Researched Persuasive Writing & Speaking

hosa
future health professionals

New for 2024-2025
Tallo has been replaced with the HOSA Digital Upload System.
These guidelines are written for ILC. States may modify events or have different event processes and deadlines. Be sure to check with your Local/State Advisor (or state website) to determine how the event is implemented for the regional/area or state conference.

TEXAS HOSA

This event will be run using the ILC guidelines with the modifications listed below for use in both Area and State Texas competitions

- No upload for Texas HOSA, upload required for those students advancing to ILC.
- Competitors will bring two stapled hard copies of their "Research Paper"
- Judges will use the hard copies of the "Research Paper" brought by the competitor in the judging process. **Failure to bring hard copies of the portfolio for use by the judges will result in a loss of research paper "Section" points on the rating sheet.**
- Index cards or electronic devices for presentation (optional)

APPOINTMENT TIMES

- **There will be holding rooms for this event.** An appointment time will be assigned to each competitor and will be posted in hard copy outside of Competitive Event Headquarters.

Event Summary
Researched Persuasive Writing and Speaking provides HOSA members with the opportunity to gain knowledge and skills required for researching a health issue, preparing written documentation supporting a thesis, and presenting information orally. This competitive event requires competitors to develop a speech and written paper, either for or against, the provided annual health topic.

Topic for 2023-2024:
Youth Sports Specialization: Good or Bad for Athletes?

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

Competitor Must Provide:

- ☐ Competitor uploads the paper to the HOSA Digital Upload System by May 15 for ILC competition (see advisor regarding SLC requirements and deadlines)
- ☐ Photo ID
- ☐ Index cards or electronic notecards (optional)
- ☐ Two #2 lead pencils (not mechanical) for evaluation

General Rules

1. Competitors in this event must be active members of HOSA and in good standing.

2. **Eligible Divisions:** Secondary and Postsecondary/Collegiate divisions are eligible to compete in this event.

3. Competitors must be familiar with and adhere to the **"**General Rules and Regulations of the HOSA Competitive Events Program (GRR)."
   A. Per the GRRs and Appendix H, HOSA members may request accommodation in any competitive event. To learn the definition of an accommodation, please read Appendix H. To request accommodation for the International Leadership Conference, submit the request form here by May 15 at midnight EST.

   B. To request accommodation for any regional/area or state level conferences, submit the request form here by your state published deadline. Accommodations must first be done at state in order to be considered for ILC.

4. All competitors shall report to the site of the event at the time designated for competition. At ILC, competitor's photo ID must be presented prior to ALL competition rounds.

The Research Paper - Pre-judged Digitally

5. The research paper will include the following four (4) pages:

A.	Page 1	Title Page
B.	Pages 2 and 3	Body of paper
C.	Page 4+ (or more if reference list takes up multiple pages)	Reference page(s)

6. **Title Page:** Create a title page, including the following: Event name, Competitor Name, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, Chartered Association, Title of Paper including Topic Stance, Title page centered, One page only. (A creative design or pictures may be used but will not affect the score.)

7. **Body of Paper** formatting:
   A. Pages are one-sided, typed
   B. 12 pt. Arial font, double-spaced, in English
   C. 1" margins on 8 ½" x 11" paper
   D. Running header with last name, & name of event, on top left side of each page (not counting title page)
   E. Include page number on top right side of each page (not counting title page)

8. **Reference Page:** List the literature cited to give guidance to the written paper and speech. American Psychological Association (APA) is the preferred resource in Health Sciences. *Points will be awarded for compiling a clean, legible reference page(s), but the formatting of the reference page(s) is not judged.*

9. No plagiarism is allowed & work must be the competitors per the GRR's.

REQUIRED Digital Uploads

10. The following item(s) **MUST** be uploaded to the HOSA Digital Upload System by May 15:
    a. The Research Paper – as a 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.

11. Detailed instructions for uploading materials can be found at:
https://hosa.org/competitive-event-digital-uploads/

12. State Leadership Conference (SLC) vs. HOSA's International Leadership Conference (ILC)
    a. **State Leadership Conferences.** It is the competitor's responsibility to 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.

13. 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.

14. 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 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.

The Speech

15. The speech may or may not be worded exactly as written in the researched written paper. The main ideas must remain the same, but the competitor may elaborate in the speech.
    NOTE: Competitors may choose to bring their paper to ILC competition, to reference during the speech, but no points are awarded on the rating sheet for doing so.

