

Biomedical Debate

Dress Code	Official HOSA uniform or business professional attire
SLC Orientation	Event explained to the competitors and individual timecards handed out. Students will return to the event room at least 5 minutes before their allotted time.
Team Numbers	Teams will consist of 3-4 people
Round # 1 Online Test	Competitors will take an online test during the testing window. Combined team scores will be used to seed teams into Round 2 of the competition. Advisors will be informed of which competitors have moved on from Round 1 to qualify to participate in Round 2 at SLC.
Round # 2 (The Debate)	- Topic: "Social Media Health Influencers Should be Monitored." - It is the responsibility of the competitor to manage their time when speaking.
Scoring	Scores from Round One will ONLY be used to seed teams into Round Two and will not be used to calculate the final score.

Event Summary

Biomedical Debate allows members to use debate as a platform for researching the pros and cons of a biomedical issue and showcasing what has been learned. This competitive event consists of two rounds, and each team consists of 3-4 people. Team members will participate in the Round One written test containing questions about the annual biomedical topic. The teams with the highest average score from the test will qualify for the Round Two debate(s). This event aims to inspire members to be proactive future health professionals by researching a given health topic, evaluating, discussing, and thinking critically about the issue, and refining verbal communication skills surrounding a complex biomedical issue.

2025 – 2026 Topic: Social Media Health Influencers Should be Monitored.

Official References

Competitors are encouraged to learn as much as they can about the annual topic. All test questions will be developed from the following references:

- a. Raphael, Rina. (2022) [*The Gospel of Wellness: Gyms, Gurus, Goop, and the False Promise of Self-Care*](#). (*Note this is a printed book)
- b. Baker, Caroline and Baker, Don (2023) [*An Influencer's World: A Behind-the-Scenes Look at Social Media Influencers and Creators*](#). (*Note this is a printed book.)
- c. Helpful or harmful? Navigating the impact of social media influencers' health advice: insights from a health expert content creator:
<https://bmcpublihealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-024-21095-3>
- d. Social Media Influencers, Health Literacy, and Food Literacy: A Correlational Study Among Adolescents: <https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/21/12/1629>
- e. The impact of social media influencers on health outcomes: Systematic review:
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0277953623008298?via%3Dihub>

- f. Social media: frenemy of public health?
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8825979/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

ROUND ONE: The Test

Test Instructions: The written test will consist of 50 multiple-choice items in a maximum of 60 minutes.

The team test score average from Round One will be used to qualify the team for Round Two.

Sample Round One Questions

1. What was the average number of minutes people worldwide spent on social media?
 - A. 120 minutes
 - B. 134 minutes
 - C. 142 minutes**
 - D. 156 minutes(An Influencer's World) pp 6
2. What do wellness brands often successfully include subtly in their messaging?
 - A. Body pressures to be thin**
 - B. Quick ways to de-stress
 - C. Method for joining the "in" crowd
 - D. Affordable and convenient(The Gospel of Wellness)
3. What could be a potentially positive impact of SMIs (Social Media Influencers) on public health?
 - A. Decreased use of cannabis products
 - B. Decreased consumption of alcohol
 - C. Increased organic foods in their diet
 - D. Increased participation in physical exercise**(<https://bmcpublikealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-024-21095-3>)

ROUND TWO – The Debate

Beginning with Round Two, two (2) teams compete against each other.

The number of teams selected for Round Two is determined by the number of entries and overall conference capacity. Usually, 32 secondary and 8 postsecondary/collegiate teams are seeded for Round Two at SLC.

Teams will be permitted to bring prepared materials (Containers/folders with notes, printed pages, books, and bound materials) to the debate area in *hard copy only*. Props will NOT be allowed.

Debate teams will draw for the affirmative or negative immediately upon entering the competition room. Teams will have two (2) minutes to prepare prior to the debate.

The following specific pattern will be followed during the debate:

- A. First Affirmative Speaker** (2 minutes). The speaker, for the affirmative, presents their arguments.
 - Thirty (30) seconds of transition time
- B. First Negative Speaker** (2 minutes). The speaker for the negative presents their response to the affirmative speaker's arguments
 - Thirty (30) seconds of transition time
- C. Second Negative Speaker** (2 minutes). The second speaker, for negative, presents their arguments.
 - Thirty (30) seconds of transition time

- D. **Second Affirmative Speaker** (2 minutes). For the affirmative, the second speaker responds to the negative speaker's arguments.
- Thirty (30) seconds of transition time
- E. **Negative Summary/Rebuttal Speaker** (2 minutes). The negative speaker presents a conclusion.
- Thirty (30) seconds of transition time
- F. **Affirmative Summary/Rebuttal Speaker** (2 minutes). The affirmative speaker presents a conclusion.
- * Thirty (30) seconds of transition time will be allowed between each part of the debate to allow teams to discuss strategy and for judges to rate the prior performance.

