



MRC Partnership

New for 2020-2021

Competitor orientation deleted from ILC.
Changes have been made to the title page & portfolio formatting requirements and binder pockets have been eliminated.
Only the completed portfolio must be uploaded to Tallo by ONE team member.
Points have been added to the rating sheet for answering judge questions effectively.
Rating sheet has been updated to reflect guideline changes.

Event Summary

MRC Partnership provides members with the opportunity to gain knowledge and skills required to initiate and maintain a partnership with their local/state Medical Reserve Corps units. This competitive event is designed for students to demonstrate the spirit and mission of both the MRC and HOSA in joint partnership activities. Each team consists of 2 to 6 competitors and teams will prepare a portfolio highlighting partnership activities that improve public health, increase emergency response capabilities, and strengthen the resiliency of local communities. This event aims to inspire members to engage with the Medical Reserve Corps to learn more about community-based groups committed to strengthening public health.

Dress Code Competitors must be in official HOSA uniform or in proper business attire. Bonus points will be awarded for [proper dress](#).

- General Rules**
1. Competitors in this event must be active members of HOSA and in good standing.
 2. Secondary and 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

5. The Recommended Reading for this event includes:
 - MRC Website:
<https://mrc.hhs.gov/pageViewFldr/About>
 - Youth Engagement Toolkit (HOSA Website):
<http://hosa.org/node/154>
 - National Health Security Strategy:
<http://www.phe.gov/Preparedness/planning/authority/nhss/Pages/default.aspx>
 - Surgeon General's Priorities:
<https://www.hhs.gov/surgeongeneral/priorities/index.html>
 - Disaster Risk Reduction:
<http://www.unisdr.org/who-we-are/what-is-drr>
 - National Strategy for Youth Preparedness Education (FEMA):

Relationship with MRC Unit

6. All HOSA chapter activities planned and implemented for this event MUST be done in partnership with the Medical Reserve Corps. (If there is no local unit, contact HOSA-Future Health Professionals for the process involved in setting up a MRC unit.) There is no exception for activities to be eligible. A partnership with MRC outside the classroom must be in place for activities to be accepted.

Activities

7. For each partnership activity in the competitive portfolio, three items are included:
 - 1) Activity Name
 - 2) Impact on Community Category – one of the below categories will be listed
 - a. Strengthen public health
 - b. Serve a vulnerable population
 - c. Support a non-emergency community event
 - d. Develop or strengthen the HOSA/MRC partnership
 - e. Improve community preparedness or resilience
 - f. Train or exercise to improve community response capability
 - g. Support an emergency response
 - 3) HOSA/MRC Partnership Interaction Description
 - a. A description of how the HOSA chapter interacted with their local MRC in preparation and planning for the activity, as well as a description of the interaction between the MRC unit and HOSA.
 - b. *Examples include* but not limited to:
 - i. The MRC unit leader provided guidance and direction on the activity.
 - ii. The MRC volunteers and HOSA members worked alongside each other at the activity.
 - iii. MRC provided mentoring or shadowing opportunities for HOSA members.
8. **Timeline for Activities** - The chapter's MRC activities must be conducted within a one-year span. To qualify, the documented project covers only activities conducted from the last day of the International Leadership Conference until May 15, 2021.

Sample Activities

9. Sample HOSA chapter activities that support this partnership could include:
 - A. Activity: Distributed 72-hour emergency kit supply lists at a local store during peak back-to-school supply shopping.
Impact: Improved community preparedness or resilience
HOSA/MRC Partnership Interaction/Description: HOSA team members met with MRC unit leader who provided guidance on 72-hour kit contents needed specifically for our communities' hazards.
 - B. Activity: Shadowing/Mentoring Program
Impact: Developed or strengthened HOSA/MRC partnership
HOSA/MRC Partnership Interaction/Description: HOSA students were paired with MRC volunteers in the student's area of interest for a shadowing and mentoring experience.

- C. Activity: Mock-disaster victims for school bus crash scenario
Impact: Trained or exercised to improve community response capability
HOSA/MRC Partnership Interaction/Description: MRC unit leader invited HOSA members to participate in a mock disaster drill where students were moulaged and played the roles of victims injured in a school bus crash.

