x 11" page, but cannot be larger.		
<b>FCCLA Planning Process Summary Page</b>	1-8 ½" x 11" summary of how each step of the <i>Planning Process</i> was used to plan and implement the project; use of the <i>Planning Process</i> may also be described in the oral presentation.		
<b>Evidence of Online Summary Form Submission</b>	Complete the <i>Online Project Summary Form</i> under the "Surveys Applications" tab of the FCCLA Student Portal and include signed proof of submission in the <i>display</i> .		

## CONTENTS OF DISPLAY (SPECIFICATIONS)

Original Prototype Formula(s)	Present original <i>prototype formula(s)</i> and additional modified version(s) after each test and alteration, including the final formula(s). Changes from the previous version must be highlighted in each modified formula. The original <i>prototype formula(s)</i> must fit within the participants' level of the national food product topic. The final formula(s) may be from any stage of development. Sufficient evidence is given to support the choice of the final formula(s) as the best option for manufacturing.		
Product Testing Method	Participants will test their formula in <i>focus groups</i> and modify it 2 times. <i>Focus groups</i> must follow the following guidelines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Test #1—minimum 5 individuals</li><li>• Test #2—minimum 10 individuals, who are part of the intended consumer <i>audience(s)</i> of the product.</li></ul> <i>Display</i> the method of evaluation for each stage of testing and include a sample of both negative and positive results from each stage. Selection of final product may occur at any stage of product testing.	Participants will test their formula in <i>focus groups</i> and modify it 2 times. <i>Focus groups</i> must follow the following guidelines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Test #1—minimum 10 individuals</li><li>• Test #2—minimum 15 individuals, who are part of the intended consumer <i>audience(s)</i> of the product.</li></ul> <i>Display</i> the method of evaluation for each stage of testing and include a sample of both negative and positive results from each stage. Selection of final product may occur at any stage of product testing.	Participants will test their formula in <i>focus groups</i> and modify it 3 times. <i>Focus groups</i> must follow the following guidelines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Test #1—minimum 10 individuals</li><li>• Test #2—minimum 15 individuals, who are part of the intended consumer <i>audience(s)</i> of the product.</li><li>• Test #3—re-test the individuals from Test #2 (minimum 15 individuals, who are part of the intended consumer <i>audience(s)</i> of the product.)</li></ul> <i>Display</i> the method of evaluation for each stage of testing and include a sample of both negative and positive results from each stage. Selection of final product may occur at any stage of product testing.
Process Storyboard	Document the various production and testing stages. Provide a minimum of 10 product photos.	Document the various production and testing stages. Provide a minimum of 15 product photos.	Document the various production and testing stages. Provide a minimum of 20 product photos.
Nutrition Information	Create a nutrition fact label for the product following FDA guidelines. Include serving size, amount per serving and % Daily Value for total calories, fat calories, total fat, total carbohydrates, protein, sodium and cholesterol; ingredients; allergy warnings; and consumption instructions.		
Equipment, Safety and Sanitation	Develop a list of equipment used and safety precautions taken to ensure a safe test kitchen and sanitary product.	Develop a list of equipment used (include pictures) and safety precautions taken to ensure a safe test kitchen and sanitary product. Describe how ServSafe or equivalent local/state food safety procedures were used.	
Product Summary	Include product name, target market and appeal of the product to target <i>audience</i> .	Include product name, target market and appeal of the product to target <i>audience</i> . Describe how sensory evaluation methods were used to appeal to target <i>audience</i> .	
Actual and Suggested Pricing	Determine the actual cost of producing one serving and one package of the product. Develop a suggested price for retailing the product.	Determine the actual cost of producing one serving and one package of the product. Develop a suggested price for retailing the product. Show process of determining actual cost and retail price.	
Display Appearance	<i>Display</i> must be neat, legible, <i>professional</i> , creative and use correct grammar and spelling.		

