

Public Health



New for 2023 – 2024

These guidelines are written for ILC. **States may modify events or have different event processes and deadlines.** Be sure to check with your Local/State Advisor (or state website) to determine how the event is implemented for the regional/area or state conference. Editorial updates have been made.

CALIFORNIA HOSA

RCE (Virtual Regional Competitive Events)

***REQUIRED DIGITAL UPLOAD**

- ONE Team member must provide a link to a four (4) minute short presentation.
- The presentation link must be pasted in the new Digital Upload System making sure it is sharable to all. This is what the judges will use to judge virtually. The presentation is one to convince the judges.
- The Rubric that the judges will be using for the California RCE Presentation is the Round 1 presentation rating sheet.

SLC (State Leadership Conference)

*Those who qualify from RCE will be posted on the secure website accessible by your advisor at Cal-HOSA.org.

- Round 1 (the four (4) minute short presentation) will be pre-judged.
- ONE Team member must provide a link to the four (4) minute short presentation.
- The presentation link must be pasted in the new Digital Upload System making sure it is sharable to all. This is what the judges will use to judge virtually. The presentation is one to convince the judges.
- The Rubric that the judges will be using is the Round 1 presentation rating sheet.
- Round 2 will be in person in Anaheim, CA

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 Two 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 about a selected public health topic.

2023-2024 Public Health Topic: Technology Addiction: How To Protect Ourselves

Technology use, especially the increasing use of social media, has become a concern among teens and young adults. Technology addiction can be characterized by compulsive behavior that is difficult or

impossible to quit, despite the adverse effects it has on the individual and their well-being. Types of Technology Addiction could include gaming, social media, online gambling, or online shopping, as examples. Information regarding the effects of social media specifically can be found in the Surgeon General's Advisory on the Youth Mental Health Crisis, found [HERE](#).

Successful public health presentations should educate the public (or other teens/young adults) about how to protect themselves from technology addiction. The presentation should include a definition of technology addiction, signs and symptoms, and ways to avoid technology addiction.

Sponsorship

This competitive event is sponsored by the [United States Public Health Service](#)



Dress Code

Competitors may wear official HOSA uniform, proper business attire, costumes, or any attire appropriate to the presentation for both rounds. There will not be dress bonus points since attire will vary significantly as appropriate to the team's presentation.

Competitors Must Provide:

- [Photo ID](#)
- Index cards or electronic notecards (optional)
- Presenters must bring their own equipment, and any special supplies needed to deliver the presentation
- Two #2 lead pencils (not mechanical) with erasers for both rounds

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 \(GRR\)](#).”
 - A. Per the [GRRs](#) and [Appendix H](#), HOSA members may request accommodation in any competitive event. To learn the definition of an accommodation, please read [Appendix H](#). To request accommodation for the International Leadership Conference, [submit the request form here](#) by May 15 at midnight EST.
 - B. To request accommodation for any regional/area or state level conferences, submit the request form [here](#) by your state published deadline. Accommodations must first be done at state in order to be considered for ILC.
4. All competitors shall report to the site of the event at the time designated for each round of competition. At ILC, each competitor’s [photo ID](#) must be presented prior to ALL competition rounds.

5. Official References

For more information on the 2023-2024 Topic, visit:

- A. [Addiction Resource](#)
- B. [Phone Addiction: What You Need to Know](#)
- C. [Internet Addiction](#)

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

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

Community Presentation

6. 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.
7. The presentation must effectively inform the audience about the annual topic, when presented to relevant groups in the community.
8. Presentations for the live community audience will be no more than nine (9) minutes in length.
9. Presentation tools such as posters, music, props, costumes, and other presentation tools may be used for both rounds, 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.
10. 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!

11. 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.
12. Presentation aids can be used; however, additional set-up time will not be provided.
13. The timekeeper shall present a flash card advising the competitors when there is one (1) minute remaining. Teams will be stopped at four (4) minutes.
14. 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

15. 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.
16. Prior to beginning both presentations 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 March 1, 2024"). This gives verification for judges that the team presented to the public. Time starts after the team states this information.
17. Use of index card notes during both rounds of the presentation are permitted. Electronic notecards (on a tablet, smart phone, laptop, etc...) are permitted, but may not be shown to judges.
18. 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.
19. Teams will have five (5) minutes to set up in preparation for their presentation, and three (3) minutes to tear down after their presentation.
20. Competitors may NOT interact with the judges and may NOT give them anything before, after, or during the presentation.
21. All team members must take an active (speaking) role in the full presentation.
22. There will be no observers in this event, but the event may be videotaped by HOSA staff at the International level for marketing purposes by event partners.

Supplies

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

Final Scoring

25. Scores from Round One will be used to determine advancement to Round Two but will NOT be included in the final score.
26. In the event of a tie, a tiebreaker will be determined by the areas on the rating sheet section(s) with the highest point value in descending order.

PUBLIC HEALTH – Judge’s Rating Sheet Round One

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. 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.	
6. Appropriate to the Annual Topic	The annual topic is clearly revealed and well-covered in the presentation.	The annual topic is addressed and appropriate for the presentation.	The annual topic is apparent and not fully covered in the presentation.	The annual topic not clearly communicated throughout the presentation.	The annual topic is not covered in the presentation.	
A. Presentation Impact	Excellent 15 points	Good 12 points	Average 9 points	Fair 6 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
7. 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 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 point	JUDGE SCORE
1. Voice Pitch, tempo, volume, quality	The team's voice was loud enough to hear. The competitors varied rate & volume to enhance the speech. Appropriate pausing was employed.	The team spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The competitors varied rate OR volume to enhance the speech. Pauses were attempted.	The team could be heard most of the time. The competitors attempted to use some variety in vocal quality, but not always successfully.	The team'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 team 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 team'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 project presentation.	The team worked together relatively well. Some of the team members spoke more than others.	The team did not work effectively together.	One team member dominated the project presentation.	
Total Points (115):						

*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.	

A. Presentation Content (Continued)	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.	
B. 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.	
C. 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.	

D. Presentation Delivery	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Voice Pitch, tempo, volume, quality	The team's voice was loud enough to hear. The team varied rate & volume to enhance the speech. Appropriate pausing was employed.	The team spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The competitors varied rate OR volume to enhance the speech. Pauses were attempted.	The team could be heard most of the time. The competitors attempted to use some variety in vocal quality, but not always successfully.	The team'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 team 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 team'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.	Most 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 (135):						

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

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