MRC Partnership Outline Steps

10. **Competitive Event Process:**
- a. **Step 1:** Review Recommended Readings
 - b. **Step 2:** Discuss engagement with local MRC unit
-Path A: Membership in local MRC unit
-Path B: Partnership with local MRC unit
 - c. **Step 3:** Complete Partnership Verification Form & Partnership Logistics Document
 - d. **Step 4:** Begin partnership activities and demonstrate impact. Take photographs at events.
 - e. **Step 5:** Track activities, and prepare descriptions for portfolio.
 - f. **Step 6:** At the conclusion of the project, MRC Unit Leader should review the completed portfolio and sign the Partnership Verification Form again indicating they have reviewed the portfolio.
 - g. **Step 7:** One member of the team creates a profile on Tallo and uploads the portfolio by the published deadline.

The Portfolio – Documentation of Project

11. The team's portfolio is limited to a maximum of sixteen (16) numbered single-sided pages and will contain the following, in order:
- A. **Page 1:** Title page (maximum of one page) that includes the Event name, Team Member Names, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, State/Assoc, Title page is centered. (A creative design or pictures may be used but will not affect the score.)
 - B. **Page 2:** HOSA/MRC Partnership Verification Form

Teams MUST have the MRC unit leader and HOSA chapter representative sign the Partnership Verification Form included in the team portfolio. This form will outline the partnership agreement between the MRC unit and the HOSA chapter participating in this event. It will be signed by the MRC leader following their review of the finalized portfolio, before the regional, state, and international conferences, as applicable. (Partnership Verification Form included at the end of these guidelines).
 - C. **Pages 3-4:** Partnership Logistics Document (maximum of 2 pages). Signed by MRC leader at the beginning of the partnership and again following review of the finalized portfolio. The MRC leader's full mailing address is required.
 - D. **Pages 5 - 6:** A description (maximum of 2 pages) of the HOSA/MRC partnership and the level, quality, and quantity of interactions during the partnership.
 - E. **Pages 7- 16:** A summary (maximum of 10 pages) of partnership activities with brief narrative that identifies the following: (as outlined in item #7 above)
 1. Activity description

2. Impact category
3. HOSA/MRC Partnership description
The Summary Section (pages 7-16) may include:
 1. Publicity regarding the partnership. The date of the publicity must be shown with a copy of the article, radio or TV spot and the program script.
 2. Programs, photographs or other verification of partnership activities should be included and dated.
 3. The team may include copies of items they developed to support their project such as pamphlets or brochures.

- F. All narrative pages:
- ✓ Are typed, one-sided, in 12 pt. Arial font, double-spaced, in English,
 - ✓ Have 1" margins on 8 ½" x 11" paper, and contain a
 - ✓ Running header with last name, event and page number on top right side of each page (not counting title page)
- G. Portfolio pages will be evaluated up to and including the maximum pages per section. Pages above the maximum allowance will not be evaluated and no points will be given for information in excess pages.
- H. 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 - Interview with Judges

12. Competitors will report to the event site at their appointed time for a five (5) minute interview with judges. The first three (3) minutes will be reserved for prepared remarks by team members. The timekeeper will present a flash card advising the competitors and judges of the time remaining at one (1) minute.

The purpose of the interview is to communicate information about the partnership activities to the judges. The first three (3) minutes of the interview MUST include:

1. a brief description of the activities used to promote the partnership;
 2. the accomplishment of goals and objectives of the partnership; and the impact of the partnership and activities.
13. Following the prepared remarks, two (2) minutes will be provided for judges to ask questions. The timekeeper will call time at the end of each phase of the interview.
 14. Immediately following the interview, competitors will be excused and judges will have three (3) minutes to complete the rating sheet.

15. Use of index card notes during the interview are permitted. Electronic notecards (on a tablet, smart phone, laptop, etc...) are permitted, but may not be shown to judges.
16. Teams will be seated across from the judges. Teams may choose to bring their original portfolio to ILC competition, to reference during the presentation, but no points are awarded on the rating sheet for doing so. All team members must take an active role in the presentation.
17. Props, costumes and other items are not permitted.

Final Scoring

18. 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

19. 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 (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.

