

## Presentation Evaluation Form

Presenter Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator \_\_\_\_\_ Start Time \_\_\_\_\_ End Time \_\_\_\_\_

CONTENT – Organization	Evaluation	Comments
1. Presentation flowed logically and was clear. Title matches presentation. Discussion precise and confined to topic.	Excellent	
Generally well organized; occasionally skipped around; occasionally wordy.	Good	
Hard to follow; more logical flow needed. Discussion not relevant to subject matter.	Poor	
2. Presenter was knowledgeable about subject matter.	Excellent	
Presenter somewhat knowledgeable about subject matter. Occasionally unable to clearly explain some concepts.	Good	
Presenter was not knowledgeable about subject matter. Unable to clearly explain most concepts.	Poor	
<b>CONTENT - Objectives</b> (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.	Excellent	
Some objectives were not clearly stated; the discussion did not reflect the objectives. Minimal discussion with no extrapolation to relevant information.	Good	
Objectives were not stated and appeared to be not considered given design of discussion.	Poor	
<b>CONTENT - Discussion of Disease States and Drug Therapy</b>		
1. Thorough critique of drug therapy; all aspects of drug therapy reviewed as applicable (pharmacology, dosing, adverse effects, interactions, complications, appropriateness). Other therapeutic options discussed.	Excellent	
Good critique to drug therapy; some aspects of drug therapy reviewed. Several options discussed.	Good	
Drug therapy presented, but not critiqued; no options discussed.	Poor	
2. Disease state discussion relevant to presentation; good balance between disease state and drug therapy.	Excellent	
Disease state too broad and difficult to relate to presentation.	Good	
Not enough disease state information presented.	Poor	
<b>CONTENT - Interpretation of Primary Literature</b>		
1. Primary literature thoroughly reviewed and relevant to presentation. Appropriate literature reviewed.	Excellent	
Primary literature somewhat reviewed and relevant to presentation. Incomplete review of data.	Good	
Primary literature reviewed but not relevant to presentation and/or too many/few studies.	Poor	
2. 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 <b>own</b> opinion.	Excellent	
Partial assessment/interpretation of primary literature. Only presented investigator's conclusions.	Good	
Did not interpret primary literature. No discussion of strengths and weaknesses of studies. Did not provide rational conclusions.	Poor	

<b>COMMUNICATION – Verbal</b>		<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>1.</b>	Presenter easily heard (adequate volume/tone/enunciation). Easy to follow & listen to. Proper use of all terminology	Excellent	
	Presenter with adequate volume, but some words lost to mumbling.	Good	
	Presenter not easily heard from the back of the room. Demonstrated lack of interest in top and/or inappropriate medical terms.	Poor	
<b>2.</b>	Efficient use of time, good pace.	Excellent	
	Rate appropriate the majority of the time with some parts too fast or too slow.	Good	
	Rate of delivery was too slow/too fast; inefficient use of time.	Poor	
<b>COMMUNICATION - Non-Verbal</b>			
	No distracting mannerisms, gestures; exhibited polish, poise; maintained eye contact with audience; used notes infrequently	Excellent	
	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.	Good	
	Many distracting mannerisms, detracted from the presentation. Did not speak with confidence. Read most of presentation with no eye contact.	Poor	
<b>COMMUNICATION - AV Materials/Handouts</b>			
<b>1.</b>	Discussion of graphs/diagrams included; NO spelling errors; familiar w/AV equipment; appropriate number of slides used.	Excellent	
	Some disorganization of slides, busy slide(s), too many/too few slides; few spelling errors.	Good	
	Slides are very unorganized with multiple spelling/grammar errors; unfamiliar with AV equipment.	Poor	
<b>2.</b>	Well organized handout that coincided with slides. Referenced summary includes comprehensive overview of discussion. NO spelling/grammatical errors.	Excellent	
	Some disorganization of handout. Handout difficult to follow and/or was not an overview of the presentation. Few spelling/grammatical errors.	Good	
	No handout provided OR handout provided is disorganized with multiple spelling/grammatical errors.	Poor	
<b>COMMUNICATION - Ability to Answer Questions</b>			
	Presenter able to respond to questions with confidence and knowledge. Appropriately anticipated audience questions. Demonstrates integration of material.	Excellent	
	Presenter somewhat able to respond to questions; was not able to respond without referring to notes. Provides pertinent information missed during presentation.	Good	
	Presenter not able to appropriately respond to questions; did not anticipate audience questions; did not appear prepared.	Poor	
<b>Additional Comments:</b>			