

## VIRTUAL PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENT

### State 2020-2021 Virtual Conference

Items required for state conference: 1) [Pdf of Forms](#) 2) [PSA video](#) and 3) [Video of Presentation](#)

How to submit: [Uploaded to Tallo per guidelines from National HOSA to AL HOSA SLC Opportunity](#)

Deadline to Submit: [February 12, 2021](#)

Description: [For the AL Virtual State Conference, one member of each team will upload a single pdf containing the Reference Page, Copyright Form, and Airdate Form to Tallo. Teams will also upload a link to their 30 second PSA video, as well as a video of their team presentation for judges. Teams will be judged on all three items as uploaded to Tallo.](#)

One pdf file with forms Uploaded\*: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Presentation Uploaded\*: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Link to 30 second PSA Uploaded: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

*\*If the materials are not uploaded, please note that applicable items on the rubric below cannot be judged.*

Section # \_\_\_\_\_ Judge's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Team Names & # \_\_\_\_\_ Division:SS \_\_\_\_\_ PS/C \_\_\_\_\_

*Digital submissions will only be judged up until the allotted timing allowed per the event guidelines. Any time in a digital submission over the allowed will not be scored and no points will be awarded for those sections of the rating sheet.*

A. Overview	Excellent 5 points	Good 4 points	Average 3 points	Fair 2 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Length	PSA is no longer than 30 seconds (not counting optional pure black lead in beginning and end of PSA).	N/A	N/A	N/A	PSA is longer than 30 seconds OR not submitted (any content over 30 seconds will not be judged)	
2. Air Date Form	Air Date Form is submitted.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Air Date Form is not submitted.	
3. Copyright Form	Copyright Form is submitted.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Copyright form not submitted.	
4. Reference Page	Reference page is submitted.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Reference page not submitted.	
B. PSA TECHNICAL QUALITY	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE
1. Exposure/Focus/ Color	Quality of exposure was excellent; the images are sharp, in focus and the lighting is highly effective to accurately tell the story.	The quality of the exposure/focus was good, although a few shots were blurry or did not come across clearly.	The quality of the exposure was average, the lighting was good and most of the images came across clearly.	The quality of the exposure was basic, several images were blurry, or lighting was either too bright or too dark.	PSA not submitted OR the quality of the exposure is poor. The PSA is often out of focus or the lighting makes the images hard to see.	
B. PSA TECHNICAL QUALITY	Excellent 10 points	Good 8 points	Average 6 points	Fair 4 points	Poor 0 points	JUDGE SCORE