Competitors Must Provide:

- Watch with second hand (optional)
- Index cards or electronic notecards (optional)
- ONE team member uploads the portfolio (.pdf preferred) to Tallo by deadline
- #2 lead pencils with eraser to complete evaluations
- [Photo ID](#)

HOSA/MRC Partnership Verification Form

1. This form **must** be completed and added to the portfolio which will be uploaded to Tallo by ONE member of the team by the state published regional and state deadlines, and by May 15th for the International Leadership Conference.
2. Note that a second signature from the MRC unit leader is needed, following their review of the finalized portfolio.
3. If there is not an MRC unit in your local community, contact HOSA-Future Health Professionals for next steps.
4. The MRC Partnership event is designed to encourage HOSA chapters to initiate and maintain a partnership with their local Medical Reserve Corps units. Through active engagement with the MRC, HOSA chapters and competitive events teams will be involved in their community and demonstrate the spirit and mission of the MRC and HOSA partnership.
5. The HOSA competitive events teams will actively engage with the Medical Reserve Corps by participating in activities that improve public health, increase emergency response capabilities and strengthen the resiliency of their communities while demonstrating an impact on their local community. The active engagement will typically involve the HOSA team working directly (and often side-by-side) with MRC volunteers, though on occasion it may consist of working on activities under the direction or guidance of the MRC unit leader.

Involved organizations include:

HOSA Chapter:	
Team Member Names:	
School Address:	
Advisor Name:	
Advisor E-Mail Address:	

MRC Unit Name:	
Address:	
MRC Unit Leader Name:	
Unit Leader E-Mail Address:	
Unit Leader Phone Number:	
Unit Leader Mailing Address:	

By signing here, I verify that I have read the HOSA MRC Partnership Event Guidelines and agree to the attached agreed upon terms of the partnership, as presented in the Partnership Logistics Document:

HOSA Chapter Representative Signature: Date

MRC Unit Leader Signature: Date

At the conclusion of the project period, the HOSA team should share their portfolio with the MRC unit leader for review. A signature is required before each applicable regional, state, or international conference.

By signing here, I verify that I have reviewed the HOSA team's portfolio and find it to be an accurate representation of the HOSA/MRC partnership activities:

MRC Unit Leader Signature (before regional conference): Date

MRC Unit Leader Signature (before state conference): Date

MRC Unit Leader Signature (before international conference): Date

HOSA/MRC Partnership Logistics Document

Agreed Upon Terms of the HOSA/MRC Partnership:

Please address the following questions in no more than two (2) pages.

1. Describe how HOSA chapter and MRC unit will maintain contact throughout this competitive events year.
2. How frequently will MRC and HOSA chapter be in contact with each other?
3. Who is responsible for initiating and maintaining contact?

Please include any specific details or additional requirements for the partnership moving forward.

MRC PARTNERSHIP – Judge’s Rating Sheet

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

Portfolio Uploaded Online: Yes ____ No ____*
**If the materials are not uploaded, please note that applicable items on the rubric below cannot be judged.*

A. 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, State/Assoc	N/A	N/A	N/A	All requirements are not met or portfolio not submitted.	
2. HOSA/MRC Partnership Verification Form	The Partnership Verification Form includes: 1. MRC Unit full address 2. MRC leader’s signature at the beginning of the project 3. MRC leader’s signature at the conclusion of the project	NA	NA	NA	The Partnership Verification does not include all 3 required criteria OR was not submitted.	
3. Partnership Logistics Document	The Partnership Logistics Document includes: 1. Description of how the HOSA chapter and MRC unit will maintain communication 2. How frequently the HOSA chapter and MRC unit will be in contact 3. Who is responsible for maintaining and initiating contact 4. MRC leader’s full mailing address	The Partnership Logistics Document includes answers to 3 of the 4 questions.	The Partnership Logistics Document includes answers to 2 of the 4 questions.	The Partnership Logistics Document includes answers to 1 of the 4 questions.	The Partnership Logistics Document is blank OR was not submitted.	
4. Description of the HOSA/MRC partnership (items included)	The description features all three items: 1. Level of interactions 2. Quality of interactions 3. Quantity of interactions	NA	The description features 2 of 3 items	The description features 1 of 3 items.	No descriptions of the partnerships were provided OR Portfolio not submitted.	
	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
5. Description of the HOSA/MRC partnership (Quality of Items)	The strength and articulation of the HOSA/MRC partnership description is excellent.	The strength and articulation of the HOSA/MRC	The strength and articulation of the HOSA/MRC	The strength and articulation of the HOSA/MRC	The strength and articulation of the HOSA/MRC	

		partnership description is good	partnership description is average	partnership description is fair	partnership description is absent.-OR Portfolio not submitted.	
--	--	---------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------	--	--

