

**POSTER PRESENTATION/ORAL RESEARCH PRESENTATION ASSESSMENT FORM**

<b>Resident Name:</b>	<b>Preceptor Name:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
<p><b>Type of research presented :</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Case report</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Pharmacokinetic study</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Observational study/pilot study</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Randomized, controlled interventional study</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Therapeutic review/meta-analysis</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other</p>		
<p><b>Conference:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Pharmacy conference</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> HIV/Infectious Diseases conference</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Conference - other</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Local   <input type="checkbox"/> Provincial   <input type="checkbox"/> National</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> International</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> research project oral presentation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> poster presentation</p> <p><b>*PLEASE ATTACH A COPY OF THE POSTER/ORAL PRESENTATION SLIDES TO THIS EVALUATION.</b></p>		

**ACTIVITY OUTCOMES:**

The resident will develop skills and gain experience in preparing and presenting an oral research or poster presentation at a local, provincial, national, or international pharmacy or medical conference. The resident will complete at least one oral poster presentation during the residency year (i.e., residency research project) and may complete a second poster presentation as part of the mandatory scholarly writing activity.

**Expectation: will be to complete the poster or research presentation at a Proficient level or higher.**

	Advanced Beginner (1)	Competent (2)	Proficient (3)	Expert (4)	Score
<b>1. CONTENT (POSTER/ORAL ABSTRACT)</b>					
<b>1.1 Introduction</b>	Introduction is incomplete, does not provide adequate background information or rationale for study	Introduction includes some background information, and/or basic rationale for study.	Introduction includes pertinent background and appropriately frames the rationale for the study. Describes how research question will add to existing literature.	Introduction includes critical summary of background, and appropriately frames the rationale for the study. Describes how the research question will add to existing literature in studied population and applicability to other populations.	
<b>1.2 Study goals/objectives</b>	Research question is	Research question is	Research question is clearly	Research question is clearly	

