MT HOSA Research Poster

Event Category: Teamwork

Dress Code: Official HOSA uniform or business professional attire	**Round One:** Digital upload of poster, pre-judged	**Digital Upload:** YES, poster
Team Event: 2-4 competitors per team	**Round Two:** Presentation (5 minutes)	**Presentation Materials:** Printed Research Poster (48"x36" landscape orientation). Notecards (optional).

New for 2026-2027

This event has moved to the Teamwork Category and is no longer a solo event. Teams will consist of two-four competitors. Teams now have five minutes to present to judges. Pre-judging and advancement to Round Two has been clarified. Editorial changes have been made.

Event Summary

Research Poster allows HOSA members to think critically about a health-related issue in their community, pose a research question surrounding the chosen topic, and conduct their **own** research on that topic. Each team will consist of 2-4 members, and they will develop a poster showcasing their findings. Round One will be an upload of their research poster which will be pre-judged virtually. The top teams from Round One will advance to Round Two where they will present their research to a panel of judges.

General Event Information

The Research Question	1. Teams must pose a topic and research question that can be researched in their community. The goal is for competitors to **conduct their own research and not simply summarize someone else's.** 2. Topics must be health-related, but flexibility is given to competitors to select something of interest and of local importance and relevance. 3. Examples of topics: a. Community-based Strategies to Reduce Mental Health Stigma b. Combating Postpartum Depression in Teen Moms c. Decreasing Juvenile Incarceration Rates by Increasing the Presence of Positive Male Role Models
The Research Process	4. Once the research question is identified, teams will determine the best method(s) for conducting their research. Research methods may include, but are not limited to: a. survey(s) b. Interviews c. Scientific study d. Observational ethnography 5. It is the team's responsibility to obtain informed consent from any participants involved in their research. While formal IRB approval is not required for HOSA projects, competitors are expected to follow ethical research practices and document content appropriately. For guidance, please refer to the HOSA FAQ. 6. The research must be conducted within the current HOSA membership year (July 1, 2026-May 15, 2027).

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.

ROUND ONE- Digital Upload of Poster (Pre-judged virtually)

The Research Poster Content	1. A Research Poster is developed to summarize the research question and research findings. 2. The best posters are self-contained and self-explanatory. Observers should be able to understand the content of your poster without the team being present. 3. The research poster will contain the following eight (8) components: **a. TITLE** ■ The title should highlight the research to be conducted by the team and gain the viewers' attention. ■ The research poster should include the competitors' names, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter number, School Name, and Chartered Association. ■ 100 words maximum **b. ABSTRACT** ■ An abstract is a brief summary of the research. ■ Include the study's overall purpose and the research problem(s) investigated. ■ Describe the basic design and objectives of the study. ■ Explain the significant findings found as a result of the analysis. ■ Provide a brief summary of interpretations and conclusions. ■ 250 words maximum (suggested) **c. METHODS** ■ Describe the research methods that led to the results. ■ Identify the target population. ■ Explain how data was collected accurately. ■ Explain how the data was analyzed. ■ Explain possible errors and biases in the methods ■ 200 words maximum (suggested) **d. RESULTS** ■ Describe qualitative and quantitative results. ■ Present the data analysis employed. ■ Explain why the results matter. ■ Use supportive charts and figures. ■ 200 words maximum (suggested) **e. CONCLUSIONS** ■ Emphasize the significant results and try to convince why the results are interesting. ■ Explain the relevance of your findings to your community and our world. ■ 200 words maximum (suggested) **f. REFERENCES** ■ List the literature cited that gave guidance to the project. ■ American Psychological Association (APA) is the preferred resource in Health Sciences. ■ 100 words maximum (suggested) **g. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS** ■ Thank anyone who helped make the project possible. **h. IMAGES** ■ Convert the data into graphs, tables, statistics, and/or quotes illustrating the findings. Include photos and illustrations that reflect the research. Use 2 to 5 images. ■ Logos from community agencies involved in the research are acceptable.
The Research Poster Template and Design	4. Competitors will create the poster template (the file sent out to be professionally printed) in 48" x 36" landscape orientation.

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.