<b>2. Audio</b>	Effective and balanced approach to sound throughout the PSA. Excellent judgement and appropriate use of silence and music/audio to capture the message of the PSA.	The audio balance between background music and speaking parts was effective. Good judgement and appropriate use of silence and music/audio to capture the message of the PSA.	Average use of background music, silence and speaking parts were used to shape the message of the PSA. The audio didn't stand out one way or another or impact the overall message.	Audio levels were too loud or too soft, or picked up a great deal of background noise which made it difficult for the viewer to hear.	PSA not submitted OR the PSA included too much background noise and the message is not able to be understood due to poor quality of the audio.	
<b>3. Editing / clean transitions / synchronization*</b>	Excellent use of video effects; editing and transitions are clear and there is high quality synchronization between the sound and video content.	Editing between scenes is strong, good transitions from scene to scene.	The editing and transitions between slides is average.	The editing was clunky. Inappropriate transitions between scenes.	PSA not submitted OR the scenes have too much movement causing distraction from the message. The editing and transitions between scenes is poor.	
<b>4. Camera Technique / Composition</b>	Excellent use of capturing the composition of movement and angles to make the story come to life. Advanced ability and unique perspective to allow the film to tell the story.	Camera technique is good and the composition of scenes tell a story. Angles and movement could be captured in a way to make the story come to life better.	The camera technique is of average skill and the composition does not stand out to the viewer.	Some evidence of thoughtful camera technique but captured intermittently throughout the PSA. Most scenes were filmed at a basic level.	PSA not submitted OR the camera technique was basic, front facing shots with no evidence of intentional composition of the angles of the camera technique.	
<b>C. PSA CONTENT</b>	<b>Excellent 10 points</b>	<b>Good 8 points</b>	<b>Average 6 points</b>	<b>Fair 4 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>1. Effectiveness</b>	The message of the PSA did an extraordinary job at captivating the attention of the audience and activating a clear message that evokes emotion. It translates an important message. PSA aligns to annual topic of HOSA Making A Difference.	The message of the PSA did a good job capturing the attention of the audience. The message stood out and evoked emotion. The PSA was interesting and thoughtful.	The message and content captured the attention of the audience. More could have been done to evoke emotion and share the content theme.	The effectiveness of the message needed more attention to detail. The PSA could have done a better job at connecting to the audience and delivering the overall message.	PSA not submitted OR the message of the PSA was not effective. It did not capture the attention of the audience or deliver a critical message. The content did not evoke emotion or relay important information.	
<b>2. Impact</b>	The message is highly impactful for the target market and encourages a "call to action" in a positive manner.	The message is good but could have a more specific impact to the target market and could inspire behavior change slightly more effectively.	The message of the PSA was educational but did not impact the audience to action.	The impact of the message was not communicated clearly. The PSA did not inspire the audience to action.	PSA not submitted OR the PSA was not impactful and did not encourage positive behavior or elicit any emotion by the viewer	
<b>C. PSA CONTENT</b>	<b>Excellent 10 points</b>	<b>Good 8 points</b>	<b>Average 6 points</b>	<b>Fair 4 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>3. Creativity and Originality</b>	The PSA is extremely creative, clever and original. Excellent!	The PSA is good. Creative messaging and original content were displayed.	The PSA provided an average amount of creativity and originality.	The creativity in the PSA was basic. Little originality was included.	PSA not submitted OR no original thoughts or creative	

					concepts were used in this PSA.	
<b>4. PSA leaves judges wanting to know more</b>	When are you filming your next PSA? The judge is waiting on the edge of their seat to see your next work!	Great job! The judge wants to watch your next PSA.	Judge liked this PSA but may or may not be interested in seeing more.	This PSA was okay, but judge probably won't go looking for any more.	PSA not submitted OR judge has seen enough.	
<b>C. PSA Content</b>	<b>Excellent 5 points</b>	<b>Good 4 points</b>	<b>Average 3 points</b>	<b>Fair 2 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 point</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>5. Realistic visual imagery provided</b>	Visual imagery was believable and realistic, and enhanced the message being portrayed.	Most of the imagery was realistic and believable.	An average amount of realistic imagery was provided.	A fair amount of realistic visual imagery was provided.	PSA not submitted OR the visual imagery was not realistic.	
<b>6. Talent</b>	Actors were extremely talented and delivered a message that was believable and realistic. Professional-level quality of talent was delivered.	The actors did a good job delivering a message that was believable and realistic.	The talent in regard to the actors was average. The material seemed forced.	The actors could have used more rehearsing to create a more believable product.	PSA not submitted OR the actors were not believable in delivering their message. Much more effort needed.	
<b>7. Writing</b>	The word choices and placement on screen were of high quality and enhanced the message. No spelling/ grammatical errors.	The PSA did a good job highlighting the written words to emphasize the message. Few, if any, spelling/ grammatical errors.	The words written in the PSA were mostly clear (small lettering, too many words, text hard to read, etc). More accuracy would have enhanced the message.	The writing displayed in the PSA was of fair quality. More focus and accuracy needed. Spelling/ grammatical errors were distracting.	PSA not submitted OR the PSA writing was not appropriate or accurate in the project delivery.	
<b>D. PRESENTATION CONTENT</b>	<b>Excellent 10 points</b>	<b>Good 8 points</b>	<b>Average 6 points</b>	<b>Fair 4 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>1. Creative process</b>	Exceptional description of the team's creative process outlining how they came up with their idea and how they developed the PSA.	Above average description of the team's creative process outlining how they came up with their idea and how they developed the PSA.	The description of the creation of the PSA was moderate and somewhat described the creative process.	The description of the creation of the PSA was only fairly effective and only briefly described the creative process.	Presentation not submitted OR the team was unable to effectively describe their journey of creating the PSA.	
<b>2. Public use of the PSA</b>	The team incorporated a thoughtful implementation strategy to showcase their PSA to a public audience. The team is able to describe their process to make this happen and the impact/response of the audience reaction.	The PSA was disseminated to a public audience and the team was able to share the impact of the public viewing.	The team adequately described the process of how the public viewed their work.	The team did not think through how they would launch their PSA to a public audience. The public use came across to the judges as an afterthought.	Presentation not submitted OR no mention of the public use of PSA was offered during the presentation.	
<b>D. PRESENTATION CONTENT</b>	<b>Excellent 10 points</b>	<b>Good 8 points</b>	<b>Average 6 points</b>	<b>Fair 4 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>

