

Health Education

New for 2020-2021

Competitor orientation deleted from ILC.
Portfolio will be submitted electronically for ILC (no hard copies required).
Maximum portfolio pages have been reduced to a maximum of twenty (20).
Presentation time has been reduced to five (5) minutes.
Title page and formatting requirements have been updated.
Editorial changes have been made in the guidelines for clarity.
Rating sheet has been updated to reflect guideline changes.

Event Summary

Health Education provides members with the opportunity to gain knowledge and skills required to select a health-related concept or instructional objective, then prepare a lesson for a targeted group of learners, provide instruction, and evaluate results. This competitive event consists of a portfolio and presentation to judges and each team consists of 2-4 members. This event aims to inspire members to be proactive future health professionals by educating others on health-related concepts.

Dress Code Competitors must be in official HOSA uniform or in proper business attire. Bonus points will be awarded for [proper dress](#). All team members must be properly dressed to receive bonus points.

General Rules

1. Competitors in this event must be active members of HOSA in good standing in the membership division in which they are registered to compete (Middle School, Secondary or Postsecondary/Collegiate).
2. Competitors must be familiar with and adhere to the [“General Rules and Regulations of the HOSA Competitive Events Program \(GRR\).”](#)
3. 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.

The Health Lesson

4. The specific topic and goal of instruction will be the decision of the team and may not be repeated from previous years. The topic must be health-related. Team members may create their own media tools, or may use prepared media (video, software and/or print) as part of their lesson.
5. The team will determine a target audience for their lesson AND must present their lesson to a real audience. The content and delivery of the lesson must be appropriate to this audience.
6. The team will develop goals and objectives for the lesson, along with a detailed lesson plan. The team will also develop an appropriate method of evaluating instruction.

The Portfolio

7. Documentation of the lesson will be submitted electronically by ONE member of the team and formatted according to the instructions below. Each page will be counted and numbered (up to 20 pages maximum), beginning with the title page. Competitors may choose to bring their portfolio to ILC competition, to reference during the presentation, but no points are awarded on the rating sheet for doing so.
8. The portfolio will contain the following parts:
 - A. **Title Page:** Event Name, team member names, HOSA division, chapter number, school name, state/association, Title of lesson, target audience age or grade level, number of participants. One page only. (A creative design or pictures may be used but will not affect the score.)
 - B. **Lesson Plan Narrative:** A maximum of 3 pages describing the lesson, including the goal and plan for instruction. This should include data/research and supportive information about the selected topic.
 - C. **Lesson Outline:** A maximum of 2 pages of a timed outline that shows the segments of the lesson. This outline will help judges evaluate the opening, organization, delivery, and close of the instructional presentation.
 - D. **Materials:** A maximum of 9 pages of materials related to or used in the lesson. These materials may include, but are not limited to, photographs of the lesson, lesson handouts, scripts, worksheets, and multimedia printouts.
 - E. **Feedback Tools:** A maximum of 4 pages of lesson evaluation tools or feedback. These materials may include tests, written evaluations, surveys, or any other written feedback used to evaluate audience learning.
 - F. **Reference Page:** List the literature cited to give guidance to the portfolio. American Psychological Association (APA) is the preferred resource in Health Sciences. One page only. *Points will be awarded for compiling a clean, legible reference page, but the formatting of the reference page is not judged.*
 - G. Pages above the maximum allowance will not be evaluated and no points will be given for information in excess pages.
 - H. Pages will be:
 - i. one-sided, typed,
 - ii. in 12 pt. Arial font, double-spaced,
 - iii. on 8 ½" x 11" paper with 1" margins,
 - iv. numbered on top right side of each page (not counting title page), and have a Running header with last name, & name of event.
9. Reminder to refer to [GRR #24](#): By entering this event, competitor's materials become property of HOSA – Future Health Professionals, and are not returned to the competitors. Teams are encouraged to retain all original documents and videos, so that between each level of competition materials can be submitted as indicated. Materials will NOT be mailed or shared from Area/Regional to State or to International competition.

The Competitive Process

10. Presentation with Judges – All team members will report to the event site.
11. The presentation is to be no more than five (5) minutes. The timekeeper will announce the time when there is one (1) minute remaining in the presentation. The timekeeper will stop the presentation after five (5) total minutes and the team will be excused.

