Seminar Evaluation Form Ernest Mario School of Pharmacy

Presenter:			Date:	Start Time:	
Seminar Title:				End Time:	
	aluation for final grade is based on the sum of the points from each set the evaluation. Please justify ratings in the comments section. Circle				
1. Introduction Style			Body of Preser		
1 2	Presenter appeared very nervous and ill-prepared; frequent distracting mannerisms Presenter was somewhat nervous; occasional distracting	1	mannerisms; freque groomed and attire	roice tone (volume), posture, and/or ent errors in pronunciation; inappropriately d; presentation was read; no periodic	
3	mannerisms Beginning anxiety handled well; minor indications of uneasiness Presenter was entirely at ease and introduced the topic flawlessly	2	infrequent errors in	e and/or mannerisms poor at times, pronunciation; grooming, and/or attire ; reads much of the presentation; minimal	
Comments		3	Infrequent problems with voice tone, posture, and/or mannerisms; appropriate pronunciation, grooming, and/or attire; reads some of the presentation; good periodic summaries		
Co	ontent	4	mannerisms, groon	e and posture; appropriate pronunciation, ning, and attire throughout presentation; eely; periodic summaries enhanced	
1 2	No structure to introduction; did not provide audience with an understanding of the topic or why it was of interest to the presenter; no plan for presentation provided	Cor	Comments		
3 4 5 6	Minimal structure to introduction; interest in topic not well described; plan for presentation provided, but difficult to follow Introduction pertinent and attracted audience's attention; presenter provided audience with some view of the		lo Vicual Aide		
7 8	importance of the topic; plan for presentation relatively clear Audience provided with a clear understanding of importance of, and presenter's interest in the topic; plan for presentation well delineated	1		mpossible to read; do not follow or ntly to presentation; inappropriate time e/overhead	
Comments		2	presentation; time s Most slides/overhead	eads readable, but do not follow spent on each slide needs improvement ads readable and generally follow nization and time management needs slight	
Objectives		4		s readable, attractive, well-organized and on; appropriate time spent on each	
2	No objectives provided Written objectives unclear and not easily measurable or obtainable	Cor	mments		
3	Measurable objectives written, but not thoroughly covered in presentation				
4	Measurable objectives written and thoroughly covered in presentation				
Co	omments				
Сс					

2. Body of Presentation (continued)	3. Summary and Conclusions			
Style – Handout	Presenter summarizes data inaccurately and conclusions are			
Handout poorly organized and/or outlined; insufficient data are	discordant with regard to presented material			
provided to audience; references inappropriately done; sloppy	2 Minimal data summary; some conclusions appropriate with regard to presentation content			
job Handout incomplete; organization needs improvement; all	Adequate data summary most conclusions accurate with			
pertinent references not included or inappropriately formatted	regard to presented material			
Handout relatively complete and organized; most pertinent	Data summarized accurately and conclusions concordant with			
references cited and formatted correctly	regard to presented material			
Handout clearly organized; easy to follow; thorough review of	Comments			
topic with all appropriate references cited correctly				
Comments				
	·			
-				
	4. Questions and Answers			
	Presenter is defensive and unprepared while answering			
Content – Body of Seminar	1 questions; questions are not repeated for understanding;			
1 Extremely cursory review of subject; data (i.e.,	answers are unorganized and/or contrived Presenter is uncomfortable and unprepared for some			
pathophysiology, pharmacology, pharmacokinetics,pharmacotherapy) presented are not interpreted correctly	2 questions; questions are not repeated for understanding;			
1	answers are somewhat disorganized			
Review of Subject not complete; Significant inaccuracies in	Presenter is relatively comfortable and prepared to answer			
6 data	3 questions; most questions repeated for understanding; most			
Review of subject relatively complete; minor inaccuracies in	answers are organized			
data	Presenter is at ease and welcomes questions; well prepared for answers; all questions repeated for understanding;			
10 Extremely thorough review of subject; data (i.e,	answers are concise and accurate			
11 pathophysiology, pharmacology, pharmacokinetics,				
12 pharmacotherapy) presented are interpreted correctly	Comments			
Comments				
- Comments				
	5. Overall Assessment – Content			
	Presenter did not know the subject well; the presentation did			
Content – Literature Review	not improve my knowledge base			
Primary literature review not included: accurate interpretation	2 Presenter did a fair job on the subject; significant deficiencies			
of literature not provided; demonstrates no understanding of	were apparent; i learned a little from the presentation			
research and statistical methods	Presenter did a good job on the subject; minor deficiencies			
Minimal use of primary literature; accuracy of interpretation of literature questionable; minimal understanding of statistical	were observed; I learned some new information Presenter knew the subject from top to bottom; I learned a lot			
4 methods and research design	of new information from the presentation			
Adaquate use of primary literature, most interpretations of	<u> </u>			
literature are accurate; good understanding of statistical	Comments			
methods and research design				
7 Thorough primary literature review included; accurate interpretation of literature provided; demonstrates clear				
understanding of statistical methods and research design				
•	Total Doints			
Comments	Total Points			
	50-60 A			
	45-50 B+			
	40-44 B			
	35-39 C+			
	30-34 C 20-30 D			
	< 20 F			