<b>3. Public Response</b>	Excellent description on how the PSA will change the public's opinion, action, or feelings on the topic. A strong emotional connection was present.	The competitors did a good job describing how the PSA will change the public's opinion, actions, or feelings. An emotional connection was attempted.	The team made a good attempt at describing how the PSA will change the public's opinion, actions or feelings, but fell short.	Team members vaguely described how the PSA will change the public's opinion, actions and feelings.	Presentation not submitted OR no mention of how the PSA will change the opinion of the public's thoughts, actions or opinions.	
<b>4. Understanding of the subject/ theme and purpose of the PSA.</b>	It is evident that this team has a clear understanding of the subject/theme and purpose of the PSA. Excellent Presentation.	Through most of the presentation, the team was able to demonstrate the purpose of the PSA. Good presentation.	Occasionally the team members were able to demonstrate a clear understanding of the subject, theme and purpose of the PSA.	The team did not demonstrate a clear understanding of the subject, theme and purpose of the PSA. More attention to detail is needed.	Presentation not submitted OR no mention of purpose of PSA, Team members appeared unclear as to subject/theme and purpose of PSA.	
<b>E. PRESENTATION DELIVERY</b>	<b>Excellent 5 points</b>	<b>Good 4 points</b>	<b>Average 3 points</b>	<b>Fair 2 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>
<b>1. Voice</b> 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.	Most of the competitor's voices were low. Judges have difficulty hearing the presentation.	Presentation not submitted OR judge had difficulty hearing and/or understanding much of the speech due to low volume. Little variety in rate or volume.	
<b>2. Stage Presence</b> 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 speakers 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 speaker's posture, body language, and facial expressions indicated a lack of enthusiasm for the topic. Movements were distracting.	Presentation not submitted OR 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.	
<b>3. Diction*, Pronunciation** &amp; Grammar</b>	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.	Presentation not submitted OR many distracting errors in pronunciation and/or articulation. Monotone or inappropriate variation of vocal characteristics. Inconsistent with verbal message.	
<b>E. PRESENTATION DELIVERY</b>	<b>Excellent 5 points</b>	<b>Good 4 points</b>	<b>Average 3 points</b>	<b>Fair 2 points</b>	<b>Poor 0 points</b>	<b>JUDGE SCORE</b>

<b>4. Team Participation</b>	Excellent example of shared collaboration in the presentation of the project. Each team member spoke and carried equal parts of the project.	All but one person on the team was actively engaged in the presentation.	The team worked together relatively well. Some of the team members had little participation.	The team did not work effectively together.	No presentation submitted OR one team member dominated the project.	
<b>Total Points (175):</b>						

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

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

\***Synchronization**- the operation or activity of two or more things at the same time or rate.