*** The full-time noted above will be provided. If a team chooses not to use any or all of the time allowed, the opposing team shall still have the total amount of time that would have passed. However, the team whose turn it is may choose to begin their debate segment when ready, and the timekeeper will give them the amount of time listed above. (A team does not receive extra time to start early.)*

**** There will NOT be a time warning given during the debate transitions. It is the responsibility of the competitor to manage their time.*

A timekeeper will keep time for each part of the debate and call time at the end of the maximum allowed time. Speakers must immediately stop speaking when time is called.

*****Competitors are not allowed to use a timing device of any kind during the debate. Participants should practice their parts to ensure they are within the time frames and rely solely on the time warning provided by the timekeeper.*

Teams are permitted to discuss and write notes with each other during all parts of the debate; however, table decorum will be evaluated on the rating sheet with the intent that teams will conduct themselves in a professional manner without distracting the other team. Paper is allowed for note-taking.

At least three (3) team members must speak in the debate.

If a team decides to have more than one speaker during any debate section(s) (#14 A - F), only one speaker is allowed at the podium at a time. The time limits for each section(s) are still in effect and the team would need to make speaker changes at the podium within the allotted time.

All members of the winning teams of each match must return to the holding room until recalled. Waiting winning teams are not allowed to communicate with other teams.

Competitors Must Provide

- Paper or index cards, to use for note taking by team members (optional)
- Two #2 lead pencils (not mechanical) with eraser for the Round 1 Test, and note taking for Round 2 Debate.
- Prepared topic materials (per rule #12) for the Round 2 Debate (printed/hard copy only)

BIOMEDICAL DEBATE - ROUND TWO

1. First Affirmative Speech							
	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE - A	JUDGE SCORE - N
A. Arguments & Evidence (Persuasiveness)	The arguments & evidence clearly expresses the team's viewpoint in a highly persuasive manner.	The arguments & evidence mostly expresses the team's viewpoint and provides responses that are persuasive.	The arguments & evidence somewhat express the team's viewpoint and provides moderately persuasive responses.	The arguments & evidence are slightly persuasive.	The arguments are not persuasive or there is not an argument presented		
	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE - A	JUDGE SCORE - N
B. Flow & Logic of speech	The content of the speech flows smoothly, is thoughtfully constructed and makes logical sense.	The content of the speech flows smoothly and makes sense.	The speech flows moderately smoothly and makes sense most of the time.	The speech has an inconsistent flow and makes sense some of the time.	The speech does not flow or make logical sense.		
C. Relevance of arguments	All arguments were accurate, relevant to topic and strong. Was able to defend position.	Majority of arguments were accurate, relevant to topic and strong. Was able to defend position.	Some of the arguments were accurate, relevant to topic and strong. Was somewhat able to defend position.	Arguments were not accurate and/or relevant to topic. Was unable to defend position.	No arguments were made. Unable to defend position.		
2. First Negative Speech							
	Excellent 15 points	Good 12 points	Average 9 points	Fair 6 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE - A	JUDGE SCORE - N
A. Arguments & Evidence	All counterarguments were accurate, relevant to topic and strong. Was able to accurately defend position.	Majority of counterarguments were accurate, relevant to topic and strong. Was able to defend position.	Some of the counterarguments were accurate, relevant to topic and strong. Was somewhat able to defend position.	Counterarguments were not accurate and/or relevant to topic. Was unable to defend position.	No counterarguments were made. Unable to defend position.		
3. Second Negative Speech							
	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE - A	JUDGE SCORE - N
A. Arguments & Evidence (Persuasiveness)	The arguments & evidence clearly expresses the team's viewpoint in a highly persuasive manner.	The arguments & evidence mostly expresses the team's viewpoint and provides responses that are persuasive.	The arguments & evidence somewhat express the team's viewpoint and provides moderately persuasive responses.	The arguments & evidence are slightly persuasive.	The arguments are not persuasive or there is not an argument presented		

