

Community Awareness

Teamwork Event

Eligible Divisions: Secondary & Postsecondary / Collegiate	Pre-Judged: pdf of Portfolio	Digital Upload: YES
Team Event: 2-6 competitors per team	Round 1: Presentation	

 **New for 2024 – 2025**
Editorial updates have been made.

Event Summary

Community Awareness provides HOSA members with the opportunity to educate their own community about one health and/or safety-related issue of local, state, and/or national interest. Teams of 2-6 members plan a local community campaign surrounding a selected topic that will impact their community as a whole. Teams develop a portfolio that documents and explains this community campaign and activities. The team presents their community campaign to a panel of judges, using the portfolio to document their accomplishments. This event aims to inspire members to be proactive future health professionals and promote local community awareness of health-related issues.

Dress Code

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

Competitors must provide

- ONE team member uploads the portfolio to the HOSA Digital Upload System by May 15 for ILC competition (see advisor regarding SLC requirements and deadlines)
- [Photo ID](#)
- Portfolio (hard copy is optional for in-person presentation)
- Notes on index cards or in electronic format for use during the presentation (optional)

General Rules

1. Competitors must be familiar with and adhere to the [General Rules and Regulations](#).

The Campaign

2. The team will actively research relevant local, state, or national health and/or safety issues and create awareness campaign(s) that increase their community's call to action for improved health. This active engagement will typically involve the HOSA team working with local community partners and/or volunteers. Examples of community campaigns may be found [here](#).
3. The campaign should assist communities to become more aware of the pros and cons of the health and/or safety issues selected while promoting goodwill and public relations for the HOSA organization and the Health Science or Biomedical Science Education program.
4. Timeline for Campaign - The Chapter's campaign activities must be completed between July 1, 2024 – May 15, 2025.

The Portfolio - Pre-judged Digitally

5. Teams will create a portfolio (up to 12 pages maximum, not counting reference pages). The purpose of the portfolio is to showcase the work completed by the team, documenting their community campaign and activities. The portfolio should highlight the team's accomplishments.

6. The following items must be included in the portfolio:
 - 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. **Activities Conducted:** Explanation of the activities conducted, including timeline, as a part of the local community awareness campaign. Development of original campaigns is highly encouraged, but partnership in established campaigns is acceptable. The team may also include any additional original items they developed to support their campaign such as publication links, pamphlets, brochures, photos, social media posts, webinars, podcasts, etc.
 - C. **Publicity/Marketing:** Publicity regarding the local community awareness campaign activities and the local HOSA chapter, which may include newspaper articles, flyers, website announcements, social media posts, etc.... Brief explanation of photos or links to publications should be included.
 - D. **Verification of Competitors Presenting Campaign:** Programs, pictures or other verification of students presenting or participating in the campaign should be included and dated. A brief explanation of photos or links to the presentation should be included.
 - E. **People Impacted:** Documentation should reflect the number of people in the local community impacted by this campaign (i.e. newspaper circulation, radio/social media audience, in-person attendance). Estimations are acceptable when exact numbers are unknown but should be realistic based on evidence.
 - F. **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,
 - IV. numbered on top right side of each page (not counting title page),
 - V. and have a Running header with team member's last names, & name of event (top left side of page, not counting title page).
 - G. **References:** List ALL the literature cited to give guidance to the portfolio. American Psychological Association (APA) is the preferred resource in Health Science. *Points will be awarded for compiling a clean, legible reference page(s), but the formatting of the reference page is not judged.*
 - H. **NOTE:** Teams may choose to bring a hard copy of their portfolio to ILC competition, to reference during the presentation if they wish, but it is not required nor judged during the presentation.

REQUIRED Digital Uploads

7. ONE member of the team **MUST** upload the following item(s) to the HOSA Digital Upload System by May 15:
 - a. Portfolio – as one combined pdf file.

May 15 at midnight EST is the **final deadline**, and there will be **NO EXCEPTIONS** to receipt of the required materials after the deadline.
8. Detailed instructions for uploading materials can be found at:
<https://hosa.org/competitive-event-digital-uploads/>
9. State Leadership Conference (SLC) vs. HOSA's International Leadership Conference (ILC)
 - a. **State Leadership Conferences.** The competitor must check with their Local Advisor for all state-level processes used for competition, as digital uploads may or may not be a requirement.
 - b. **International Leadership Conference.**
 - i. If a competitor uses the HOSA Digital Upload System as a requirement at the SLC, the competitor **MUST upload an ADDITIONAL time for ILC by May 15.**

- ii. If the HOSA Digital Upload System is NOT used at the competitor's SLC, it is still the competitor's responsibility to upload the product for HOSA's ILC no later than May 15. Not using the HOSA Digital Upload System at a competitor's State Leadership Conference is not an exception to the rule.
10. The FINAL ILC digital upload deadline is May 15. We STRONGLY suggest not waiting until the last minute to upload online to avoid user challenges with the system.
 11. For ILC, the digital materials uploaded by May 15 will be PRE-JUDGED. Competitors who do not upload materials are NOT eligible for the presentation portion of the competition and **will NOT be given a competition appointment time at ILC**. All digital content uploaded as of May 15 will be used for pre-judging at ILC.