	<b>Advanced Beginner (1)</b>	<b>Competent (2)</b>	<b>Proficient (3)</b>	<b>Expert (4)</b>	<b>Score</b>
	poorly formulated, and/or study objectives and endpoints are missing/incomplete.	defined. Main study objectives and/or endpoints are identified.	defined. Study objectives and endpoints are appropriate and feasible.	and concisely defined. Study objectives and endpoints are appropriately defined and feasible.	
<b>1.3 Methodology (study design, population, and outcomes; ethical considerations)</b>	Details on methodology are summarized in an imprecise or inaccurate manner.	Details on methodology are accurately summarized.	The methodology is accurately and clearly summarized. The resident identifies some limitations of the methodology chosen.	The methodology is accurately, clearly and concisely summarized. The resident identifies most limitations of the methodology.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>1.4 Data collection/ plan / statistical analysis</b>	Unable to identify appropriate statistical tests conducted.	Plan for data collection is described. Plan for data analysis is not clearly articulated or incomplete.	Plan for data collection is clearly described, including details on data storage and confidentiality. Plan of statistical analysis is described and appropriate. Demonstrates some understanding of limitations of approach used.	Plan for data collection is clearly and thoroughly described. Details regarding storage/confidentiality of data are provided. Plan of statistical analysis is clearly described and appropriate; demonstrates understanding of limitations of approach used.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>1.5 Results</b>	Results provided are incomplete, inaccurately presented, or do not align with defined primary and secondary endpoints.	Results provided align with defined primary and secondary endpoints. Information is generally complete, but sometimes vague or incomplete.	Results provided align with defined primary and secondary endpoints. Results are presented clearly and completely in a format consistent with accepted standards of reporting.	Results are presented clearly and completely in a format consistent with accepted standards of reporting. Results which are notable are highlighted.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>1.6 Discussion/ conclusion</b>	Superficial or incomplete discussion. Conclusions do not adequately reflect research results.	Discussion/conclusions adequately reflect main findings of paper. Some insight into interpretation/ implication of findings is lacking.	Discussion/conclusions adequately interpret main findings of paper; includes discussion on relevance of findings to field of study, and implications of study findings for clinicians and researchers.	Results appropriately interpreted, incl. limitations, relevance of findings to field of study, how results compare to other similar studies, implications of study findings for clinicians and researchers, and suggestions for future research.	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<b>Advanced Beginner (1)</b>	<b>Competent (2)</b>	<b>Proficient (3)</b>	<b>Expert (4)</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>1.7 Tables/ Figures</b>	Tables/figures are incomplete and / or unclear, or duplicate information provided in poster/oral presentation.	Tables/figures contain relevant information that is clearly presented. There is some duplication/overlap of information with text in the poster/oral presentation.	There are an appropriate number of tables/figures. Results are clearly presented and complement the information in the text.	There are an appropriate number of tables/figures. Results are clearly presented, complement the information in the text, and enhance the audience's understanding of the study.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>1.8 References</b>	References are incomplete/missing. Only secondary/tertiary sources used.	References are complete and appear in order of citation. Primary and secondary sources used.	References are complete and formatted according to standards of reporting. Key primary and secondary sources used.	References are complete and formatted according to standards of reporting. References are relevant, up-to-date, and reflect current practices/key research data.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2 ABSTRACT SUBMISSION PROCESS</b>					
<b>2.1 Selection of conference</b>	Unable to identify appropriate conference for abstract submission.	Able to identify some conferences appropriate for abstract submission, based on target audience and attendance.	Identifies conferences appropriate for abstract submission, based on nature of data, target audience, attendance, and importance in the field.	Identifies all conferences appropriate for abstract submission, based on nature of data, target audience, attendance and importance in the field and suggests conference most closely aligned with focus of research.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2.2 Abstract</b>	The abstract is incomplete, or is not an accurate representation of the research study.	Abstract includes required components but is unfocused, does not clearly represent main study findings, or exceeds the specified word limit.	Abstract includes required components (e.g., background/purpose, methods, results, concl), appropriately reflects findings of research, and is within the specified word limit.	Abstract is clearly and concisely written, includes required components (e.g., background/purpose, methods, results, conclusions), appropriately reflects findings of research, and is within the specified word limit.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>3 PRESENTATION</b>					
<b>3.1 Adherence to poster/slide requirements (incl. font size,</b>	Requires significant revisions/support to meet criteria.	Requires some assistance in formatting poster/slides to meet	Prepares poster/slides to meet conference requirements with little	Independently prepares poster/slides, adhering to all of the conference requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<b>Advanced Beginner (1)</b>	<b>Competent (2)</b>	<b>Proficient (3)</b>	<b>Expert (4)</b>	<b>Score</b>
spacing, required sections, formatting, etc)	Poster/slides unorganized, difficult to read.	most of conference requirements. Poster/slides could be improved for clarity/flow.	assistance. Information is presented clearly, with logical flow.	Information is presented clearly, with logical flow in an appealing format.	
<b>3.2 Oral presentation</b>	Significant gaps in knowledge, poor organization and/or oral delivery.	Demonstrates enthusiasm for topic, some gaps in depth/breadth of knowledge. Some audience engagement, could be improved.	Demonstrates confidence and enthusiasm for topic; presents clearly and engages audience. Delivers presentation in allotted time.	Demonstrates confidence and mastery of topic, clearly presents and engages audience attention. Delivers presentation in allotted time.	
<b>3.3 Question period</b>	Difficulty answering most questions from audience, did not understand questions.	Able to answer basic/clarifying questions from the audience.	Able to answer most questions from the audience (clarifying, methodological, etc).	Able to answer all questions with confidence, providing clarification and critical assessment and reflection, as needed.	
<b>4 PROFESSIONALISM, COLLABORATION</b>					
<b>4.1 Professionalism, Sense of responsibility</b>	Needed repeated reminders to complete work within required time frame. Did not request required assistance. Work was incomplete or poorly done.	Completed work within required time frame with assistance. Poster/slides were clearly organized with few typos / grammatical error.	Completed work within required time frame with minimal assistance. Poster/slides were clearly written in professional language with minimal typos or grammatical errors.	Completed work in required time frame with no assistance or revisions required. Posters/slides were clearly written, using appropriate terminology.	
<b>4.2 Authorship</b>	Unclear of conventions regarding authorship order, unable to appropriately identify significance of contributions.	General understanding of conventions regarding authorship order; able to appropriately identify significance of contributions.	Understands conventions regarding authorship order; able to appropriately identify significance of own contributions as well as those of co-authors.	Appropriately identifies significance of own contributions as well as those of co-authors. Able to negotiate appropriate order of authorship with some assistance.	

## RESIDENT'S PERSONAL LEARNING OBJECTIVES FOR POSTER / ORAL RESEARCH PRESENTATIONS

Please assess whether the resident's personal learning objectives were met:

ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE	Unmet	Partially Met	Met	Not Applicable
List personal learning objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### ASSESSMENT OF RESIDENT:

	Advanced beginner	Competent	Proficient	Expert
ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE	<input type="checkbox"/> Requires significant guidance to prepare poster/slides at the proficient level.	<input type="checkbox"/> Competently prepares poster/slides with some guidance. Some gaps identified that require further focused development.	<input type="checkbox"/> Proficiently prepares poster/slides with minimal guidance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Prepares poster/slides at an expert level, with little to no guidance.
Resident Comments:			Preceptor Comments:	
Resident Signature			Preceptor Signature	
Date			Date	

Adapted from:

- The University of Vermont College of Nursing and Health Sciences, Doctoral Program of Study in Human Functioning and Rehabilitation Sciences. Criteria for Assessment of Research Article. [https://www.uvm.edu/sites/default/files/media/Criteria\\_for\\_Assessment\\_of\\_Research\\_Article.pdf](https://www.uvm.edu/sites/default/files/media/Criteria_for_Assessment_of_Research_Article.pdf)
- Swygart-Hobaugh AJ. Rubric for original research project. Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa, USA. <https://www.cornellcollege.edu/LIBRARY/faculty/focusing-on-assignments/tools-for-assessment/original-research-rubric.pdf>
- Research paper rubric (Figure 1). Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa, USA. <https://www.cornellcollege.edu/LIBRARY/faculty/focusing-on-assignments/tools-for-assessment/ResearchPaperRubric.pdf>

*Last updated August 2020*