PRESENTATION EVALUATION FORM

**Presenter Name**

**Date**

**Evaluator**

**Start Time**

**End Time**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Content | **Evaluation** | Comments |
| Presentation flowed logically and was clear. Title matches presentation. Discussion precise and confined to topic. |  |  |
| Generally, well organized; occasionally skipped around; occasionally wordy. |  |
| Hard to follow; more logical flow needed. Discussion not relevant to subject matter. |  |
| Presenter was knowledgeable about subject matter. |  |
| Presenter somewhat knowledgeable about subject matter. Occasionally unable to clearly explain some concepts. |  |
| Presenter was not knowledgeable about subject matter.  Unable to clearly explain most concepts. |  |
| **Content - Objectives** (should list a minimum of 3 learning objectives.) | | |
| All objectives were stated and emphasized; all objectives were covered/met. Thorough elaborate discussion of topics and relevant recommendations. |  |  |
| Some objectives were not clearly stated; the discussion did not reflect the objectives. Minimal discussion with no extrapolation to relevant information. |  |
| Objectives were not stated and appeared to be not considered given design of discussion. |  |
| Content - Discussion of Disease States and Drug Therapy | | |
| Thorough critique of drug therapy; all aspects of drug therapy reviewed as applicable (pharmacology, dosing, adverse effects, interactions, complications, appropriateness). Other therapeutic options discussed. |  |  |
| critique to drug therapy; some aspects of drug therapy reviewed. Several options discussed. |  |
| Drug therapy presented, but not critiqued; no options discussed. |  |
| Disease state discussion relevant to presentation; balance between disease state and drug therapy. |  |
| Disease state too broad and difficult to relate to presentation. |  |
| Not enough disease state information presented. |  |
| Content - Interpretation of Primary Literature | | |
| Primary literature thoroughly reviewed and relevant to presentation. Appropriate literature reviewed. |  |  |
| Primary literature somewhat reviewed and relevant to presentation.  Incomplete review of data. |  |
| Primary literature reviewed but not relevant to presentation and/or too many/few studies. |  |
| Accurate and thorough interpretation of primary literature (comments on design, limitations, statistics, and applicability to patient population). Discussed strengths and weaknesses of studies and provided ***own*** opinion. |  |
| Partial assessment/interpretation of primary literature. Only presented investigator's conclusions. . |  |
| Did not interpret primary literature. No discussion of strengths and weaknesses of studies. Did not provide rational conclusions. |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Communication – Verbal** | **Evaluation** | Comments |
| Presenter easily heard (adequate volume/tone/enunciation). Easy to follow & listen to. Proper use of all terminology |  |  |
| Presenter with adequate volume, but some words lost to mumbling. |  |
| Presenter not easily heard from the back of the room. Demonstrated lack of interest in top and/or inappropriate medical terms. |  |
| Efficient use of time, pace. |  |
| Rate appropriate the majority of the time with some parts too fast or too slow. |  |
| Rate of delivery was too slow/too fast; inefficient use of time. |  |
| Communication - Non-Verbal | | |
| No distracting mannerisms, gestures; exhibited polish, poise; maintained eye contact with audience; used notes infrequently |  |  |
| Mildly (1-4) distracting mannerisms or gestures; usually polished and poised. Read some of the presentation with some eye contact. Minimum use of stall words. |  |
| Many distracting mannerisms, detracted from the presentation. Did not speak with confidence. Read most of presentation with no eye contact. |  |
| Communication - AV Materials/Handouts | | |
| Discussion of graphs/diagrams included NO spelling errors; familiar w/AV equipment; appropriate number of slides used. |  |  |
| Some disorganization of slides, busy slide(s), too many/too few slides; few spelling errors. |  |
| Slides are very unorganized with multiple spelling/grammar errors; unfamiliar with AV equipment. |  |
| Well organized handout that coincided with slides. Referenced summary includes comprehensive overview of discussion. NO spelling/grammatical errors. |  |
| Some disorganization of handout. Handout difficult to follow and/or was not an overview of the presentation. Few spelling/grammatical errors. |  |
| No handout provided OR handout provided is disorganized with multiple spelling/grammatical errors. |  |
| Communication - Ability to Answer Questions | | |
| Presenter able to respond to questions with confidence and knowledge. Appropriately anticipated audience questions. Demonstrates integration of material. |  |  |
| Presenter somewhat able to respond to questions; was not able to respond without referring to notes. Provides pertinent information missed during presentation. |  |
| Presenter not able to appropriately respond to questions; did not anticipate audience questions; did not appear prepared. |  |
| **Additional Comments** | | |