The Competitive Process – Presentation

12. The presentation will be no more than five (5) minutes. The timekeeper will announce when there is one (1) minute remaining in the presentation. The timekeeper will stop the presentation after five (5) minutes, and the team will be excused.
13. The presentation aims to communicate information about this campaign to the judges. The presentation MUST include the:
 - A. Purpose for campaign selection with brief summary of development;
 - B. research used in the selection and development of the campaign;
 - C. description of local community partnerships created
 - D. goal of and activities used to promote and complete the campaign;
i.e.) Our local 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 by creating an original PSA blasted on social media, attendance at the local health fair in February and monthly reminders in the school newspaper.
 - E. evidence of accomplishment of goals and objectives of the campaign
 - F. impact of the campaign and areas for improvement
14. Index card notes are permitted during the presentation. Electronic notecards (on a tablet, smartphone, laptop, etc....) are allowed but may not be shown to judges. Only the team's portfolio may be shown to the judges during the presentation. Please refer to [GRRs](#).
15. **NOTE:** Teams may choose to bring a hard copy of their portfolio to ILC competition, to reference during the presentation if they wish, but it is not required nor judged during the presentation.

Final Scoring

16. Scores from the pre-judged portfolio will be added to the presentation score to determine the final results.
17. 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.

COMMUNITY AWARENESS

Section # _____ Division: SS ____ PS/Collegiate ____

Team # _____ Judge's Signature _____

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

For ILC, the digital materials uploaded by May 15 will be PRE-JUDGED. Competitors who do not upload materials are NOT eligible for competition and **will NOT be given a competition appointment time at ILC.** All digital content uploaded as of May 15 is what will be used for pre-judging at ILC.

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, Chartered Assoc, Title of Campaign, Target Audience are included	N/A	N/A	N/A	Portfolio not submitted/ accessible OR all requirements are not met.	
2. Campaign promotes local 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.	
A. Portfolio	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
3. Activities Conducted	Exceptional, original activities are showcased throughout the shared timeline that highlight the quality of research and call to action this campaign presented.	The campaign activities highlighted are good quality. They add value to the portfolio.	The activities developed for this campaign are average. They have a basic level of quality.	The campaign activities need extra attention to make them average quality.	Portfolio not submitted/accessible OR the activities were poor quality and did not enhance the campaign.	
4. Strength of publicity	High-level publicity and exposure helped to tell the story of this campaign throughout the local community in four or more media sources (such as newspaper articles, flyers, etc...) Realistic estimation/account of audience included.	The publicity for this campaign was promoted in three forms of media. Realistic estimation/account of audience included.	The campaign was promoted in two forms of media. Estimation/account of audience included.	The campaign received low-level visibility in one form of media. Estimation/account of audience not realistic or is missing.	Portfolio not submitted/accessible OR the campaign was not promoted in any form of media.	
5. Evidence of competitor's quality participation in the local campaign.	Evidence of ALL team member's quality participation in the local campaign was exceptional.	Evidence of team member's participation in the local campaign was strong.	Evidence of some team member's participation in the local campaign was provided.	Evidence of team member participation in a local campaign was limited or questionable.	Portfolio not submitted/accessible OR there is no evidence of team member participation in a local campaign.	

A. Portfolio	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
6. Evidence of local campaign impact with published dates & est. audience number	Four or more forms of evidence (such as dated programs, pictures, etc.) were provided to demonstrate widespread local community participation. All published dates and estimated audience numbers are included, and supported by evidence.	Three examples of significant local community participation were provided in this campaign. Published dates and estimated audience numbers are included.	Local community participation in this campaign is limited. Published dates and estimated audience numbers may be included.	There is weak evidence and/or little local community participation in this campaign. Published dates and estimated audience numbers may be missing.	Portfolio not submitted/accessible OR there is no evidence of competitor participation.	
7. Original Items developed to support campaign (photos, pamphlets/brochures, social media posts, presentation links, webinars, podcasts, etc...)	Four or more original, high quality items were developed to support this campaign.	At least Three original, quality items were developed to support this campaign.	Average quality items were shared to support the development of this campaign.	Only One item was developed to support this campaign and it may or may not be of good quality. Items may be of questionable originality.	Portfolio not submitted/accessible OR no items were created to support this campaign.	
A. Portfolio	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
8. 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/accessible OR there are many misspellings and overall weakness within the portfolio. The portfolio looks unprofessional.	
9. Page formatting	All narrative pages are typed, 12 point Arial font, double-spaced, 1" margins, numbered on top right side of each page, running header on top left side of page.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Pages not formatted	
10. Reference Page(s)	The reference page(s) is included in the portfolio submission.	NA	N/A	N/A	Portfolio not submitted/accessible OR no reference page(s) is included in the portfolio.	
11. Max Pages no pages above 12 will be judged; (this does NOT include reference page(s))	Pages do not exceed 12 total.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Portfolio exceeds maximum page limit OR portfolio not submitted.	
Subtotal Points for Pre-Judging Portfolio (80)						

B. Presentation Content	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 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. 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.	
3. Activities Conducted	Exceptional activities are showcased throughout the shared timeline that highlight the quality of research and call to action this campaign presented.	The campaign activities highlighted are good quality. They add value to the portfolio.	The activities developed for this campaign are average. They have a basic level of quality.	The campaign activities need extra attention to make them average quality.	Portfolio not submitted/accessible OR the activities were poor quality and did not enhance the campaign.	
4. 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.	
5. 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.	
6. Cooperative work with local community partners	Strong evidence (4+ examples) reflects the partnership demonstrated a high level of impact on the local community and created positive change.	Some evidence (3 examples) reflects The partnership had a good impact on the local community.	The partnership's impact was average. Little evidence (2 examples) 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.	
C. 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	Each team's voice was loud enough to hear. They varied rate & volume to enhance the speech. Appropriate pausing was employed.	The team spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The competitor 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.	

C. Presentation Delivery	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
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** & 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.	
Subtotal Points for Presentation (80)						
Total Points (160):						

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

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