16. Use of index card notes during the speech is permitted. Electronic notecards (on a tablet, smart phone, laptop, etc.) are permitted, but may not be shown to judges. Props may **NOT** be used.

17. The speech may be up to four (4) minutes in length. The timekeeper shall present a flash card advising the competitor when there is one (1) minute remaining. The competitor will be stopped and dismissed when the four minutes are up.

Final Scoring

18. Should a tie occur, scores on the rating sheet section(s) with the highest point value(s) will be used, in descending order, to break the tie.

RESEARCHED PERSUASIVE WRITING AND SPEAKING
Judges Rating Sheet

Section # _____ Competitor # _____
Division: _____ SS _____ PS/C Judge's Signature _____

One PDF File of the completed paper Uploaded Online: Yes ___ No*

A. Written Paper	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Opening Statement	Writer grabs attention of reader. The introduction is creative, imaginative and thoughtful. Thesis clearly revealed and well-structured for the paper. Forecasts body of paper in a memorable and effective way.	Writer somewhat grabs the attention of the reader. Thesis stated and appropriate for the paper. Forecasts body so audience knows main points in brevity.	Audience is reading with some engagement. Thesis needs strength or structure. Forecast incomplete.	Attention device is unrelated to the topic. Thesis missing OR forecast statement missing.	Paper not submitted OR attention device is missing. Thesis inappropriate or missing AND forecast is missing or indistinguishable.	
2. Coverage of Assigned Event Topic and Quality of Information	Information included high-quality details that support the topic in a thorough manner. Research was in-depth and beyond the obvious, revealing new insights. Overall, the coverage of the assigned topic was excellent.	Information included sufficient detail relevant to the topic. Research seemed to be in-depth. The coverage of the assigned topic was good.	The quality of the information was limited to support the topic. The competitor provided an average amount of coverage on the assigned topic.	Some information provided was relevant to the topic. Research provided was mostly surface-level and the competitor missed key points.	Paper not submitted OR information was unreliable and interfered with ability of the audience to understand the speech. Research was irrelevant to the assigned topic.	
3. Originality	Writing reflects the original thoughts of the author and extends a creative or unique idea, question or concept on the topic. No evidence of plagiarism.	Writing reflects the original thoughts of the author and provides some unique ideas on the topic. No evidence of plagiarism.	Some original thoughts are provided by the author. Creativity is experimented with on the topic. No evidence of plagiarism.	Limited originality is provided by the author on the topic. No evidence of plagiarism.	Paper not submitted OR There was evidence of plagiarism.	
4. Conclusion	Conclusion is concise and summarizes supporting	Conclusion is mostly concise	Conclusion provides a	Conclusion may be	Paper not submitted OR	

	points: restates the thesis in a new way. The reader is satisfied with the conclusion and is left with something to think about.	and summarizes the supporting points. The reader is indifferent with the conclusion of the essay.	summary of supporting points: it does not restate the thesis.	attempted but does not summarize or restate thesis.	no conclusion is apparent in the essay.	
A. Written Paper	**Excellent 20 points**	**Good 15 points**	**Average 10 points**	**Fair 5points**	**Poor 0 points**	**JUDGE SCORE**
5. Persuasiveness	The paper was exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their position on the topic.	The paper was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view.	The paper was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view.	The paper provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very persuasive.	Paper not submitted OR the paper was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point of view.	
A. Written Paper	**Excellent 5 points**	**Good 4 points**	**Average 3 points**	**Fair 2 points**	**Poor 0 points**	**JUDGE SCORE**
6. Title Page	Title Page includes Competitor Name, HOSA Division, HOSA Chapter #, School Name, State/Chartered Assoc, Title of Paper including Topic Stance, Title page centered, One page.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Paper not submitted OR title page does not include all requirements OR is not present.	
7. Transitions	Writing has voice and is easily read aloud. Appropriate transitions are used to move from one supporting detail to the next. Word choice and syntax offer surprise, clarity and "just right" wording.	Writing has some voice and is easily read aloud. Transitions are used, but better wording could have been used.	Vocabulary or writing style needs further development in sentence variety, word choice, and fluency. Some basic transitions used.	Sentences are short, fragmented or run-ons. Flow of essay is hard to follow. Few to no transitions are used.	Paper not submitted OR no flow to writing. Difficult for reader to follow. No transitions used	
8. Grammar	Zero (0) grammatical errors found in this essay.	1-2 grammatical errors were found in this essay. They do not detract from the general flow of the essay.	3-4 errors were found in the essay, and they detract from the overall flow of the essay.	There are 5-6 grammatical errors present which detract from the overall meaning and flow of the essay.	Paper not submitted OR more than 6 errors were found in this essay. The errors are glaring, and the essay is difficult to read.	
9. Spelling & Punctuation	Zero (0) errors in spelling and punctuation were found in this essay.	1-2 errors in spelling or punctuation were found in this essay.	3-4 errors in spelling or punctuation in this essay.	5 errors in spelling or punctuation were found in this essay.	Paper not submitted OR more than 5 errors in spelling or punctuation were documented within the essay.	