## MODEL (SPECIFICATIONS)

MODEL			
Suggested Product Packaging		In addition to the <i>display</i> , suggested product packaging must be actual size, 3D <i>model</i> of intended product container.	
SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVELS 3 & 4
Design Effectiveness	The <i>model</i> must exhibit creativity and innovation and the design must be effective in containing, shipping and storing the product. Include a description of actual materials to be used in the suggested product packaging.	The <i>model</i> must exhibit creativity and innovation and the design must be effective in containing, shipping and storing the product. Include a description of actual materials to be used in the suggested product packaging. Include a list of potential shipping and storing issues that may occur due to packaging choices.	
Marketability	The packaging must be appealing to the target market and contain all of the appropriate information to be ready for sale. Minimum information required: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Product Name</li><li>• Nutrition Facts Label</li><li>• Ingredient List</li><li>• Allergy Warning</li><li>• Consumption Instructions</li><li>• Net Weight</li></ul>		
Model Appearance	The suggested product packaging must be neat, legible, <i>professional</i> , creative, visually appealing and use correct grammar/spelling		

## ORAL PRESENTATION (SPECIFICATIONS)

PRESENTATION FORMAT			
<b>Oral Presentation</b>	The oral presentation may be up to 10 minutes in length and is delivered to evaluators. The presentation must explain the specifics of the project. The presentation may not be prerecorded. If audio or <i>audiovisual equipment</i> is used, it is limited to 3-minute playing time during the presentation. <i>Presentation equipment</i> , with no audio, may be used throughout the oral presentation. Participants may use any combination of <i>props</i> , materials, supplies and/or equipment to demonstrate how to carry out the project.		
SPECIFICATIONS	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVELS 3 & 4
<b>Organization/Delivery</b>	Deliver an organized, sequential oral presentation; concisely and thoroughly summarize project.		
<b>Explanation of Product Choice</b>	Explain why the particular food product was chosen and its appeal to both the participant and potential consumers.		
<b>Knowledge of Food Science, Dietetics and Nutrition</b>	Demonstrate thorough knowledge of Food Science, dietetics and nutrition. Discuss the area of Food Science which was most directly relevant in creating and testing the <i>prototype formula</i> .		
<b>Relationship of Family and Consumer Sciences Coursework/ Standards/National Programs</b>	Describe the relationship of Family and Consumer Sciences coursework to food innovations project.	Describe the relationship of Family and Consumer Sciences coursework to food innovations project. Explain which FCCLA National Program(s) could be used during project implementation.	Describe the relationship of Family and Consumer Sciences coursework and standards to food innovations project. Explain which FCCLA National Program(s) could be used during project implementation. Identify career pathway.
<b>Use of Display and Visuals During Presentation</b>	Use proper grammar, word usage and pronunciation.		
<b>Voice</b>	Speak clearly with appropriate pitch, tempo and volume.		
<b>Body Language</b>	Use appropriate body language including gestures, posture, mannerisms, eye contact and appropriate handling of notes or note cards if used.		
<b>Grammar/Word Usage/ Pronunciation</b>	Use proper grammar, word usage and pronunciation.		

## Responses to Evaluators' Questions

Provide clear and concise answers to evaluators' questions regarding the project.

## FOOD INNOVATIONS STAR EVENTS POINT SUMMARY FORM

Participant Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Chapter: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Team #: \_\_\_\_\_ Station #: \_\_\_\_\_ Level: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Make sure all information at the top is correct. If a student named is not participating, cross their name(s) off. If a *team* does not show, write "No Show" across the top and return with other forms. Do NOT change *team* or station numbers.
2. Before the student presentation, the room consultants must check the participants' *display* using the criteria and standards listed below and fill in the boxes.
3. Confirm STAR Competition(s) is mandatory solely for participation at the National Leadership Conference. States have the authority to decide whether this requirement applies to picking up the registration packet and confirming the event/schedule accuracy OR attending a state-specific orientation.
4. At the conclusion of the presentation, verify the evaluator scores and fill in the information below. Calculate the final score and ask for evaluators' verification. Place this form in front of the completed rubrics and staple all items related to the presentation together.
5. At the end of the competition in the room, double-check all scores, names and *team* numbers to ensure accuracy. Sort results by *team* order and turn them into the Lead Consultant.
6. Check with the Lead Consultant if there are any questions regarding the evaluation process.

