



Last updated: February 25th, 2022

Community Awareness

PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING DIFFERENCES IN HOW THIS EVENT WILL BE RUN AT HOSA CANADA'S FALL LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE (FLC) AND SPRING LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE (SLC):

1. Community Awareness (CA) will be run as indicated in the event guidelines at both FLC and SLC. At both FLC and SLC, it will be run entirely online.
 - a. *If students participate over Zoom, they must have their cameras on for the entire duration of the event and show the judges their surroundings to help us minimize cheating as much as possible.*
 - b. Teams will be emailed their presentation time slots and Zoom invitations ahead of time.
2. The portfolio should be submitted as a single PDF document through a Google Form which will be made available on Google Classroom. The submission deadline for this year's SLC is April 30th, 11:59PM EST.

Community Awareness

New for 2021-2022

Editorial updates have been made for clarity.
Rubric has been updated.

Event Summary

Community Awareness provides HOSA members with the opportunity to educate their community about one health and/or safety related issue of local, state and/or national interest. Teams of 2-4 members plan a community campaign surrounding a selected topic that will impact the community as a whole. Teams develop a portfolio that documents and explains the community campaign and activities. The team presents the community campaign to a panel of judges, using the portfolio as documentation of their accomplishments. This event aims to inspire members to be proactive future health professionals and promote community awareness of health related issues.

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 (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 Campaign

4. The team will actively research relevant local, state, or national health and/or safety issues, and create awareness campaign(s) that increase the community’s call to action for improved health. This active engagement will typically involve the HOSA team working with community partners and/or volunteers. Examples of community campaigns may be found [here](#).
5. The campaign should assist communities to become more aware of the pros and cons of the health and/or safety issue selected, while promoting goodwill and public relations for the HOSA organization and the Health Science or Biomedical Science Education program.
6. Time Line for Campaign - The Chapter’s campaign activities must be completed between July 1, 2021 – May 15, 2022.

The Portfolio

7. Each page will be counted and numbered (up to 12 pages maximum), beginning with the title page.

- A. **Title Page:** Event name, Team Member Names, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, Chartered Association, Title of Campaign, Target Audience, Title page centered. One page only (A creative design or pictures may be used but will not affect the score).
- B. **All Narrative Pages will have the following formatting:**
- i. one-sided, typed,
 - ii. in 12 pt. Arial font, double-spaced,
 - iii. on 8 ½" x 11" paper with 1" margins, numbered on top right side of each page (not counting title page), and have a Running header with last name, & name of event.
- C. **(Summary):** A summary reflecting (Maximum of 3 pages):
- a. the research
 - b. selection of the campaign issue
 - c. goals and objectives of the campaign
 - d. community partners engaged in the campaign
 - e. accomplishments, effectiveness and impact of the campaign
- D. **Supporting Documentation):** The following items must be included as a part of the portfolio documentation (Maximum of 7 pages):
- a. Documentation of the activities conducted as a part of the community awareness campaign.
 - b. Publicity regarding the community awareness campaign activities and the local HOSA chapter and Health Science or Biomedical Science program, which may include newspaper articles, flyers, website announcements, etc...
 - c. Programs, pictures or other verification of students presenting or participating in the campaign should be included and dated.
 - d. Documentation should reflect the number in the community impacted by the campaign (i.e. newspaper circulation, radio/social media audience).
 - e. The team may also include items they developed to support their campaign such as pamphlets or brochures
- E. **(Reference Page):** List the literature cited to give guidance to the portfolio. American Psychological Association (APA) is the preferred resource in Health Science. One page only. *Points will be awarded for compiling a clean, legible reference page, but the formatting of the reference page is not judged.*

NOTE: *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. 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 Chartered Association to International competition.

The Competitive Process

9. Teams will report at their appointed time to present to the judges.
10. 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.
11. The purpose of the presentation is to communicate information about the campaign to the judges. The presentation MUST include the:
 1. research used in the selection and development of the campaign;
 2. goal of and activities used to promote and complete the campaign;
 - a. ie) *Our Community Awareness goal is to successfully encourage 10% of our high school students to sign up to be organ & tissue donors with The Transplantation Society between September 1st and May 10th. We will accomplish this goal through the creation of an original PSA blasted on social media, attendance at the local health fair in February, and monthly reminders in the school newspaper.*
 3. evidence of accomplishment of goals and objectives of the campaign
 4. impact of the campaign
 5. evaluation of the successes or failures of the campaign
 6. description of community partnerships created
12. 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.

Final Scoring

13. 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.

Required Digital Uploads

14. 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.
 - b. Uploads for ILC will be open from April 15th -May 15th for ILC qualified competitors only.

Instructions for uploading materials to Tallo can be found [HERE](#).

NOTE: *Chartered Associations 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 chartered association. For ILC, only digital submissions will be used for judging if uploaded by May 15th*

Competitors must provide

- A .pdf of the portfolio uploaded to Tallo 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)

