

New for 2020-2021

Competitor orientation deleted from ILC.

No reference page or verification form required. Quality of research and verification of the live community presentation have been added to points on the rating sheet instead.

Presentation time has been decreased to nine (9) minutes.

There are no required digital Tallo uploads for ILC.

Event Summary

Public Health provides HOSA members with the opportunity to develop an effective, dynamic and creative presentation that informs the public about an important public health issue. The team consists of 2-6 members. The event consists of two rounds. In the initial round the team has the opportunity to convince a panel of judges of the need to view their entire presentation. The highest scoring teams will advance to Round 2 where a panel of judges will view the entire presentation. The event aims to inspire members to be proactive health professionals by producing a presentation that educates the public in regard to a selected public health topic.

2020-2021 Public Health Topic: Reducing Health Disparities: Social Determinants of Health Can Help!

According to www.healthypeople.gov, we know that poverty limits access to healthy foods and safe neighborhoods and that more education is a predictor of better health. We also know that differences in health are striking in communities with poor Social Determinants of Health (SDOH). Things such as unstable housing, low income, unsafe neighborhoods, prevalence of discrimination and racism, healthcare access issues, or substandard education lead to health inequities. By applying what we know about SDOH, we can not only improve individual and population health but also advance health equity.

In your public health presentation, your team should educate the public on ways to improve the social determinants of health in your community. How can your HOSA chapter play a role? What can HOSA do to address the social determinants of health in your community?

Consider presenting to relevant stakeholders in your community such as a hospital board, city and county commissioners, school boards, the Mayor's office, public health department, etc. or other community groups who can be part of influencing change on the areas you highlight.

Dress Code Competitors must be in official HOSA uniform or in proper business attire during the event orientation, and bonus points will be awarded for [proper dress](#) at the event orientation. During the actual event, competitors may wear official HOSA uniform, proper business attire, costumes or any attire appropriate to the presentation. There will not be a dress bonus for presentation dress since teams may wear whatever they wish to wear.

General Rules

1. Competitors in this event must be active members of HOSA in good standing.
2. Middle School, Secondary or Postsecondary/Collegiate Divisions are eligible to compete

in this event.

3. Competitors must be familiar with and adhere to the "[General Rules and Regulations of the HOSA Competitive Events Program \(GRR\)](#)."
4. 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.

Official References

For more information on the 2020-2021 Topic, visit:

- <https://www.cdc.gov/socialdeterminants/index.htm>
- <https://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/topics-objectives/topic/social-determinants-of-health>

For more information about Public Health, in general, teams are encouraged to visit:

- [U.S. Public Health Service](#)
- [American Public Health Association](#)

Community Presentation

5. The goal of the event is to create and deliver a presentation to a live community audience designed to inform the public about a Public Health issue.
6. The presentation must effectively inform the public about the annual topic, when presented to groups in the middle school / high school / postsecondary / college / or community.
7. Presentations for the live community audience will be no more than nine (9) minutes in length.
8. Presentation tools such as posters, music, props, costumes, and other presentation tools may be used, with the goal of developing and presenting a creative and effective public health presentation. Basically, anything goes. *The more creative, powerful and effective the presentation, the better.* There is no limit to the presentation tools or techniques.
9. Teams should determine their target audience and make a plan for how, when, and where they will deliver their presentation to the community.

ROUND ONE: Short Presentation, Convince the Judges!

10. Round One will give each team four (4) minutes to convince the judges of the power and effectiveness of the team's community presentation. What can you do in 4 minutes to convince the judges that they want to see your full presentation? Plan your time carefully and "wow" the judges with your presentation.
11. Presentation aids can be used; however, additional set-up time will not be provided.
12. The timekeeper shall present a flash card advising the competitors when there is one (1) minute remaining. Teams will be stopped at four minutes.
13. The top middle school, secondary and postsecondary/collegiate teams from Round One will advance to Round Two, the full presentation. Number of advancing teams will be determined by criteria met in Round One and space available for Round Two.

