**WPRC Resident Presentation Feedback Form**

Presenter Name:

Title:

Date:

Evaluator Name/Organization:

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Scale | Comments |
| **Presentation Content** |
| Purpose and methods clearly stated | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| Results were effectively articulated | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| Conclusion appropriate and supported | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| **Presentation Quality** |
| Project was presented in a manner that other organizations could learn from  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| The presentation was free from bias and referenced appropriately | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| **Presenter Assessment** |
| Presenter exhibited command of the content | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| Resident demonstrated substantial contribution to project | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| Presented in logical sequence with smooth transitions.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| Presenter exhibited effective presentation skills (ex: appropriate volume and pace, adequate eye contact, does not read from slides, no distracting mannerisms, absence of filler words) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| Presenter engaged the audience and answered questions appropriately | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| Presentation slides were easy to read and visually appealing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |
| Other Comments (strengths **and** areas for improvement): |

**WPRC Resident Presentation Feedback Form**

Presenter Name: Awesome Resident

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

Date: 4/8/25

Evaluator Name/Organization: Perfect Preceptor/PSW

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Scale | Comments |
| **Presentation Content** |
| Purpose and methods clearly stated | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 | Too much time on background – spend more time on the project itself. Methods were effective - I clearly understood the step by step approach you took. |
| Results were effectively articulated | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** | Results were clear and directly tied to your project objective. |
| Conclusion appropriate and supported | 1 | **2** | 3 | 4 | 5 | Conclusion restated project objectives. Be bold with your conclusions. |
| **Presentation Quality** |
| Project was presented in a manner that other organizations could learn from  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** | Interesting topic - applicable to other organizations. |
| The presentation was free from bias and referenced appropriately | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** | Yes. |
| **Presenter Assessment** |
| Presenter exhibited command of the content | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 | Presentation style (dependent on notes) made it seem you were uncertain of the content. Addressing questions demonstrated your mastery of the topic. |
| Resident demonstrated substantial contribution to project | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** | I clearly understood your involvement with the project. |
| Presented in logical sequence with smooth transitions.  | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 | Logical sequence, but choppy transitions that seemed to be surprising. Focus more preparation time on these for future presentations. |
| Presenter exhibited effective presentation skills (ex: appropriate volume and pace, adequate eye contact, does not read from slides, no distracting mannerisms, absence of filler words) | 1 | **2** | 3 | 4 | 5 | Was dependent on notes for majority of the presentation.  |
| Presenter engaged the audience and answered questions appropriately | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 | Answered questions appropriately - consider restating the question before answering to ensure entire audience hears the question. |
| Presentation slides were easy to read and visually appealing | 1 | **2** | 3 | 4 | 5 | See below. |
| Other 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! |