Public Health

Event Category: Emergency Preparedness

Dress Code: Official HOSA uniform or business professional attire	**Round One:** Trailer Video (pre-judged)	**Digital Upload:** YES, link to trailer video
Team Event: 2-6 competitors per team	**Round Two:** Required Display Time & Presentation (10 minutes)	**Allowed Presentation Materials:** There is no limit to presentation tools or techniques. Device for showing video during Display Time. Notecards (optional).

Event Summary

Public Health allows HOSA members to develop an effective, dynamic, and creative presentation informing the public about a significant public health issue. The team consists of 2-6 members. The event consists of two rounds. In Round One, the team creates a video "trailer" of their presentation with the goal of convincing a panel of judges of the need to view their full Round Two presentation. The video trailer should "wow" the judges. The highest-scoring teams will advance to Round Two, where a panel of judges will view the entire in-person presentation. The panel of judges for each round may be different, so bring your "A" game to both rounds.

The event aims to inspire members to be proactive health professionals. It aids in the development of a blend of skills necessary to address complex health challenges, including analysis and data literacy capabilities to interpret health trends, as well as communication and advocacy skills to engage with diverse communities and stakeholders effectively. The team nature of the event helps build leadership abilities for interdisciplinary teamwork and ethical decision-making.

2026-2027 Event Topic

Fact-Check Your Feed: Taking Down Health Myths Before They Spread

Health misinformation is defined as false, misleading, or inaccurate information that is shared among the public. The spread of this inaccurate data has grown so severe that the World Health Organization now officially refers to it as an "infodemic." Far from being a minor issue, the American Psychological Association has classified health misinformation as one of the "most urgent threats to public health." This threat manifests in dangerous ways, as misleading information can lead individuals to delay necessary medical care, opt for unproven treatments, and ultimately experience a steep decrease in their overall trust in medical science.

To combat this growing crisis, it is essential for individuals to take an active role in halting the spread of bad data. Everyone must learn to identify health misinformation when they encounter it and rigorously evaluate its sources for credibility. By making a conscious effort to seek out and get information you can trust, you can actively help put a stop to misinformation before it causes further harm to public wellness.

The expectation is that competitors read and are aware of all the content within these guidelines and associated links. Successful competitors will study all links for the detailed information.

General Event Information

Pre & Post Survey	All team members are asked to complete the pre-survey before the first competition in Public Health. The pre-survey can be found HERE. All team members are asked to complete the post survey after their last competition in Public Health for 2026-2027. The post survey can be found HERE.
Official References	For more information on the 2026-2027 topic, visit: ● Health and Human Services - Health Misinformation ● Johns Hopkins Center for Health Equity - Pandemic of Misinformation ● WHO - Combatting Misinformation Online For more information about Public Health, in general, teams are encouraged to visit: ● U.S. Public Health Service ● American Public Health Association

Community Presentation

1. The goal of the event is to create and deliver a presentation to a live community audience designed to inform the public about the assigned Public Health issue.
2. The presentation must effectively inform the audience about the annual topic, when presented to relevant groups in the community.
3. Presentations for the live community audience will be no more than 10 minutes in length.
4. Presentation tools such as posters, music, props, costumes, and other presentation tools may be used and are encouraged to develop and present a creative and effective public health presentation. Basically, anything goes. *The more creative, powerful and effective the presentation, the better*. There is no limit to the in-person presentation tools or techniques.
5. Teams should determine their target audience and plan how, when, and where they will deliver their presentation to the community.

ROUND ONE: Short Video Submission, Convince the Judges! (Pre-judged virtually)

Video Submission Details	1. Round One will give each team three (3) minutes in video format to convince the judges of the power and effectiveness of the team's community presentation. What can you do in three minutes to convince the judges that they want to see your full presentation that you gave in your community? Plan your time carefully and "wow" the judges with your video presentation. Think of a "movie trailer" that convinces you to go see the full movie! 2. Actors are not required but can be used. If used. actors may or may not be members of the team. 3. The video trailer submission does not need to be shown in the community, like the full presentation does. The video trailer is simply the time to "wow" the judges and earn your chance for a spot in Round Two. 4. The top Middle School, Secondary and Postsecondary/Collegiate teams from Round One will advance to Round Two, the full presentation for judges. The number of advancing teams will be determined by criteria met in Round One and space available for Round Two.
REQUIRED Digital Upload	5. The following item(s) **MUST** be uploaded by ONE member of the team to the HOSA Digital Upload System by March 19: ● Link to the team's round one video trailer presentation. **Any links or documents that are not accessible to the judge for viewing, no points will be awarded. Judges will NOT request access or permission to view any links not already set for public viewing.**