COMMUNITY AWARENESS – Judge’s Rating Sheet

Section # _____ Division: SS _____ PS/Collegiate _____

Team # _____ Judge’s Signature _____

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	Title page contains ALL requirements: Event Name, Team Member Names, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, Chartered Assoc, Title of Campaign, Target Audience, Title page centered. One page only	N/A	N/A	N/A	Portfolio not submitted OR title page not included OR all requirements are not met.	
2. Narrative Pages Formatting	All pages one-sided, typed in 12 pt. Arial font, double-spaced, on 8 ½" x 11" paper with 1" margins, numbered on top right side of each page (not counting title page), and have a Running header with last name, & name of event.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Portfolio not submitted OR all requirements are not met.	
3. Max Pages pages above 12 will be judged)	Pages do not exceed 12 total.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Portfolio exceeds maximum page limit OR portfolio not submitted.	
4. Reference Page	The reference page is included in the portfolio submission.	NA	N/A	N/A	Portfolio not submitted OR no reference page is included in the portfolio.	
5. "Summary"	Summary provides an outstanding reflection of the campaign issue, goals, and objectives of the campaign. The accomplishments, effectiveness and impact of the campaign are clearly defined, thoughtful, and well-executed. The issue is thoroughly researched and the community partners engaged are explained.	The summary of the campaign issue, goals & objectives of the campaign are good, and provide a quality reflection of the campaign. Research is evident and some note is made of community partners.	The summary of the campaign is adequate, an average level of summarization is provided on the accomplishments and effectiveness of the campaign. Research is average and only a brief mention was made of community partners.	More attention is needed in the summary of the selection of the campaign issue, goals & objectives. Research is questionable or limited and it is not clear if community partners were engaged.	Portfolio not submitted OR the summary did not do a sufficient job in reflecting the campaign issue, goals & objectives, accomplishments, effectiveness & impact of the campaign. Research is missing.	

A. A. Quality of Portfolio	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
6. Strength of publicity	High-level publicity and exposure helped to tell the story of this campaign throughout the community in four or more media sources (such as newspaper articles, flyers, etc...)	The publicity for this campaign was promoted in three forms of media.	The campaign was promoted in two forms of media.	The campaign received low-level visibility in one form of media.	Portfolio not submitted OR the campaign was not promoted in any form of media.	
7. Evidence of student participation	Four or more forms of evidence (such as dated programs, pictures, etc.) were provided to demonstrate widespread student participation.	Three examples of significant student participation were provided in this campaign.	There are two examples of limited student participation in this campaign.	There is one form of evidence of little student participation in this campaign.	Portfolio not submitted OR there is no evidence of student participation.	
8. Items developed to support campaign	Four or more high quality items (such as pamphlets, brochures, etc.) were developed to support this campaign.	Three good quality items were developed to support this campaign.	Two average quality items were shared to support the development of this campaign.	One item was developed to support this campaign and it was not of good quality.	Portfolio not submitted OR no items were created to support this campaign.	
9. 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.	
B. Presentation to Judges	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Purpose for selection/ development of campaign	A clear purpose for the selection and development of the campaign was provided to the judges.	The purpose for the selection and development of the campaign was mostly clear in the presentation to judges.	The purpose for the selection and development of the campaign was moderately clear in the presentation to judges.	There was some detail provided for the purpose and selection of the campaign, however more information is needed .	The purpose and development of this campaign was unclear.	
2. Campaign promotes community awareness of a health and/or safety issues	Selected campaign clearly focuses on a health or safety issue of local, state, or national interest.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Selected campaign does not reflect a health or safety issue.	
3. Objectives/ accomplishments of campaign	The activities used to promote this campaign were detailed with clear objectives and several accomplishments were highlighted in the presentation.	The activities used to promote the campaign were mostly clear; objectives and accomplishments were highlighted.	The objectives and accomplishments of the campaign were somewhat highlighted in this presentation.	The objectives were somewhat clear, little demonstration of accomplishments were evident in the presentation of the campaign.	The objectives of the campaign were not clear and there was little evidence of accomplishments made throughout the presentation of the campaign.	

B. Presentation to Judges	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
4. Impact	The campaign is highly impactful for the target market and encourages a “call to action” in a positive manner.	The campaign is good but could have a more specific impact to the target market and could inspire behavior change slightly more effectively.	The campaign was educational but did not impact the audience to action.	The impact of the campaign was not communicated clearly. The campaign did not inspire the audience to action.	The campaign was not impactful and did not encourage positive behavior or elicit any change in the community.	
5. Evaluation of success/failure of campaign	The team strongly highlighted the success and failure of the campaign and had evidence to back up their findings. Excellent reflection of the campaign.	The team highlighted the success and failure of the campaign with only some evidence. Good reflection of the campaign.	The team shared some feedback on the success and/or failure of the campaign.	The team presented very little on the evaluation process of the campaign. Few details were provided.	No evidence of evaluation of the campaign was presented.	
6. Research-Understanding of problem / health issue	Research was in-depth and beyond the obvious. Demonstrates clear evidence of a deep, insightful understanding of the problem or health issue.	Research seemed to be in-depth. Shows a solid grasp of understanding of the problem or health issue.	The quality of the information was limited to support the topic. Demonstrates an average understanding of the problem or health issue. Judges left with a few questions.	Research provided was mostly surface-level. Shows a basic understanding of the problem or health issue. Judges left with more questions than answers.	Information used in the campaign was unreliable. Team is not able to demonstrate an understanding of the problem or health issue.	
7. Cooperative work with community partners	The team provided four or more high quality examples of cooperative work with community partners to promote and reach the campaign goal.	Three quality examples of cooperative work with community partners to promote and reach the campaign goal were shared.	Two average quality examples of cooperative work with community partners to promote and reach the campaign goal were provided.	One example of cooperative work with a community partner to promote and reach the campaign goal was provided and it was not of high quality.	No evidence of cooperative work with community partners was provided.	
C. 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	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 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.	Judges had difficulty hearing /understanding much of the speech due to little variety in rate or volume.	The competitor's voice is too low or monotone. Judges struggled to stay focused during the majority of presentation.	
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.	

C. Presentation Delivery	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
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 campaign. 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 had little participation.	The team did not work effectively together.	One person dominated the project presentation.	
Total Points (120):						

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

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