12. The purpose of the presentation is to communicate information about the project to the judges. The presentation **MUST** include:
 1. the goal of their instructional topic, instructional planning process, and, why they did what they did.
 2. the value of their lesson/topic to the chosen audience.
 3. the actual lesson highlighting the presentation outline, the use of presentation tools, and electronic media.
 4. the role that each team member played in the preparation and delivery of the lesson.
 5. the techniques they used to evaluate the effectiveness/impact of their instruction.
13. Teams should explain to the judges the items listed below in the rating sheet. All team members must take an active role in the presentation.
14. 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.
15. In the event of a tie, a tie breaker will be determined by the areas on the rating sheet section(s) with the highest point value in descending order.
16. By entering this event, the competitors grant permission for their portfolio contents to be used in HOSA publications and on the HOSA website.

Required Digital Uploads

17. The completed portfolio must be uploaded as a single document, pdf preferred, by **ONE** member of the team:
 - a. to Tallo for Secondary & Postsecondary/Collegiate divisions **OR**
 - b. to this [LINK](#) for Middle School division. Name of file **MUST** read: school name.state/association.member name.ILC2021
 - c. Uploads for ILC will be open from April 15th - May 15th for ILC qualified competitors only.

Instructions for uploading materials to Tallo (Secondary/Postsecondary divisions only) can be found [HERE](#).

NOTE: States have the option to use hard copy submissions instead of digital submissions. Please check with your State Advisor to determine what process is used in your state. For ILC, only digital submissions will be used for judging if uploaded by May 15th

Competitor Must Provide

- A .pdf of the portfolio electronically submitted by published deadline
- [Photo ID](#)
- #2 lead pencils with eraser (for evaluation)
- Notes on index cards or in electronic format for use during the presentation (optional)
- Watch with second hand (optional)

HEALTH EDUCATION – Judge’s Rating Sheet

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

One PDF file with Portfolio Uploaded Online*: Yes _____ No _____

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

| A. Quality of Portfolio | Excellent 5 points | Good 4 points | Average 3 points | Fair 2 points | Poor 0 points | JUDGE SCORE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------------|
| 1. Title Page | Event Name, team member names, HOSA division, chapter number, school name, state/association, Title of lesson, target audience age or grade level, number of participants. One page only. | | | | Portfolio not submitted OR all requirements are not met. | |
| 2. Reference Page | The reference page is included in the portfolio submission. | NA | NA | NA | Portfolio not submitted or no reference page is included in the portfolio. | |
| 3. Spelling, grammar, punctuation, neatness | There are no spelling or grammatical errors throughout the entire portfolio. The portfolio is very neat and presentable. | There are a few minor misspellings or grammatical errors that will be easy to fix to make it appeal to the viewer. The portfolio is neat, with only minor examples where the pages could be better organized. | There is a mix of good spelling and poor spelling or proper grammar and improper grammar. The portfolio is presentable, although some pages appear to be cluttered or busy. | There are either several misspellings or there is very little correct grammar present in the portfolio. Portfolio needs more organization or attention to detail. | Portfolio not submitted OR there are many misspellings and overall weakness within the portfolio. The portfolio looks unprofessional. | |
| 4. ALL PAGES are formatted correctly. | 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 and page number top right side of each page (not counting title page). | NA | NA | NA | Portfolio not submitted OR all requirements are not met. | |
| 5. Max Pages (no pages above 20 will be judged) | Pages do not exceed 20 total. | NA | NA | NA | Portfolio not submitted OR portfolio exceeds maximum page limit. | |