	6. **March 19** at midnight MST is the **final deadline,** and there will be **NO EXCEPTIONS** to receipt of the required materials after the deadline. We STRONGLY suggest not waiting until the last minute to upload online to avoid user-challenges with the system. 7. Detailed instructions for uploading materials can be found at: https://hosa.org/competitive-event-digital-uploads/ 8. For SLC, the digital materials uploaded by March 19 will be PRE-JUDGED. Competitors who do not upload materials are NOT eligible for the presentation portion of competition and **will NOT be given a competition appointment time at SLC**.

ROUND TWO: Presentation to the Judges

1. The top teams from Round One will advance to Round Two. The number of advancing teams will be determined by the scores obtained in Round One and the space and time available for Round Two. Competitors shall report to the event site 10 minutes before their appointment time.
2. Teams will have three (3) minutes for setup and three (3) minutes tear down.
3. For Round Two, the full presentation to the judges **should be the same presentation that was performed in the public/ community.** Basically, anything goes. The more creative, powerful and effective the presentation, the better. There is no limit to the presentation tools or techniques.
4. Prior to beginning the Round Two presentations for judges, the team will state the date and audience to which the full presentation was given (e.g., "The following presentation was completed at the Mayor's office on March 1, 2025"). This gives judges verification that the team presented to the public. Time starts after the team states this information. If the team does not share this information after 30 seconds, the timer will state, "time has started."
5. Use of index card notes during the presentation is permitted. Electronic notecards (on a tablet, smartphone, laptop, etc.) are allowed, but will not be shown to judges. If using a device to show judges something during the presentation, this must be a different device than the device used for notecards. Teams will NOT have access to electricity. Battery-powered equipment (such as a laptop) is permitted. Internet connection is NOT provided but is allowed if the team provides it themselves.
6. HOSA will provide a table for Round Two. The team must provide all other equipment and presentation needs.
7. The full presentation will be a maximum of 10 minutes in length. A timecard will be shown with one (1) minute remaining, and the presentation will be stopped after 10 minutes.
8. While competitors may pose rhetorical questions to the judges, they may not engage in direct dialogue or provide them with any materials before, during, or after the presentation.
9. All team members must take an active (speaking) role in the full presentation.

Final Scoring

1. The pre-judged video scores will be added to the presentation score to determine the final results.

2. In the event of a tie, a tiebreaker will be determined by the areas on the rating sheet section(s) with the highest point value in descending order.

Public Health

Round One Pre-Judged Video Trailer

Team #:_____ **Division:**_____MS _____SS_____PS/C **Judge's Signature:**_____

Link provided for video trailer. YES _____ NO _____

If judges cannot access the video link, judges are not to score the submission.

A. Video Overview	EXCELLENT 10 points	GOOD 8 points	AVERAGE 6 points	FAIR 4 points	POOR 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Length	Video is no longer than 3 minutes.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Video exceeded 3 minutes.	
2. Quality of video- Focus, Audio, Editing	The video quality was excellent. Images are sharp. Sound and editing added to the value of the video. Transitions are clear and help the message stand out.	The video quality was good. Some blurriness or difficulty hearing was noted. Transitions between scenes help narrate the message.	The video quality was average. Some issues with lighting, sound, or editing was noted. Transitions are inconsistent or do not add additional value.	The quality of the video was basic. Audio levels were too loud or too soft. There were several blurry images or lighting was too bright or too dark. Editing was clunky or inappropriate.	Quality of the video was poor. Often out of focus, background noises evident and led to poor audio, scenes were distracting. Editing was not apparent.	
3. Appropriate to the Annual Topic	The annual topic is clearly revealed and well-covered in the video.	The annual topic is addressed and appropriate for the video.	The annual topic is apparent though not fully covered in the video.	The annual topic is not clearly communicated throughout the video.	The annual topic is not covered in the video.	
B. Video Content	**EXCELLENT 15 points**	**GOOD 12 points**	**AVERAGE 9 points**	**FAIR 6 points**	**POOR 0 points**	**JUDGE SCORE**
1. Effectiveness	The video did an extraordinary job captivating the attention of the audience and provided a clear message that evokes emotion, and shares the importance of the topic.	The video did a good job capturing the attention of the audience. The message stood out and evoked emotion. It was interesting and thoughtful regarding the topic.	The video captured the attention of the audience. The video could have done more to evoke emotion and to stand out. The importance of the topic was not fully developed.	The video needed more attention to detail. It could have done a better job connecting to the audience and delivering the importance of the topic.	The video was not effective. It did not capture the attention of the audience or deliver the importance of the public health topic.	
2. Impact	The video was highly impactful and encourages a "call to action" in a positive manner in regards to the public health topic.	The video was good but the message could have been more specific impact and to inspire change regarding the public health topic.	The video was informative but did not impact the audience to action.	The video did not clearly communicate the impact of the public health topic or inspire the audience to action.	Video was not impactful and did not elicit any emotion from the viewer.	
3. Creativity and Originality	The video is extremely creative, clever and original. Excellent!	The video is good. Creative messaging and original content were displayed.	The video provided an average amount of creativity and originality.	The creativity in the video was basic. Little originality was included.	No original thoughts or creative concepts were used in this video.	
4. Video leaves judges wanting to know more	When are you presenting Round 2!? The judge is waiting on the edge of their seat to see your next work!	Great job! The judge wants to watch your full presentation.	Judge liked this video but may or may not be interested in seeing more.	This video was okay, but the judge probably won't go looking for any more.	Judge has seen enough.	
					Total Points for Pre-Judging Video (90)	