ROOM CONSULTANT CHECK			POINTS
<b>Confirm STAR Competition(s)</b> 0 or 1 point	Confirmed STAR Competition(s) schedule in the FCCLA Adviser Portal by the deadline (National Leadership Conference Only)		
	0 No	1 Yes	
<b>Event Online Orientation Form</b> 0 or 1 point	0 Online Orientation Form not completed in the Student Portal by the deadline	1 Online Orientation Form completed in the Student Portal by the deadline	
<b>Display Set-Up</b> 0 or 1 point	0 Participants did not set up their display within allotted time period	1 Participants set up display during allotted time period	
<b>Display Dimensions</b> 0 or 1 point	0 Display does not fit with the appropriate dimensions/objects not returned within display after presentation	1 Display fits with the appropriate dimensions/objects returned within display after presentation	
<b>Project Identification Page</b> 0 or 1 point	0 Project ID page is missing or incomplete	1 Project ID page is present and completed correctly	
<b>Project Summary Form Submission Proof</b> 0 or 1 point	0 Project Summary Form Submission missing	1 Project Summary Form Submission present	
<b>Punctuality</b> 0 or 1 point	0 Participant was late for presentation	1 Participant was on time for presentation	
<b>Dress Code</b> 0 or 1 point	0 Event dress code was not followed	1 Event dress code was followed	
<b>EVALUATORS' SCORES</b>			<b>ROOM CONSULTANT TOTAL</b> (8 Points Possible)
Evaluator 1: _____	Initials: _____		
Evaluator 2: _____	Initials: _____		
Evaluator 3: _____	Initials: _____		
Total Score: _____	Divided by # of Evaluators = <b>AVERAGE EVALUATOR SCORE</b>		<b>AVERAGE EVALUATOR SCORE</b> (92 Points Possible)
	Rounded only to the nearest hundredth (i.e., 79.99 not 80.00)		<b>FINAL SCORE</b> (Average Evaluator Score plus Room Consultant Score)

**RATING ACHIEVED** (circle one)    **Gold:** 90–100    **Silver:** 70–89.99    **Bronze:** 1–69.99

**VERIFICATION OF FINAL SCORE & RATING** (please initial)

Evaluator 1: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator 2: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator 3: \_\_\_\_\_ Adult Room Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_ Event Lead Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_

## FOOD INNOVATIONS

### LEVEL 1 RUBRIC

Participant Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Chapter: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Team #: \_\_\_\_\_ Station #: \_\_\_\_\_ Level: \_\_\_\_\_