	5. Any computer program the team chooses to create the poster template is acceptable, as long as the final digital product can be saved as a PDF and the final printed product is 48" x 36" landscape orientation. Posters should be designed digitally and not hand-drawn. 6. The items listed in rule #3 must be included, but colors, fonts, and overall design are at the discretion of the team. 7. Numerous websites are available showcasing sample poster designs and templates to show strengths and weaknesses of sample posters as a reference for competitors. 8. Below are tips for poster design. These are suggestions only and NOT required: **a. 3 Feet Rule** ■ Poster must be readable 3 feet away ■ Title font size: Minimum 65 pt. ■ Heading font size: Minimum 48 pt. ■ All other text sizes: Minimum 24 pt., suggested 36-42 pt. ■ Use bold to provide emphasis, but avoid underlining and CAPITALS **b. Left to Right, Top to Bottom** ■ Most readers read top left to bottom, top right to bottom, in that order ■ Strategically placing your content in order will help the reader to follow **c. Use Bullet Points** ■ Focus on highlights ■ Use brief statements instead of complete sentences **d. Context** ■ Write in active language, avoid using passive language ■ Use third third-person point of view to provide readers with an objective perspective ■ Use text boxes to write your text. This will make editing and layout adjustments easier. ■ Writing should be left justified. **e. Images** ■ Make sure images are high quality to avoid grainy or distorted photos ■ Photos typically print best at 300 dpi or greater and in TIFF format. ■ Use italicized captions (in a minimum 18-point font) to help your readers distinguish your caption from the rest of your text. Adding captions will also help your readers understand what your image represents. ■ Avoid long numeric tables.
The Research Poster Printing	9. Once the poster template is finalized as a PDF, competitors should determine the best place and method for printing the final size of 48" x 36" (landscape orientation). 10. Avoid using dark backgrounds and patterns to help with printing costs and to be more visually appealing. Instead, use high-contrast colors on muted backgrounds. 11. To help costs, posters can be printed on matte/economy-style paper and do NOT need to be printed on high-glass paper. They can also be made of thin paper that is easily rolled up- there is no need for foam boards. 12. Competitors should check with their local advisors for assistance on where to print the poster. Often, schools, colleges, universities, etc., have printing departments with discounted printing rates. Additionally, there are many online sites available that provide affordable printing options.
REQUIRED Digital Upload	13. ONE member of the team **MUST** upload the following item(s) to the Digital Upload System by March 19 for SLC. ● Research Poster- as ONE PDF File.

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.

	If the upload is not submitted as a single PDF document, the judge will NOT view it and NO points will be awarded. In addition, any links or documents that are not accessible to the judge for viewing, no points will be awarded. 14. **March 19** at midnight MST is the final deadline, and there will be **NO EXCEPTIONS.** We STRONGLY suggest not waiting until the last minute to upload online to avoid user challenges with the system. 15. Detailed instructions for uploading materials can be found at: https://hosa.org/competitive-event-digital-uploads/ 16. For SLC, the digital materials uploaded by March 19 will be PRE-JUDGED. Competitors who do not upload materials are NOT eligible for the Round Two presentation portion of the competition and **will NOT be given a competition appointment time at SLC**.

ROUND TWO- Presentation to Judges

1. The top teams from Round One will advance to Round Two, where they will present their poster to judges. The number of advancing teams will be determined by criteria met in Round One, space and time available for Round Two. Competitors shall report to the event site 10 minutes before their appointment time.
2. Round Two qualifying teams will report to the scheduled room at their team's assigned appointment time to present a five (5) minute prepared oral presentation to the judges. Teams will stand next to their poster for the presentation.
3. During the five (5) minute prepared presentation, time cards will be shown with one (1) minute remaining, and time will be called at the end of the five (5) minutes
4. 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.
5. All team members must take an active role in the presentation.
6. Presentation Content:
    a. Begin the presentation with an "elevator pitch"- a short, enthusiastic introduction to the research that draws the judges in and sets the stage for why the research is essential.
    b. The presentation should be clearly connected to the poster content, but should not simply duplicate it. It should complement the information on the poster and engage the audience's interest.
    c. Highlight the salient points of the research- focus on key findings and implications.
7. Recognition of Research Posters in Fall HOSA e-Magazine: The top three winners from each division at the International Leadership Conference (ILC) may have their abstracts featured in the fall edition of HOSA's e-Magazine. This opportunity allows HOSA members to showcase their work to a broader audience, inspiring interest in health-related research and academic excellence. For more information about material submission rules, see GRRs.

Final Scoring

1. Scores from Round One will be added to Round Two 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.

Research Poster

Round One- Digital Research Poster (pre-judged virtually)

Team #:_____ **Division:** _____SS,_____PS/C **Judge's Signature:**_____

One PDF file with Research Poster Uploaded Online: Yes: ___ No: ___*

If the submission is NOT uploaded as a PDF file, judges are not to score the submission.