The expectation is that competitors read and are aware of all the content within these guidelines and associated links. Successful competitors will study all links for the detailed information.

Public Health

Round Two Presentation Rubric

Team #:_____ **Division:** _____MS _____SS_____PS/C **Judge's Signature:**_____

Presentation Content	EXCELLENT 10 points	GOOD 8 points	AVERAGE 6 points	FAIR 4 points	POOR 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Community Presentation Confirmed	Community presentation date and audience stated for judges prior to presentation.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Community presentation not confirmed.	
2. Importance of information presented	The interpretation of the topic/issue was presented in a highly-effective and compelling manner that reinforced the information gathered on this year's topic.	The interpretation of this year's topic/issue was well-received by the audience.	The information presented was done in a way that somewhat connected to this year's topic/theme.	The information presented provided a slight connection to this year's topic/theme.	Information was not presented in a way that made sense to the audience or did not cover this year's topic.	
3. Overall Understanding of issue/topic	The public health issue/topic is clearly revealed and well-structured into the presentation. The team clearly and accurately shares the complexity of the public health issue.	The public health issue/topic is stated and appropriate for presentation. Understanding of the issue or topic is lacking small details.	The understanding of the public health issue/topic is average and not fully threaded into the presentation.	The public health ssue/topic is not clearly communicated throughout the presentation.	No evidence of understanding of the public health issue or topic.	
4. Effectiveness/ Impact	The presentation was extremely effective and clearly educated the public on the given topic. It is explicitly clear that a positive impact was made on the community as a result of seeing the team's presentation	The presentation was effective and educated the public on the given topic. A positive impact on the community was most likely made as a result of seeing the team's presentation	The presentation was somewhat effective and may or may not have educated the public on the given topic. It is unclear whether or not a positive impact on the community was made as a result of seeing the team's presentation	The presentation lacked effectiveness in most key areas and only sparingly educated the public. It is not evident that a positive impact was made on the community as a result of seeing the team's presentation.	The presentation was not effective and did not make any kind of positive impact on the community.	
5. Captivating	The team actively engaged the audience with a well-executed presentation and maintained the attention of the audience throughout.	The team used techniques to attempt to retain the interest of the audience.	The team attempted to engage audience interest, but the effort was incomplete, disorganized, or was negated by poor delivery.	The team did not use any techniques to engage audience interest, or the attempt was made in an incoherent and disorganized fashion.	The team did not capture the attention of the audience whatsoever.	
6. Distinction	The team provided a highly creative, original, and imaginative presentation that was highly innovative. It stood out above others!	The presentation was unique and offered a fresh approach to the topic; however it was missing the "wow" factor.	The presentation was adequately imaginative. Would like to see more creativity and innovation in the approach to the presentation.	The presentation was unoriginal and little imagination was included in the presentation.	No evidence of imagination or creativity was used in the presentation.	
7. Research/ Resources	There is evidence of significant and reliable research in the information provided in the presentation.	There is evidence of some researched information in the presentation.	The presentation could benefit from increased researched based information.	There is minimal evidence incorporated into the presentation.	There is no evidence of research in the presentation.	