ROUND TWO: Full Presentation

14. The full presentation (Round Two) to the judges **should be the same presentation that was performed in the public / community**. Basically, anything goes. The more creative, powerful and effective the presentation, the better. There is no limit to the presentation tools or techniques.
15. Prior to beginning the full presentation for judges, the team will state the date and audience to which the full presentation was given (i.e., The following presentation was completed at the Mayor's office on May 1, 2021). This gives verification for judges that the team presented in the community.
16. 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.
17. The full presentation will be a maximum of nine (9) minutes in length. A time card will be shown with one (1) minute remaining, and the presentation will be stopped after 9 minutes.
18. Teams will have 5 minutes to set up in preparation for their presentation, and 3 minutes to tear down after their presentation. Judges will also use this 3 minute tear down time to complete the rating sheet.
19. Competitors may NOT interact with the judges and may NOT give them anything before, after, or during the presentation.
20. All team members must take an active (speaking) role in the full presentation.
21. There will be no observers in this event, but the event may be videotaped at the International level.

Supplies

22. For both rounds, teams will NOT have access to electricity. Battery powered equipment (such as a laptop) are permitted. Internet connection is NOT provided.
23. For both rounds, HOSA will provide a table. All other equipment and presentation needs must be provided by the team.

Final Scoring

24. Scores from Round One will be used to determine advancement to Round Two but will NOT be included in the final score.
25. 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.

Competitors Must Provide:

- #2 lead pencils with eraser to complete evaluations
- [Photo ID](#)
- Watch with second hand (optional)
- Index cards or electronic notecards (optional)
- Presenters must bring their own equipment, and any special supplies needed to deliver the presentation

PUBLIC HEATH – Judge’s Rating Sheet Round 1

Section # _____
Team #: _____

Level: _____MS _____ SS _____ PS/Collegiate
Judge’s Signature _____

A. Presentation Content	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Community Presentation Confirmed	Community presentation date and audience stated for judges prior to presentation.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Community presentation not confirmed.	
2. Understanding of issue/topic	The Public Health issue/topic is clearly defined and streamlined into the presentation. The team shared the complexity of the public health issue.	The public health issue/topic is stated and appropriate for the presentation. Understanding of the issue or topic is lacking small details.	The understanding of the public health issue/topic is average and not fully threaded into the presentation.	The public health issue/topic is not clearly communicated throughout the presentation.	No evidence of understanding of the public health issue or topic.	
3. Importance of information presented	The interpretation of the topic/issue was presented in a highly-effective and compelling manner that reinforced the information gathered on this year’s topic.	The interpretation of this year’s topic/issue was well-received by the audience.	The information presented was done in a way that somewhat connected to this year’s topic/theme.	The information presented provided a slight connection to this year’s topic/theme.	Information was not presented in a way that made sense to the audience or did not cover this year’s topic.	
4. Flow and logic of content	The team demonstrated command of the topic throughout the presentation, it flows in a logical, clear and informed manner. Excellent transitions between competitors.	The team mentions the topic and its significance. The flow is mostly smooth and provides an informed approach to the material. Proficient transitions between competitors.	The flow of the content is somewhat choppy and disjointed.	The flow of the content is out of order and does not make sense.	There is no evidence of flow or logic behind the presented content.	
5. Engagement	The team actively engaged the audience with a well-practiced and delivered opening and maintained the attention of the audience throughout the presentation.	The team used techniques to attempt to retain the interest of the audience.	The team attempted to engage audience interest, but the effort was incomplete, disorganized, or was negated by poor delivery.	The team did not use any techniques to engage audience interest, or the attempt was made in an incoherent and disorganized fashion	The team did not capture the attention of the audience.	
	Excellent 15 points	Good 12 points	Average 9 points	Fair 6 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
6. Effectiveness/ Impact Was the presentation convincing? Do the judges want to see the team’s full community presentation?	The presentation was extremely effective and convincing. Judges absolutely want to see the team’s full community presentation.	The presentation was effective and appealing to judges. They are interested in seeing the team’s full presentation.	The presentation was somewhat effective and appealing. The judges might be interested in seeing the full presentation, but are having a hard time making up their mind.	Some of the presentation lacked effectiveness and did not leave a strong impact on the audience/ judges.	The judges do not want to see the full community presentation.	