| A. Quality of Portfolio | Excellent 8 points | Good 6 points | Average 4 points | Fair 2 points | Poor 0 points | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|------------------------|
| 6. Lesson Plan Narrative | Narrative provides an outstanding description of the goal of the lesson, thoroughly outlining the instruction plan. | Narrative provides a good description of the goal of the lesson, mostly outlining the instruction plan | Narrative provides an adequate description of the goal of the lesson, fairly outlining the instruction plan. | The narrative somewhat describes the lesson plan goal and plan for instruction. | Portfolio not submitted OR The lesson plan narrative does not provide a description of the goal or plan for instruction. | |
| 7. Lesson Outline | The lesson was clearly defined with key elements, a timed outline, and a detailed explanation of the execution of the lesson. Clear evidence of the lesson is provided. The evidence provided shows the lesson had a strong opening, delivery and closing. | The timed outline provides explanation of the lesson format. Some details are provided to bring the instructional presentation to life. | The lesson outline adequately defines the details of the elements of the lesson. | Little evidence of a lesson plan outline is provided. | Portfolio not submitted OR outline is included in the lesson outline. No evidence of the instructional presentation were included. | |
| 8. Materials | Exceptional examples of teaching materials (such as lesson handouts, scripts, worksheets, multimedia printouts, photos, etc.) are showcased in this portfolio that highlight the quality of instruction provided during this lesson. | The lesson plan materials are good quality. They add value to the portfolio. | The materials developed for this lesson are average. They have a basic level of quality. | The lesson plan materials need extra attention to make them average quality. | Portfolio not submitted OR the lesson plan materials were poor quality and did not enhance the portfolio. | |
| 9. Feedback Tools | Exceptional examples of lesson feedback tools (such as tests, written evaluations, surveys, or other items to evaluate audience learning) are showcased in the portfolio and provided feedback from audience members. | Good examples of lesson feedback tools are provided in the portfolio. | The examples used to provide feedback were average and could use more attention to detail. | The feedback tools used to evaluate lesson plans were not effective. | Portfolio not submitted OR no feedback tools were provided. | |
| B. Presentation to Judges: | Excellent 10 points | Good 8 points | Average 6 points | Fair 4 points | Poor 0 point | JUDGE SCORE |
| 1. Objectives / accomplishments of project | The activities used in this lesson were detailed with clear objectives and several accomplishments were highlighted in the presentation. | The activities used in this lesson were mostly clear; objectives and accomplishments were highlighted. | The objectives and accomplishments in this lesson were somewhat highlighted in this presentation. | The objectives were somewhat clear, little demonstration of accomplishments was evident in the presentation. | The objectives in this lesson were not clear and there was little evidence of accomplishments made throughout the presentation. | |
| B. Presentation to Judges: | Excellent 10 points | Good 8 points | Average 6 points | Fair 4 points | Poor 0 point | JUDGE SCORE |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| 2. Inclusion of media/software | The team effectively described the inclusion of original and/or appropriate media / software in the presentation. | N/A | The team attempted to describe the original and /or appropriate media / software. More attention to detail is needed to be effective. | N/A | The team did not describe the use of media or software. to support their presentation. | |
| C. Presentation Delivery | Excellent 5 points | Good 4 points | Average 3 points | Fair 2 points | Poor 0 point | JUDGE SCORE |
| 1. Voice Pitch, tempo, volume, quality | Each competitor's voice was loud enough to hear. The competitors varied rate & volume to enhance the speech. Appropriate pausing was employed. | Each competitor spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The competitor s varied rate OR volume to enhance the speech. Pauses were attempted. | Each competitor could be heard most of the time. The competitors attempted to use some variety in vocal quality, but not always successfully. | Most of the competitor'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 competitors 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 competitor'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** & 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. | |
| 4. 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. | All but one person on the team was actively engaged in the presentation. | The team worked together relatively well. Some team members spoke more than others. | The team did not work effectively together. | One team member dominated the presentation. | |
| D. Quality of the Lesson: | Excellent 10 points | Good 8 points | Average 6 points | Fair 4 points | Poor 0 point | JUDGE SCORE |
| 1. Health related | Lesson is health related. | N/A | N/A | N/A | Either presentation OR portfolio not | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| | | | | | submitted OR lesson is not health related. | |
| 2. Meaningful, relevant, importance to audience | Lesson is exceptionally meaningful, relevant, and important for the audience. The topic is vital for this audience to know! | The lesson is relevant and important for the audience. The topic is beneficial for the audience. | The lesson offers some meaningful and important content but it is unclear if this topic is beneficial to the audience or not. | There is little value connected to this lesson for the audience. | Either presentation OR portfolio not submitted OR the lesson is not relevant and does not hold a sense of importance to the audience. The topic in no way connects to the audience. | |
| 3. Engaging, interesting | The lesson is extremely engaging and will captivate the interest of the audience. | The lesson is engaging and interesting to the audience. | Some of the lesson is engaging and considered moderately interesting by the audience. | The lesson is slightly engaging to the audience | Either presentation OR portfolio not submitted OR the lesson does not appear to be engaging. More effort needed to hold the interest of the audience. | |
| 4. Appropriateness to targeted audience | The quality of instruction was appropriate for the age of the audience. Much thought and consideration went into the instruction to assure the content would be well-received. | Instruction was appropriate to targeted audience. | The instruction was moderately age-appropriate to the targeted audience. | Instruction was slightly appropriate for the targeted audience. | Either presentation OR portfolio not submitted OR the instruction was inappropriate for the targeted audience. | |
| 5. Lesson creativity and originality | The lesson is highly creative, original, and incorporates real and authentic learning. | The lesson is unique and original in content. | The lesson plan was mostly creative and only somewhat original in content. | The lesson was fairly creative but lacked original content. | Either presentation OR portfolio not submitted OR the lesson lacked creativity and originality. More effort needed to connect with your audience. | |
| Total Points (147): | | | | | | |

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

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