The expectation is that competitors read and are aware of all the content within these guidelines and associated links. Successful competitors will study all links for the detailed information.

Presentation Organization	EXCELLENT 5 points	GOOD 4 points	AVERAGE 3 points	FAIR 2 points	POOR 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Flow, Logic, and Transitions	There is evidence of practice and consistency of presentation flow and transitions.	There is evidence of practice and some consistency in presentation flow and transitions.	The presentation could benefit from a more consistent flow and transitions.	More practice is needed to achieve an authentic flow in the presentation.	The entire presentation is delivered with a lack of attention to flow and transitions.	
2. Opening	The team clearly establishes the occasion and purpose of the presentation, grabs the audience's attention and makes the audience want to listen.	The team introduced the presentation adequately, including an attention getter and established the occasion and purpose of the presentation.	The team introduced the topic but did not clearly establish the occasion and/or purpose of the speech. Weak attention getter.	The team failed to introduce the presentation. Or, the introduction was not useful in indicating what the presentation was about.	The team did not provide any kind of opening statement or action.	
3. Closing	The team prepares the audience for ending and ends memorably. They drew the presentation to a close with an effective memorable statement, including Impact on the community, and feedback from presentation.	The team adequately concluded the presentation and ended with a closing statement. Clear ending but ends with little impact.	The team concluded the presentation in a disorganized fashion and/or did not have a closing statement.	Audience has no idea the conclusion is coming. Team's message was unclear.	The team ended the presentation abruptly without an effective conclusion.	
Presentation Materials	**EXCELLENT 10 points**	**GOOD 8 points**	**AVERAGE 6 points**	**FAIR 4 points**	**POOR 0 points**	**JUDGE SCORE**
1. Visual Aids / Presentation Materials	Visual aids, props, and/or costumes add value and relevance to the presentation and are not used as substitutes. They help to tell a story and offer a better understanding of the subject. Creativity is evident.	Visual aids, props and/or costumes support the theme of the presentation and complement the overall message.	Most of the visual aids, props and/or costumes add value to the presentation and support the overall message.	The visual aids used offered minimal support or missed the opportunity to enhance the overall presentation.	No visual aids were used to complement the presentation.	
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	The team's voice was loud enough to hear. The competitors varied rate & volume to enhance the speech. Appropriate pausing was employed.	The team spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The competitors varied rate OR volume to enhance the speech. Pauses were attempted.	The team could be heard most of the time. The competitors attempted to use some variety in vocal quality, but not always successfully.	The team's voice is low. Judges have difficulty hearing the presentation.	Judge had difficulty hearing and/or understanding much of the speech due to low volume. Little variety in rate or volume.	
2. Stage Presence Poise, posture, eye contact, and enthusiasm	Movements & gestures were purposeful and enhanced the delivery of the speech and did not distract. Body language reflects comfort interacting with audience. Facial expressions and body language consistently generated a strong interest and enthusiasm for the topic.	The team maintained adequate posture and non-distracting movement during the speech. Some gestures were used. Facial expressions and body language sometimes generated an interest and enthusiasm for the topic.	Stiff or unnatural use of nonverbal behaviors. Body language reflects some discomfort interacting with audience. Limited use of gestures to reinforce verbal message. Facial expressions and body language are used to try to generate enthusiasm but seem somewhat forced.	The team's posture, body language, and facial expressions indicated a lack of enthusiasm for the topic. Movements were distracting.	No attempt was made to use body movement or gestures to enhance the message. No interest or enthusiasm for the topic came through in presentation.	

The expectation is that competitors read and are aware of all the content within these guidelines and associated links. Successful competitors will study all links for the detailed information.

. Presentation Delivery	EXCELLENT 5 points	GOOD 4 points	AVERAGE 3 points	FAIR 2 points	POOR 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
3.Diction, Pronunciation. and Grammar **Diction:** choice of words, especially with regard to correctness, clearness, and effectiveness. **Pronunciation:** Act or manner of uttering officially.	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 the 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 is minimal. Regular verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. Delivery problems cause disruption to message.	Many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or Articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal message.	
4. Team Participation	Excellent example of shared collaboration in the presentation of the project. Each team member spoke and carried equal parts of the project presentation.	All but one person on the team was actively engaged in the project presentation.	The team worked together relatively well. Some of the team members had little participation.	The team did not work effectively together.	One person dominated the project presentation.	
Total Points for Presentation (115)						

The expectation is that competitors read and are aware of all the content within these guidelines and associated links. Successful competitors will study all links for the detailed information.