3. Second Negative Speech Cont'd							
	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE - A	JUDGE SCORE - N
B. Flow & Logic of speech	The content of the speech flows smoothly, is thoughtfully constructed and makes logical sense.	The content of the speech flows smoothly and makes sense.	The speech flows moderately smoothly and make sense most of the time.	The speech has an inconsistent flow and makes sense some of the time.	The speech does not flow or make logical sense.		
C. Relevance of arguments	All arguments were accurate, relevant to topic and strong. Was able to defend position.	Majority of arguments were accurate, relevant to topic and strong. Was able to defend position.	Some of the arguments were accurate, relevant to topic and strong. Was somewhat able to defend position.	Arguments were not accurate and/or relevant to topic. Was unable to defend position.	No arguments were made. Unable to defend position.		
4. Second Affirmative Speech							
	Excellent 15 points	Good 12 points	Average 9 points	Fair 6 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE - A	JUDGE SCORE - N
A. Arguments & Evidence	All counterarguments were accurate, relevant to topic and strong. Was able to accurately defend position.	Majority of counterarguments were accurate, relevant to topic and strong. Was able to defend position.	Some of the counterarguments were accurate, relevant to topic and strong. Was somewhat able to defend position.	Counterarguments were not accurate and/or relevant to topic. Was unable to defend position.	No counterarguments were made. Unable to defend position.		
5. Negative Summary/Rebuttal Speech							
	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE - A	JUDGE SCORE - N
A. Evidence and effectiveness	The negative rebuttal was clear and highlighted the point of view with confidence.	The negative rebuttal was effective	The evidence used in the negative rebuttal was mediocre.	Not enough evidence was used in the negative rebuttal.	No evidence was provided in the negative rebuttal.		
B. Clarification of argument	The negative rebuttal was clear and significantly strengthened the negative point of view	N/A	The negative rebuttal reiterated the position but did not add anything to the argument.	N/A	No negative rebuttal was provided.		
C. Relevance of rebuttal	Rebuttal was articulately stated and offered strong relevant, researched data to support the argument.	The rebuttal offered good research and supported the argument.	The rebuttal offered mediocre researched data to support the argument.	Little relevancy was offered in the rebuttal. More data/supporting information needed to support the point.	No rebuttal was offered or the rebuttal was not relevant to the topic.		
6. Affirmative Summary/Rebuttal Speech							
	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE - A	JUDGE SCORE - N
A. Evidence and effectiveness	The affirmative rebuttal was clear and highlighted the point of view with confidence.	The affirmative rebuttal was effective.	The evidence used in the affirmative rebuttal was mediocre.	Not enough evidence was used in the affirmative rebuttal.	No evidence was provided in the affirmative rebuttal.		
B. Clarification of argument	The affirmative rebuttal was clear and significantly	N/A	The affirmative rebuttal reiterated the position but did not add anything to	N/A	No affirmative rebuttal was provided.		

	strengthened the affirmative point of view		the argument.				
--	--	--	---------------	--	--	--	--

6. Affirmative Summary/Rebuttal Speech Cont'd							
	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE - A	JUDGE SCORE - N
C. Relevance of rebuttal	Rebuttal was articulately stated and offered strong relevant, researched data to support the argument.	The rebuttal offered good research and supported the argument.	The rebuttal offered mediocre researched data to support the argument.	Little relevancy was offered in the rebuttal. More data/supporting information needed to support the point.	No rebuttal was offered or the rebuttal was not relevant to the topic.		
7. Overall Debate Qualities (AFFIRMATIVE)							
	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE - A	JUDGE SCORE - N
A. 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.	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.		
B. 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. Diction*, Pronunciation** and Grammar	Delivery emphasizes and enhances message. Clear enunciation/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/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.		
	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE - A	JUDGE SCORE - N
D. Decorum, professional behavior	All statements and responses were respectful and appropriate.	N/A	Most statements and responses were respectful. Seldom interrupted or talked over	N/A	Decorum was not professional. Statements and responses were		

toward other team	Decorum was professional toward the other team.		other team members.		consistently not respectful. Interrupted or talked over other team members.		
-------------------	---	--	---------------------	--	---	--	--

7. Overall Debate Qualities (AFFIRMATIVE) Cont'd

	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE - A	JUDGE SCORE - N
E. Team Participation	Excellent example of shared collaboration. Three team members spoke, demonstrating equal knowledge of the topic.	Most team members were actively engaged in the debate and appeared to be knowledgeable on the topic.	The team worked together relatively well. Some team members appeared more knowledgeable than others.	The team did not work effectively together.	One team member dominated the debate.		

8. Overall Debate Qualities (NEGATIVE)

	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE - A	JUDGE SCORE - N
A. 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.	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.		
B. 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. 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.		

8. Overall Debate Qualities (NEGATIVE) Cont'd							
	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE - A	JUDGE SCORE - N
D. Decorum, professional behavior toward other team	All statements and responses were respectful and appropriate. Decorum was professional toward the other team.	N/A	Most statements and responses were respectful. Seldom interrupted or talked over other team members.	N/A	Decorum was not professional. Statements and responses were consistently not respectful. Interrupted or talked over other team members.		
	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE - A	JUDGE SCORE - N
E. Team Participation	Excellent example of shared collaboration. Three team members spoke, demonstrating equal knowledge of the topic.	Most team members were actively engaged in the debate and appeared to be knowledgeable on the topic.	The team worked together relatively well. Some team members appeared more knowledgeable than others.	The team did not work effectively together.	One team member dominated the debate.		
9. Best Overall Arguments							
	10 points				0 points	JUDGE SCORE - A	JUDGE SCORE - N
Debate Winner	Based on judge opinion, which team was the debate winner based on best overall arguments presented. The debate winner is awarded 10 points.	N/A	N/A	N/A	0 points awarded to the losing debate team based on judge opinion.		
AFFIRMATIVE TOTAL POINTS (85):							
NEGATIVE TOTAL POINTS (85):							