B. 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 competitors 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 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.	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.	
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.	N/A	The team worked together relatively well. Some team members spoke more than others	N/A	One team member dominated the presentation.	
Total Points (85):						

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

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

PUBLIC HEALTH – Judge’s Rating Sheet Round Two

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

A. Presentation Content	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Community Presentation Confirmed	Community presentation date and audience stated for judges prior to presentation.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Community presentation not confirmed.	
2. Importance of information presented	The interpretation of the topic/issue was presented in a highly-effective and compelling manner that reinforced the information gathered on this year’s topic.	The interpretation of this year’s topic/issue was well-received by the audience.	The information presented was done in a way that somewhat connected to this year’s topic/theme.	The information presented provided a slight connection to this year’s topic/theme.	Information was not presented in a way that made sense to the audience or did not cover this year’s topic.	
3. Overall Understanding of issue/topic	The public health issue/topic is clearly revealed and well-structured into the presentation. The team clearly and accurately shares the complexity of the public health issue.	The public health issue/topic is stated and appropriate for presentation. Understanding of the issue or topic is lacking small details.	The understanding of the public health issue/topic is average and not fully threaded into the presentation.	The public health issue/topic is not clearly communicated throughout the presentation.	No evidence of understanding of the public health issue or topic.	
4. Effectiveness/ Impact	The presentation was extremely effective and clearly educated the public on the given topic. It is explicitly clear that a positive impact was made on the community as a result of seeing the team’s presentation	The presentation was effective and educated the public on the given topic. A positive impact on the community was most likely made as a result of seeing the team’s presentation	The presentation was somewhat effective and may or may not have educated the public on the given topic. It is unclear whether or not a positive impact on the community was made as a result of seeing the team’s presentation	The presentation lacked effectiveness in most key areas and only sparingly educated the public. It is not evident that a positive impact was made on the community as a result of seeing the team’s presentation.	The presentation was not effective and did not make any kind of positive impact on the community.	
5. Captivating	The team actively engaged the audience with a well-executed presentation and maintained the attention of the audience throughout.	The team used techniques to attempt to retain the interest of the audience.	The team attempted to engage audience interest, but the effort was incomplete, disorganized, or was negated by poor delivery.	The team did not use any techniques to engage audience interest, or the attempt was made in an incoherent and disorganized fashion.	The team did not capture the attention of the audience whatsoever.	

B. Presentation Content	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
6. Distinction	The team provided a highly creative, original, and imaginative presentation that was highly innovative. It stood out above others!	The presentation was unique and offered a fresh approach to the topic; however it was missing the “wow” factor.	The presentation was adequately imaginative. Would like to see more creativity and innovation in the approach to the presentation.	The presentation was unoriginal and little imagination was included in the presentation.	No evidence of imagination or creativity was used in the presentation.	
7. Research / Resources	There is evidence of significant and reliable research in the information provided in the presentation.	There is evidence of some researched information in the presentation.	The presentation could benefit from increased researched based information.	There is minimal evidence incorporated into the presentation.	There is no evidence of research in the presentation.	
C. Presentation Organization	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Flow, Logic, and Transitions	There is evidence of practice and consistency of presentation flow and transitions.	There is evidence of practice and some consistency in presentation flow and transitions.	The presentation could benefit from a more consistent flow and transitions.	More practice is needed to achieve an authentic flow in the presentation.	The entire presentation is delivered with a lack of attention to flow and transitions.	
2. Opening	The team clearly establishes the occasion and purpose of the presentation, grabs the audience's attention and makes the audience want to listen.	The team introduced the presentation adequately, including an attention getter and established the occasion and purpose of the presentation.	The team introduced the topic but did not clearly establish the occasion and/or purpose of the speech. Weak attention getter.	The team failed to introduce the presentation. Or, the introduction was not useful in indicating what the presentation was about.	The team did not provide any kind of opening statement or action.	
3. Closing	The team prepares the audience for ending and ends memorably. They drew the presentation to a close with an effective memorable statement.	The team adequately concluded the presentation and ended with a closing statement. Clear ending but ends with little impact.	The team concluded the presentation in a disorganized fashion and/or did not have a closing statement.	Audience has no idea conclusion is coming. Team's message was unclear.	The team ended the presentation abruptly without an effective conclusion.	
D. Presentation Materials	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Visual Aids / Presentation Materials	Visual aids, props, and/or costumes add value and relevance to the presentation and are not used as substitutes. They help to tell a story and offer a better understanding of the subject. Creativity is evident.	Visual aids, props and/or costumes support the theme of the presentation and complement the overall message.	Most of the visual aids, props and/or costumes add value to the presentation and support the overall message.	The visual aids used offered minimal support or missed the opportunity to enhance the overall presentation.	No visual aids were used to complement the presentation.	

E. 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.	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 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.	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.	
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 of the team members had little participation.	The team did not work effectively together.	One team member dominated the presentation.	
Total Points (115):						