10. Formatting	Pages: a. Are one-sided, typed, b. Use 12 pt. Arial font, double-spaced, in English, c. Are 1" margins on 8 ½" x 11" paper, d. Use running header with last name, event on top left, and page number top right side of each page (not counting title page). e. Are no more than two for body of paper	N/A	N/A	N/A	Paper not submitted OR all requirements are not met.	
11. Reference Page	The reference page is included with the paper.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Paper not submitted OR no reference page is included.	
Subtotal Points for Pre-Judging Written Paper (90)						

B. Speech Content	Excellent 15 points	Good 12 points	Average 9 points	Fair 6 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Introduction	The competitor grabs the attention of the audience in a way that is creative, imaginative and thoughtful. The thesis statement is clearly revealed and well-structured for speech.	The competitor draws in the audience with their introduction and piques their interest to want to learn more. The thesis statement connects to body of the speech.	The competitor provides an average introduction of the topic and slightly sparks the interest and attention of the audience.	The introduction provided by the competitor lacks attention to detail and connection to the overall point of the speech.	The competitor does not provide an introduction that draws in the audience and captures their attention.	
2. Overall coverage of assigned event topic and quality of information.	Information included high-quality details that support the event topic in a thorough manner. Research was in-depth and revealed new insights. Overall, the coverage of the assigned topic was excellent.	Information included sufficient detail relevant to the topic. Research seemed to be in-depth. The coverage of the assigned topic was good.	The quality of the information was limited to support the topic. The competitor provided an average amount of coverage on the assigned topic.	Some information provided was relevant to the topic. Research provided was mostly surface-level and the competitor missed key points of the assigned topic.	Information was unreliable and interfered with ability of the audience to understand the speech. Research was irrelevant to the assigned topic and the competitor missed the point of the topic.	
3. Conclusion	The competitor reviews the thesis and main points of speech in a memorable and effective way that provides an effective flow leading to the conclusion.	The competitor reviews the thesis and main points of speech in a clear way that provides an adequate flow leading to the conclusion.	The competitor reviews the thesis and main points clearly. Underwhelming conclusion.	The competitor is missing a review of the thesis or main points. The conclusion was hard to follow.	Review of the thesis and main points are missing from the conclusion.	
B. Speech Content	**Excellent 20 points**	**Good 15 points**	**Average 10 points**	**Fair 5 points**	**Poor 0 points**	**JUDGE SCORE**
4. Persuasiveness	The speech is exceptionally persuasive and convincing. The competitor provided well-researched evidence that reinforced their position on the topic.	The speech was persuasive and provided good reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view.	The speech was somewhat persuasive and provided some reasons to agree with the competitor's point of view.	The speech provided limited evidence of competitor's point of view and was not very persuasive.	The speech was not persuasive and did not provide evidence to support the competitor's point of view.	
C. Speech 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 competitor's voice was loud enough to hear. The competitor varied rate & volume to enhance the speech. Appropriate pausing was employed.	The competitor spoke loudly and clearly enough to be understood. The competitor varied rate OR volume to enhance the speech. Pauses were attempted.	The competitor could be heard most of the time. The competitor 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 most of the presentation.	

C. Speech 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 competitor 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 competitor's posture, body language, and facial expressions indicated a lack of enthusiasm for the topic. Movements were distracting.	No attempt was made to use body movement or gestures to enhance the message. No interest or enthusiasm for the topic came through in presentation.	
3. Diction*, Pronunciation and Grammar**	Delivery emphasizes and enhances message. Clear enunciation and pronunciation. No vocal 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"). 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.	
					Subtotal Speech Points (80):	
					Total Points (170):	

* Definition of Diction – Choice of words especially with regard to correctness, clearness, and effectiveness.
** Definition of Pronunciation – Act or manner of uttering officially.