A. Portfolio	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
6. A summary of partnership activities with a brief narrative. (Activities included)	The partnership features all-three of the descriptions: 1. Activity description 2. Impact category (as outlined in the event descriptions) 3. HOSA/MRC Partnership description	NA	The partnership features 2 of 3 descriptions	The HOSA/MRC partnership features 1 of 3 descriptions.	No descriptions of the partnership activities were provided. OR Portfolio not submitted	
	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
7. A summary of partnership activities with a brief narrative. (Quality of activities)	The partnership activities documented in portfolio are excellent quality, scope, and value.	The partnership activities documented in portfolio are good quality, scope, and value.	The partnership activities documented in portfolio are average quality, scope, and value.	The partnership activities documented in portfolio are fair quality, scope, and value.	No summary of partnership activities is included OR Portfolio not submitted	
	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
8. ALL PAGES of portfolio are neat, and error-free.	No errors in grammar or appearance were detected in the submission.	The submission had 1-2 errors within the entry.	3-4 errors in grammar or neatness were detected in the submission.	5 or more errors in grammar or neatness were detected in the submission.	Portfolio was not submitted	
9. ALL Narrative 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 1/2" 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	All requirements are not met OR portfolio not submitted.	
10. Max Pages (no pages above 16 will be judged)	Pages do not exceed 16 total.	NA	NA	NA	Portfolio exceeds maximum page limit OR portfolio not submitted.	
B. HOSA/MRC Partnership Overall Content	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Cooperative work with MRC to reach goals of activities	The team exceeded the collaborative goals of working with the MRC.	The team met the collaborative goals of working with the MRC.	The team's goals were of average effort and impact.	The team did not put forth much collaborative effort to reach the goals of the proposed activities.	The team did not meet the collaborative goals of the MRC activities.	

2. Description and Understanding of the MRC Mission	Strong evidence was provided to prove the understanding of the MRC Mission. Four or more examples of the mission were provided.	Evidence of understanding the MRC mission was evident in three examples provided in the portfolio.	Basic evidence of understanding the MRC mission was provided in two examples within the portfolio.	One example was provided to prove understanding of the MRC mission.	No evidence was provided of understanding of the MRC mission.	
B. HOSA/MRC Partnership Overall Content	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
3. Impact on the local community	Strong evidence (4+ examples) reflects the partnership demonstrated a high level of impact on the community and created positive change.	Some evidence (3 examples) reflects The partnership had a good impact on the community.	The partnership's impact was average. Little evidence (2 example)s of change occurred as a result of this project.	Very little impact occurred from the result of this project. Only one example shared.	No change or impact occurred as a result of this project implementation. No examples shared.	
4. Impact on the HOSA chapter	Strong evidence (4+ examples) reflects the partnership demonstrated a high level of impact on the HOSA chapter and created positive change.	Some evidence (3 examples) reflects The activity had a good impact on the HOSA chapter.	The impact on the HOSA chapter was average. Little evidence (2 examples) of change occurred as a result of this project.	Very little impact on the HOSA chapter occurred as a result of this project. Only one example shared	No change or impact occurred as a result of this project. No examples shared	
5. Imagination & creativity of the activities	The partnership activities demonstrated a high level of imagination & creativity.	The partnership activities demonstrated a moderate level of imagination & creativity.	The partnership activities demonstrated an average level of imagination & creativity	Very little imagination & creativity were included in the activities.	No imagination & creativity were included in the activities	
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 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 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** and Grammar	Delivery emphasizes and enhances message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. No vocal	Delivery helps to enhance message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. Minimal vocal fillers	Delivery adequate. Enunciation and pronunciation suitable. Noticeable verbal fillers (ex:	Delivery quality minimal. Regular verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows")	Many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or	

	fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone heightened interest and complemented the verbal message.	(ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). Tone complemented the verbal message	"ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Tone seemed inconsistent at times.	present. Delivery problems cause disruption to message.	articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal message.	
C. Presentation Delivery	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 point	JUDGE SCORE
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	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 person dominated the project.	
5. Answered judge questions effectively	The team provided excellent answers to judge's questions, shared important details and maintained a high level of professionalism and poise throughout the presentation.	The team answered the judge's questions accurately and provided some important details about the MRC and their chapter's partnership.	The team was able to answer most of the questions effectively, could have provided more details regarding the MRC and/or their chapter's partnership.	The team answered some of the questions but failed to expound on the details of the MRC and/or their chapter's partnership.	The team had trouble answering the judge's questions. More evidence is needed to demonstrate a basic understanding of the MRC and/or their chapter's partnership.	
Total Points (145):						