DISPLAY						POINTS
<b>FCCLA Planning Process Summary Page</b> 0–10 points	<b>0</b> Planning Process Summary not provided	<b>1 2 3</b> Planning Process steps are not clearly summarized or are inadequate	<b>4 5 6</b> All Planning Process steps are summarized	<b>7 8</b> Evidence that the Planning Process was utilized to plan project	<b>9 10</b> The Planning Process is used to plan the project. Each step is fully explained. No more than 1 page	
<b>Original Prototype Formula(s)</b> 0–10 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1 2 3</b> Missing either original, modified or final version(s). Formula(s) inconsistent with food topic or participant level. Modifications and supporting evidence for best option poorly detailed	<b>4 5 6</b> Original, modified and final version(s) presented. Formula(s) mostly matches food topic and participant level. Modifications and supporting evidence for best option detailed	<b>7 8</b> Original, modified and final version(s) presented. Formula(s) matches food topic and participant level. Modifications and supporting evidence for best option detailed	<b>9 10</b> Original, modified and final version(s) well presented. Formula(s) clearly matches food topic and participant level. Modifications and supporting evidence for best option well detailed	
<b>Product Testing Method</b> 0–10 points	<b>0</b> No evidence of product testing provided	<b>1 2 3</b> Product tested less than 2 times. Focus group does not meet evaluation criteria (see specifications)	<b>4 5 6</b> Product tested 2 times. Focus groups meet evaluation criteria (see specifications). Method(s) of evaluation and results loosely detailed	<b>7 8</b> Product tested 2 times. Focus groups meet evaluation criteria (see specifications). Method(s) of evaluation and results detailed	<b>9 10</b> Product tested 2 times. Focus groups meet evaluation criteria (see specifications). Method(s) of evaluation and results well detailed	
<b>Process Storyboard</b> 0–2 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Product and testing stages documented. Less than 10 photos included	<b>2</b> Product and testing stages well documented. Provided at least 10 photos			
<b>Nutrition Information</b> 0–5 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1 2</b> Nutrition information does not meet specification requirements	<b>3</b> Nutrition fact label does not follow FDA guidelines. Required nutrition information poorly detailed. (See specifications)	<b>4</b> Nutrition fact label clearly follows FDA guidelines. Required nutrition information detailed. (See specifications)	<b>5</b> Nutrition fact label clearly follows FDA guidelines. Required nutrition information well detailed. (See specifications)	
<b>Equipment, Safety and Sanitation</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Equipment, safety and sanitation list poorly detailed	<b>2</b> Equipment, safety and sanitation list included, but lacks detail	<b>3</b> Equipment, safety and sanitation list well detailed		
<b>Product Summary</b> 0–2 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Product name, target market and expected appeal poorly detailed	<b>2</b> Product name, target market and expected appeal well detailed			
<b>Actual and Suggested Pricing</b> 0–2 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Actual cost of production for one serving/package and suggested retail price poorly detailed	<b>2</b> Actual cost of production for one serving/package and suggested retail price well detailed			
<b>Display Appearance</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Display has many errors and is not aesthetically pleasing	<b>2</b> The display is neat, legible and professional, but has grammar and spelling errors and minimal appeal	<b>3</b> Display is neat, legible, professional and creative with correct grammar and spelling		
SUGGESTED PRODUCT PACKAGING						POINTS
<b>Design Effectiveness</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Model lacks creativity. Somewhat effective in containing, shipping and storing. List of suggested packaging materials poorly detailed	<b>2</b> Model is creative and innovative. Effective in containing, shipping and storing. List of suggested packaging materials detailed	<b>3</b> Model is creative and innovative. Highly effective in containing, shipping and storing. List of suggested packaging materials well detailed		
<b>Marketability</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Target audience not considered in packaging. Required information loosely detailed. (See	<b>2</b> Packaging appeals to target audience. All appropriate information included. (See	<b>3</b> Packaging appeals to target audience. All appropriate information well detailed. (See		

		specifications)	specifications)	specifications)		
--	--	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	--	--

  

<b>Model Appearance</b> 0–2 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Packaging has many errors and is not aesthetically pleasing	<b>2</b> Packaging is neat, legible, professional and creative with correct grammar and spelling			
---------------------------------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	--	--

  

ORAL PRESENTATION						POINTS
<b>Organization/Delivery</b> 0–10 points	<b>0</b> Presentation is not complete or presented briefly and does not cover components of the project	<b>1 2 3</b> The presentation covers some or all topic elements with limited information	<b>4 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> 0–4 points	<b>0</b> No evidence	<b>1</b> Product choice explanation brief and product choice is not thought out or appropriate for topic and audience	<b>2</b> Product choice explanation clear and thorough. Product choice is appropriate for topic and audience	<b>3</b> Product choice explanation clear and thorough. Some evidence that the product choice was thought out and appropriate for topic and target audience	<b>4</b> Product choice explanation clear and thorough. It is evident that the product choice was thought out and highly appropriate for topic and target audience	
<b>Knowledge of Food Science, Dietetics and Nutrition</b> 0–4 points	<b>0</b> Little or no evidence of subject matter knowledge	<b>1</b> Some evidence of subject matter knowledge	<b>2</b> Knowledge is evident but not effectively used in presentation, food science prototype area not mentioned	<b>3</b> Knowledge is evident and shared at times in the presentation, food science prototype area mentioned	<b>4</b> Knowledge is evident and incorporated throughout the presentation and included food science prototype area	
<b>Relationship of Family and Consumer Sciences Coursework and Standards</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> No evidence of relationship between FCS coursework and project	<b>1</b> Limited evidence of relationship between FCS coursework and project	<b>2</b> Relationship between FCS coursework and project is evident and shared at times	<b>3</b> Relationship between FCS coursework and project is evident and explained well		
<b>Use of Display During Presentation</b> 0–5 points	<b>0</b> Display not used during presentation	<b>1 2</b> Display and visuals used minimally during presentation	<b>3 4</b> Display and visuals incorporated throughout presentation	<b>5</b> Presentation moves seamlessly between oral presentation and display		
<b>Voice—pitch, tempo, volume</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Voice qualities not 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		
<b>Body Language</b> 0–2 points	<b>0</b> Uses inappropriate gestures, posture or mannerisms, avoids eye contact	<b>1</b> Gestures, posture, mannerisms and eye contact is inconsistent	<b>2</b> Gestures, posture, mannerisms, and eye contact are appropriate			
<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> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Did not answer evaluators' questions	<b>1</b> Unable to answer some questions and/or given with hesitation and/or inaccurate	<b>2</b> Gave appropriate responses to evaluators' questions	<b>3</b> Responses to questions were appropriate and given without hesitation		
<b>Evaluator's Comments—Include two things done well and two opportunities for improvement:</b>					<b>TOTAL</b> <b>(92 Points Possible)</b>	
					<b>Evaluator #:</b> _____	
					<b>Evaluator Initials:</b> _____	
					<b>RC Initials:</b> _____	



