**WPRC Resident Presentation Feedback Form**

Presenter Name: Date:

Title:

Evaluator Name/Organization:

**1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Scale | | | | | | | | | Comments | |
| **Presentation Content** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Presentation topic was current and relevant to the audience | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | 4 | | 5 |  | |
| Background and rationale were effectively articulated | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | 4 | | 5 |  | |
| Project objective(s) were effectively articulated | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | 4 | | 5 |  | |
| Steps in methods were clearly articulated | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | 4 | | 5 |  | |
| Results were effectively articulated | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | 4 | | 5 |  | |
| Discussion points (summary of results, other findings, limitations, future direction) were appropriately articulated | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | 4 | | 5 |  | |
| Given the information presented, the conclusion (if applicable) was appropriate | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | 4 | | 5 |  | |
| I gained new information and knowledge on the subject presented | No | | | | | Yes | | | |  | |
| The presentation was free from bias | No | | | | | Yes | | | |  | |
| **Presentation Quality** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Presentation was organized in a logical order | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | 4 | | 5 |  | |
| Presentation subject and detail were appropriate for allotted time and audience | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | 4 | | 5 |  | |
| Presentation slides were easy to read and visually appealing | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | 4 | | 5 |  | |
| **Speaker Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Presenter was prepared and had comprehensive knowledge of their topic | 1 | 2 | | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  |
| Presenter had effective presentation delivery skills (ex: eye contact, volume, slide transition, does not read from slides) | 1 | 2 | | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | |  |
| Presenter engaged the audience and answered questions appropriately | No | | Yes | | | | | NA | | |  |
| General Comments (strengths **and** areas for improvement): | | | | | | | | | | | |

**WPRC Resident Presentation Feedback Form**

Presenter Name: Awesome Resident Date: 4/5/18

Title: Completion of the WPRC evaluation form: a stepwise approach.

Evaluator Name/Organization: Perfect Preceptor / PSW

**1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Scale | | | | | | | | | Comments | |
| **Presentation Content** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Presentation topic was current and relevant to the audience | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | 4 | | **5** | Interesting topic - applicable to other organizations. | |
| Background (and rationale) effectively articulated | 1 | 2 | | **3** | | | 4 | | 5 | Too much time on background – spend more time on the project itself. | |
| Project objective(s) effectively articulated | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | 4 | | **5** | Yes. | |
| Steps in methods are clearly articulated | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | 4 | | **5** | Yes, I clearly understood the step by step approach you took. | |
| Results are effectively articulated | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | 4 | | **5** | Results were clear and directly tied to your project objective. | |
| Discussion points (summary of results, other findings, limitations, future direction) are appropriately articulated | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | **4** | | 5 | What happens to your project when you are no longer a resident? | |
| Given the information presented, the conclusion (if applicable) is appropriate | 1 | **2** | | 3 | | | 4 | | 5 | Conclusion restated project objectives. Be bold with your conclusions. | |
| I gained new information and knowledge on the subject presented | No | | | | | **Yes** | | | |  | |
| The presentation was free from bias | No | | | | | **Yes** | | | |  | |
| **Presentation Quality** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Presentation was organized in a logical order | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | 4 | | **5** | Yes. | |
| Presentation subject and detail were appropriate for allotted time and audience | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | **4** | | 5 | As above, consider spending majority of presentation on project content rather than background. | |
| Presentation slides were easy to read and visually appealing | 1 | **2** | | 3 | | | 4 | | 5 | See below. | |
| **Speaker Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Presenter was prepared and had comprehensive knowledge of their topic | 1 | 2 | | | 3 | | 4 | | **5** | | I clearly understood your involvement with the project. |
| Presenter had effective presentation delivery skills (ex: eye contact, volume, slide transition, does not read from slides) | 1 | **2** | | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | Was dependent on notes for majority of the presentation. |
| Presenter engaged the audience and answered questions appropriately | No | | **Yes** | | | | | NA | | | Answered questions appropriately - consider restating the question before answering to ensure entire audience hears the question. |
| General Comments (strengths **and** areas for improvement):  Great job outlining a rather complicated methodology in a way the audience could follow.  Slides contained too many words. In the future, consider using slides to support what you are saying rather than as a script.  Thank you and good luck! | | | | | | | | | | | |