A. Overview	EXCELLENT 10 points	GOOD 8 points	AVERAGE 6 points	FAIR 4 points	POOR 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Research Question	The Research Question posed is health-related, specific, and reflects a deep understanding of an issue that needs addressing in the competitor's local community. It is evident the competitor was thorough in developing the question.	The Research Question is health-related but could benefit from being more specific and more action-oriented. There is some detail lacking to make it stand out.	The Research Question sufficiently addresses a health topic, but leaves the judges wanting more clarification or information to fully understand the question posed.	The Research Question is confusing, not fully thought out, and/or not a good representation of a health issue.	The Research Question is drastically lacking substance or is not included at all.	
B. Poster Content	**EXCELLENT 5 points**	**GOOD 4 points**	**AVERAGE 3 points**	**FAIR 2 points**	**POOR 0 points**	**JUDGE SCORE**
1. Title	A title is included and the poster contains: competitor's name, Division, Chapter #, School Name, and Chartered Association.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Poster not submitted OR Title is missing or all requirements are not met	
2. References	At least one reference is included on the poster.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Poster not submitted OR No references are included on the poster.	
3. Acknowledgement	At least one person or community organization is acknowledged on the poster.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Poster not submitted OR No acknowledgements are made	
B. Poster Content	**EXCELLENT 10 points**	**GOOD 8 points**	**AVERAGE 6 points**	**FAIR 4 points**	**POOR 0 points**	**JUDGE SCORE**
4. Abstract	The Abstract does an excellent job summarizing the research. It clearly describes the purpose of the research, the overall methods, major findings, and a succinct summary of the conclusions. The abstract leaves the judges excited about learning more!	The Abstract included sufficient details to the purpose of the research, some of the methods, some findings, and is a good summary of the conclusions. The judges are curious about learning more.	The information provided in the Abstract to summarize the purpose, methods, findings, and conclusions is limited and/or some of these components are missing.	Some information was provided in the Abstract but was mostly surface-level and key points were missing.	Poster not submitted OR The Abstract is missing or did not describe all key items.	
5. Method	The research methods are explicitly explained, including: 1) target population 2) how data was collected 3) how data was analyzed 4) how data was shared	The research methods were explained. Some supporting points needed more detail, but all 5 items were covered.	Some of the research methods were explained but included only 4 of the 5 requirements.	The research methods explanation was limited and only included 2 or 3 of the 5 requirements.	Poster not submitted OR The research methods were not explained or included and/or left the judges with more questions than answers.	

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.

	5) A review of possible errors and biases is also included.					
B. Poster Content	**EXCELLENT 10 points**	**GOOD 8 points**	**AVERAGE 6 points**	**FAIR 4 points**	**POOR 0 points**	**JUDGE SCORE**
6. Results	The results of the research are presented and explained in a way that makes sense and can be easily understood. It is clear what was discovered and an additional explanation about why the results matter is included.	The results of the research are presented and explained but some questions remain. It is clear what was discovered but additional explanation about why the results matter is needed.	The results of the research are presented but the explanation is not clear. There seems to be important information that should have been included. Minimal explanation about why results matter.	The results of the research are limited and significant gaps are evident. No explanation of why the results matter.	Poster not submitted OR The results of the research are not included and no description given of why they matter.	
7. Conclusions	The conclusion provides a short and solid justification of the research question, explains the relevance of findings to the community and/or world, and explains why the results are conclusive.	The conclusion is mostly concise and does a good job of summarizing the justification of the research question, the relevance of the results, and why they are conclusive. More information is needed.	The conclusion provides minimal justification of the research question. Questions remain as to how the results can be used or why the results are conclusive.	There is not a solid justification of the research question nor how results are relevant nor if they are conclusive.	Poster not submitted OR The competitor failed to include conclusions or the conclusions drawn were out of scope.	
8. Images	2-5 images (graphs, tables, illustrations, photos, logos, etc.) are included. Images used add excellent value to the overall poster, complimenting the text, illustrating the findings, and reflecting key research. They stand out above others.	2-5 images are included and they do a good job of adding overall value to the poster and accurately representing the details of the research and process. They however, lack the special 'wow factor"	2-5 images are included that adequately connect to the research. They do not enhance nor distract from the poster.	2-5 images are included but their connection to the research and process is only fair. They distract from the overall appeal of the poster and/or do not accurately reflect the research project.	Poster not submitted OR 0-1, or more than 5 images are included	
C. Poster Design	**EXCELLENT 10 points**	**GOOD 8 points**	**AVERAGE 6 points**	**FAIR 0 points**	**POOR 0 points**	**JUDGE SCORE**
1. Artistic Design	The artistic quality is exceptional. The design is vibrant, balanced, visually pleasing and pushes the boundaries of artistic expression. The design choices take the poster to the next level and has that "wow factor"	The artistic quality is good; the design stands out. The design elements seem to be well-thought out and comprehensive.	The poster incorporates balanced design choices, showcasing some artistic features. Some of the poster lacks artistic details that took away from the overall visual of the poster.	Basic levels of artistic design are incorporated into the poster. Better design/color choices should be incorporated to assure the design of the poster is pleasing to the eye.	Poster not submitted OR The design is simplistic and not visually appealing.	
2. Appearance/ Organization	The poster is exceptionally neat, organized, & error-free. Information is clearly displayed & easy to understand & follow. Content is strategically placed to enhance the research & the poster can easily be seen from 3 feet away. Poster is created digitally (not hand drawn).	Poster is neat and organized. The content has a logical flow with only minimal errors and does a good job enhancing the research process.	The poster was basic and could use more organization and thought to be understood.	The poster lacked organization and/or contained several spelling errors. The flow of information seemed to be out of order and it was difficult to read the poster from 3 feet away.	Poster not submitted OR The poster is either too busy or lacks enough detail to support the content. OR poster is hand drawn.	
Total Points for Round One Pre-judging Research Poser (95)						