## FOOD INNOVATIONS

### LEVEL 2 RUBRIC

Participant Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Chapter: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Team #: \_\_\_\_\_ Station #: \_\_\_\_\_ Level: \_\_\_\_\_

DISPLAY						POINTS
<b>FCCLA Planning Process Summary Page</b> 0–10 points	<b>0</b> Planning Process Summary not provided	<b>1 2 3</b> Planning Process steps are not clearly summarized or are inadequate	<b>4 5 6</b> All Planning Process steps are summarized	<b>7 8</b> Evidence that the Planning Process was utilized to plan project	<b>9 10</b> The Planning Process is used to plan the project. Each step is fully explained. No more than 1 page	
<b>Original Prototype Formula(s)</b> 0–10 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1 2 3</b> Missing either original, modified or final version(s). Formula(s) inconsistent with food topic or participant level. Modifications and supporting evidence for best option poorly detailed	<b>4 5 6</b> Original, modified and final version(s) presented. Formula(s) mostly matches food topic and participant level. Modifications and supporting evidence for best option detailed	<b>7 8</b> Original, modified and final version(s) presented. Formula(s) matches food topic and participant level. Modifications and supporting evidence for best option detailed	<b>9 10</b> Original, modified and final version(s) well presented. Formula(s) clearly matches food topic and participant level. Modifications and supporting evidence for best option well detailed	
<b>Product Testing Method</b> 0–10 points	<b>0</b> No evidence of product testing provided	<b>1 2 3</b> Product tested less than 2 times. Focus group does not meet evaluation criteria (see specifications)	<b>4 5 6</b> Product tested 2 times. Focus groups meet evaluation criteria (see specifications). Method(s) of evaluation and results loosely detailed	<b>7 8</b> Product tested 2 times. Focus groups meet evaluation criteria (see specifications). Method(s) of evaluation and results detailed	<b>9 10</b> Product tested 2 times. Focus groups meet evaluation criteria (see specifications). Method(s) of evaluation and results well detailed	
<b>Process Storyboard</b> 0–2 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Product and testing stages documented. Less than 15 photos included	<b>2</b> Product and testing stages well documented. Provided at least 15 photos			
<b>Nutrition Information</b> 0–5 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1 2</b> Nutrition information does not meet specification requirements	<b>3</b> Nutrition fact label does not follow FDA guidelines. Required nutrition information poorly detailed. (See specifications)	<b>4</b> Nutrition fact label clearly follows FDA guidelines. Required nutrition information detailed. (See specifications)	<b>5</b> Nutrition fact label clearly follows FDA guidelines. Required nutrition information well detailed. (See specifications)	
<b>Equipment, Safety and Sanitation</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Equipment, safety and sanitation list poorly detailed, but incorporates ServSafe or equivalent local/state food safety requirements. Photos included	<b>2</b> Equipment, safety and sanitation list included, but lacks detail. Equipment, safety and sanitation list incorporates ServSafe or equivalent local/state food safety requirements, but lacks detail. Photos included	<b>3</b> Equipment, safety and sanitation list incorporates ServSafe or equivalent local/state food safety requirements well detailed. Photos included		
<b>Product Summary</b> 0–2 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Product name, target market, expected appeal and sensory evaluation methods poorly detailed	<b>2</b> Product name, target market, expected appeal and sensory evaluation methods well detailed			
<b>Actual and Suggested Pricing</b> 0–2 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Process for determining actual cost for one serving/package of production and suggested retail price poorly detailed	<b>2</b> Process for determining actual cost for one serving/package of production and suggested retail price well detailed			
<b>Display Appearance</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Display has many errors and is not aesthetically pleasing	<b>2</b> The display is neat, legible and professional, but has grammar and spelling errors and minimal appeal	<b>3</b> Display is neat, legible, professional and creative with correct grammar and spelling		
SUGGESTED PRODUCT PACKAGING						POINTS
<b>Design Effectiveness</b>	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Model lacks creativity.	<b>2</b> Model is creative and	<b>3</b> Model is creative and		



0–3 points		Somewhat effective in containing, shipping and storing. List of suggested packaging materials poorly detailed. Shipping issues not considered	innovative. Effective in containing, shipping and storing. List of suggested packaging materials detailed. Shipping issues considered	innovative. Highly effective in containing, shipping and storing. List of suggested packaging materials well detailed. Shipping issues considered		
------------	--	---	---	---	--	--

<b>Marketability</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Target audience not considered in packaging. Required information loosely detailed. (See specifications)	<b>2</b> Packaging appeals to target audience. All appropriate information included. (See specifications)	<b>3</b> Packaging appeals to target audience. All appropriate information well detailed. (See specifications)		
<b>Model Appearance</b> 0–2 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Packaging has many errors and is not aesthetically pleasing	<b>2</b> Packaging is neat, legible, professional and creative with correct grammar and spelling			

## ORAL PRESENTATION POINTS

<b>Organization/Delivery</b> 0–10 points	<b>0</b> Presentation is not complete or presented briefly and does not cover components of the project	<b>1 2 3</b> The presentation covers some or all topic elements with limited information	<b>4 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> 0–4 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 topic and audience	<b>2</b> Product choice explanation was clear and thorough. Product choice is appropriate for topic and audience	<b>3</b> Product choice explanation was clear and thorough. Some evidence that the product choice was thought out and appropriate for topic and target audience	<b>4</b> Product choice explanation was clear and thorough. It is evident that the product choice was thought out and highly appropriate for topic and target audience	
<b>Knowledge of Food Science, Dietetics and Nutrition</b> 0–4 points	<b>0</b> Little or no evidence of subject matter knowledge	<b>1</b> Some evidence of subject matter knowledge	<b>2</b> Knowledge is evident but not effectively used in presentation, food science prototype area not mentioned	<b>3</b> Knowledge is evident and shared at times in the presentation, food science prototype area mentioned	<b>4</b> Knowledge is evident and incorporated throughout the presentation and included food science prototype area	
<b>Relationship of Family and Consumer Sciences Coursework and Standards</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> No evidence of relationship between FCS coursework and project. National program not identified	<b>1</b> Limited evidence of relationship between FCS coursework and project. National Program not identified	<b>2</b> Relationship between FCS coursework and project is evident and shared at times. National Program identified	<b>3</b> Relationship between FCS coursework and project is evident, National Program identified and both explained well		
<b>Use of Display During Presentation</b> 0–5 points	<b>0</b> Display not used during presentation	<b>1 2</b> Display and visuals used minimally during presentation	<b>3 4</b> Display and visuals incorporated throughout presentation	<b>5</b> Presentation moves seamlessly between oral presentation and display		
<b>Voice—pitch, tempo, volume</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Voice qualities not 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		
<b>Body Language</b> 0–2 points	<b>0</b> Uses inappropriate gestures, posture or mannerisms, avoids eye contact	<b>1</b> Gestures, posture, mannerisms and eye contact is inconsistent	<b>2</b> Gestures, posture, mannerisms, and eye contact are appropriate			
<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> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Did not answer evaluators' questions	<b>1</b> Unable to answer some questions and/or given with hesitation and/or inaccurate	<b>2</b> Gave appropriate responses to evaluators' questions	<b>3</b> Responses to questions were appropriate and given without hesitation		