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.

Research Poster

Round Two- Presentation Rubric

Team #:_____ **Division:** _____SS,_____PS/C **Judge's Signature:**_____

A. Presentation Content	**EXCELLENT 15 points**	**GOOD 12 points**	**AVERAGE 9 points**	**FAIR 6 points**	**POOR 0 points**	**JUDGE SCORE**
1. Opening "Elevator Pitch"	The presentation starts with an excellent and enthusiastic elevator pitch that introduces the research, draws the judge in, & sets the stage for why the research is important.	The elevator pitch does a good job setting the stage for the rest of the presentation, but does not "wow" the judges.	The presentation starts with an elevator pitch but it is lacking enthusiasm, and an overall draw for the judges.	There is an attempt made to begin with an elevator pitch, but the overall execution is lacking.	No elevator pitch was shared during the presentation	
2. Presentation of the Research	The presentation of the research information was exceptionally organized, clear, and highlighted relevant details of the research question, methods, results, and implications of the research. The competitors could speak freely without using notes and clearly had a mastery of the subject matter.	The content and messaging of the research was presented in a clear and concise manner. Most of the appropriate connections were drawn between the methods, results, and implications. The competitor was confident in the subject matter.	Information shared by competitors was mostly organized and included basic information about the research process. The judges were left with unanswered questions though.	Presenters shared little knowledge of the overall research process, and the information that was shared was not delivered in a clear and concise manner. The competitors seemed dependent on notes in order to speak on the subject matter.	Little to no information was presented to the judges on the research process.	
3. Connection to the Poster	The presentation is clearly connected to the research poster but does not duplicate it. The presentation does an excellent job complementing the information on the poster and engages the interest of the audience in a fresh way than what is seen on the poster. The competitors appropriately point to images, graphs, and sections of the poster during the presentation.	The presentation connects to the research poster and the majority of information is not duplicative. The presentation is somewhat unique from the poster. The competitors mostly do a good job of referencing the poster during the presentation.	The competitors did an adequate job of connecting the presentation to the poster.	The competitors seemed to read from the poster at times word for word, and had a hard time making the presentation unique.	The presentation seemed to be an afterthought. There was a disconnect between what was presented and the content of the poster.	
B. Presentation Delivery	**EXCELLENT 5 points**	**GOOD 4 points**	**AVERAGE 3 points**	**FAIR 2 points**	**POOR 0 points**	**JUDGE SCORE**

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.

1. Voice Pitch, tempo, volume, quality	Each 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.	
B. 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 the 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 the 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 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 the presentation.	
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 the message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. No vocal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows"). The 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 are suitable. Noticeable verbal fillers (ex: "ahs," "uh/ums," or "you-knows") present. The 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 the 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.	The team worked effectively together, but the project presentation could have been more evenly divided.	The team worked together relatively well. One of the team members had less participation.	The team did not work effectively together.	One team member dominated the project presentation.	
C. Poster Size	**EXCELLENT 5 points**	**GOOD 4 points**	**AVERAGE 3 points**	**FAIR 2 points**	**POOR 0 points**	**JUDGE SCORE**
1. Poster Size	Poster is 48" x 36" landscape orientation.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Poster is not 48" x 36" and/or landscape orientation.	
Subtotal Points for Round Two Presentation (70):						
Total Points (Pre-judged Research Poster & Presentation) (165):						

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.