Evaluator's Comments—Include two things done well and two opportunities for improvement:					<b>TOTAL</b> <b>(92 Points Possible)</b>	
					Evaluator #: _____	
					Evaluator Initials: _____	
					RC Initials: _____	

## FOOD INNOVATIONS

### LEVELS 3 & 4 RUBRIC

Participant Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Chapter: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Team #: \_\_\_\_\_ Station #: \_\_\_\_\_ Level: \_\_\_\_\_

DISPLAY						POINTS
<b>FCCLA Planning Process Summary Page</b> 0–10 points	<b>0</b> Planning Process Summary not provided	<b>1 2 3</b> Planning Process steps are not clearly summarized or are inadequate	<b>4 5 6</b> All Planning Process steps are summarized	<b>7 8</b> Evidence that the Planning Process was utilized to plan project	<b>9 10</b> The Planning Process is used to plan the project. Each step is fully explained. No more than 1 page	
<b>Original Prototype Formula(s)</b> 0–10 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1 2 3</b> Missing either original, modified or final version(s). Formula(s) inconsistent with food topic or participant level. Modifications and supporting evidence for best option poorly detailed	<b>4 5 6</b> Original, modified and final version(s) presented. Formula(s) mostly matches food topic and participant level. Modifications and supporting evidence for best option detailed	<b>7 8</b> Original, modified and final version(s) presented. Formula(s) matches food topic and participant level. Modifications and supporting evidence for best option detailed	<b>9 10</b> Original, modified and final version(s) well presented. Formula(s) clearly matches food topic and participant level. Modifications and supporting evidence for best option well detailed	
<b>Product Testing Method</b> 0–10 points	<b>0</b> No evidence of product testing provided	<b>1 2 3</b> Product tested less than three times. Focus group does not meet evaluation criteria (see specifications)	<b>4 5 6</b> Product tested three times. Focus groups meet evaluation criteria (see specifications). Method(s) of evaluation and results loosely detailed	<b>7 8</b> Product tested three times. Focus groups meet evaluation criteria (see specifications). Method(s) of evaluation and results detailed	<b>9 10</b> Product tested three times. Focus groups meet evaluation criteria (see specifications). Method(s) of evaluation and results well detailed	
<b>Process Storyboard</b> 0–2 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Product and testing stages documented. Less than 20 photos included	<b>2</b> Product and testing stages well documented. Provided at least 20 photos			
<b>Nutrition Information</b> 0–5 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1 2</b> Nutrition information does not meet specification requirements	<b>3</b> Nutrition fact label does not follow FDA guidelines. Required nutrition information poorly detailed. (See specifications)	<b>4</b> Nutrition fact label clearly follows FDA guidelines. Required nutrition information detailed. (See specifications)	<b>5</b> Nutrition fact label clearly follows FDA guidelines. Required nutrition information well detailed. (See specifications)	
<b>Equipment, Safety and Sanitation</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Equipment, safety and sanitation list poorly detailed, but incorporates ServSafe or equivalent local/state food safety requirements. Photos included	<b>2</b> Equipment, safety and sanitation list incorporates ServSafe or equivalent local/state food safety requirements, but lacks detail. Photos included	<b>3</b> Equipment, safety and sanitation list incorporates ServSafe or equivalent local/state food safety requirements well detailed. Photos included		
<b>Product Summary</b> 0–2 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Product name, target market, expected appeal and sensory evaluation methods poorly detailed	<b>2</b> Product name, target market, expected appeal and sensory evaluation methods well detailed			
<b>Actual and Suggested Pricing</b> 0–2 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Process for determining actual cost for one serving/package of production and suggested retail price poorly detailed	<b>2</b> Process for determining actual cost for one serving/package of production and suggested retail price well detailed			
<b>Display Appearance</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Display has many errors and is not aesthetically pleasing	<b>2</b> The display is neat, legible and professional, but has grammar and spelling errors and minimal appeal	<b>3</b> Display is neat, legible, professional and creative with correct grammar and spelling		
SUGGESTED PRODUCT PACKAGING						POINTS
<b>Design Effectiveness</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Model lacks creativity. Somewhat effective in containing, shipping and	<b>2</b> Model is creative and innovative. Effective in containing, shipping and	<b>3</b> Model is creative and innovative. Highly effective in containing, shipping and		

		storing. List of suggested packaging materials poorly detailed. Shipping issues not considered	storing. List of suggested packaging materials detailed. Shipping issues considered	storing. List of suggested packaging materials well detailed. Shipping issues considered		
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

<b>Marketability</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Target audience not considered in packaging. Required information loosely detailed. (See specifications)	<b>2</b> Packaging appeals to target audience. All appropriate information included. (See specifications)	<b>3</b> Packaging appeals to target audience. All appropriate information well detailed. (See specifications)		
<b>Model Appearance</b> 0–2 points	<b>0</b> Not included	<b>1</b> Packaging has many errors and is not aesthetically pleasing	<b>2</b> Packaging is neat, legible, professional and creative with correct grammar and spelling			

## ORAL PRESENTATION

## POINTS

<b>Organization/Delivery</b> 0–10 points	<b>0</b> Presentation is not complete or presented briefly and does not cover components of the project	<b>1 2 3</b> The presentation covers some or all topic elements with limited information	<b>4 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> 0–4 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 topic and audience	<b>2</b> Product choice explanation was clear and thorough. Product choice is appropriate for topic and audience	<b>3</b> Product choice explanation was clear and thorough. Some evidence that the product choice was thought out and appropriate for topic and target audience	<b>4</b> Product choice explanation was clear and thorough. It is evident that the product choice was thought out and highly appropriate for topic and target audience	
<b>Knowledge of Food Science, Dietetics and Nutrition</b> 0–4 points	<b>0</b> Little or no evidence of subject matter knowledge	<b>1</b> Some evidence of subject matter knowledge	<b>2</b> Knowledge is evident but not effectively used in presentation, food science prototype area not mentioned	<b>3</b> Knowledge is evident and shared at times in the presentation, food science prototype area mentioned	<b>4</b> Knowledge is evident and incorporated throughout the presentation and included food science prototype area	
<b>Relationship of Family and Consumer Sciences Coursework and Standards</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> No evidence of relationship between FCS coursework, standards and project. Neither National Program nor career pathway identified	<b>1</b> Limited evidence of relationship between FCS coursework, standards and project. Either National Program or career pathway not identified	<b>2</b> Evidence of relationship between FCS coursework, standards and project. National Program and career pathway identified	<b>3</b> Detailed evidence of relationship between FCS coursework, standards and project. National Program and career pathway identified. All components explained well		
<b>Use of Display During Presentation</b> 0–5 points	<b>0</b> Display not used during presentation	<b>1 2</b> Display and visuals used minimally during presentation	<b>3 4</b> Display and visuals incorporated throughout presentation	<b>5</b> Presentation moves seamlessly between oral presentation and display		
<b>Voice—pitch, tempo, volume</b> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Voice qualities not 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		
<b>Body Language</b> 0–2 points	<b>0</b> Uses inappropriate gestures, posture or mannerisms, avoids eye contact	<b>1</b> Gestures, posture, mannerisms and eye contact is inconsistent	<b>2</b> Gestures, posture, mannerisms, and eye contact are appropriate			
<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> 0–3 points	<b>0</b> Did not answer evaluators' questions	<b>1</b> Unable to answer some questions and/or given with hesitation and/or inaccurate	<b>2</b> Gave appropriate responses to evaluators' questions	<b>3</b> Responses to questions were appropriate and given without hesitation		
<b>Evaluator's Comments—Include two things done well and two opportunities for improvement:</b>					<b>TOTAL</b> <b>(92 Points Possible)</b>	

Evaluator #: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator Initials: \_\_\_\_\_

RC Initials: \_\_\_\_\_