## POSTER PRESENTATION/ORAL RESEARCH PRESENTATION ASSESSMENT FORM

Resident Name:	Project Preceptor/Coordinator Name:	Date:
Type of research presented :	Conference:	research project oral presentation
□ Case report	Pharmacy conference	poster presentation
Pharmacokinetic study	HIV/Infectious Diseases conference	_ p
Observational study/pilot study	Conference - other	
Randomized, controlled interventional study	Local      Provincial      National	Completed by:
Therapeutic review/meta-analysis Other	□ International	☐ Resident
		Preceptor/Coordinator
		*PLEASE ATTACH A COPY OF THE POSTER/ORAL PRESENTATION SLIDES TO THIS EVALUATION.

## **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 research presentation (oral/poster) during the residency year (i.e., residency research project) and may complete a second poster presentation as part of the mandatory scholarly writing activity.

	Advanced Beginner (1)	Competent (2)	Proficient (3)	Expert (4)	Not Applicable
1. CONTENT (POSTE	R/ORAL ABSTRACT)				
1.1 Introduction	☐ 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	

	Advanced Beginner (1)	Competent (2)	Proficient (3)	Expert (4)	Not Applicable
				populations.	
1.2 Study goals/objectives	☐ Research question is poorly formulated, and/or study objectives and endpoints are missing/incomplete.	□ Research question is defined. Main study objectives and/or endpoints are identified.	☐ Research question is clearly defined. Study objectives and endpoints are appropriate and feasible.	□ Research question is clearly and concisely defined. Study objectives and endpoints are appropriately defined and feasible.	
1.3 Methodology (study design, population, and outcomes; ethical considerations)	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.	
1.4 Data collection/ plan / statistical analysis	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.	
1.5 <b>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.	
1.6 Discussion/ conclusion	□ 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	Discussion/conclusions adequately interpret main findings of paper; includes discussion on relevance of findings to field of study, and implications of study findings	☐ Results appropriately interpreted, incl. limitations, relevance of findings to field of study, how results compare to other similar studies, implications of study findings	

	Advanced Beginner	Competent (2)	Proficient (3)	Expert (4)	Not Applicable
	(1)				
		lacking.	for clinicians and researchers.	for clinicians and researchers, and suggestions for future research.	
1.7 Tables/ Figures	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.	in There are an appropriate number of tables/figures. I. Results are clearly presented and complement the information in the text.		
1.8 References	☐ 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.	
1.9 Language/ terminology	Language in the poster/oral presentation is often or consistently stigmatizing, and does not align with the People First Charter and the UNAIDS Terminology Guidelines.	The poster/oral presentation includes occasional instances of stigmatizing language or terminology inconsistent with the People First Charter and the UNAIDS Terminology Guidelines. Abbreviations such as PLWH are frequently used throughout rather than writing out the name or identity of the group in full unless in the context of a chart or graph for brevity.	Most of the language in the poster/oral presentation is non-stigmatizing and consistent with the People First Charter and the UNAIDS Terminology Guidelines. Abbreviations such as PLWH are used rather than writing out the name or identity of the group in full unless in the context of a chart or graph for brevity.	All language in the poster/oral presentation is non- stigmatizing and consistent with the People First Charter and the UNAIDS Terminology Guidelines. People are not referred to as abbreviations such as PLWH, unless in the context of a chart or graph for brevity.	
2 ABSTRACT SUBM	ISSION PROCESS	giapition brothly.			
2.1 Selection of conference	□ Unable to identify appropriate	☐ Able to identify some conferences appropriate	□ Identifies conferences appropriate for abstract	□ Identifies all conferences appropriate for abstract	

		Advanced Beginner (1)	Competent (2)	Proficient (3)	Expert (4)	Not Applicable
		conference for abstract submission.	for abstract submission, based on target audience and attendance.	submission, based on nature of data, target audience, attendance, and importance in the field.	submission, based on nature of data, target audience, attendance and importance in the field and suggests conference most closely aligned with focus of research.	
2.2 Abstra	ct	☐ 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.	Ides       Abstract includes required       Abstract is clearly and         ents but       components (e.g.,       Abstract is clearly and         bes not       background/purpose,       required components (e.g.,         it main       methods, results, concl),       background/purpose,         s, or       appropriately reflects       methods, results, conclusions),         ecified       findings of research, and is       appropriately reflects findings		
3 PRESE	INTATION					
(incl. fo spacing section	/ <b>slide</b> ements ont size, g, required	☐ Requires significant revisions/support to meet criteria. Poster/slides unorganized, difficult to read.	☐ Requires some assistance in formatting poster/slides to meet most of conference requirements. Poster/slides could be improved for clarity/flow.	□ Prepares poster/slides to meet conference requirements with little assistance. Information is presented clearly, with logical flow.	☐ Independently prepares poster/slides, adhering to all of the conference requirements. Information is presented clearly, with logical flow in an appealing format.	
3.2 Oral pr	resentation	☐ 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.	
3.3 Questi	on period	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.	

	Advanced Beginner (1)	Competent (2)	Proficient (3)	Expert (4)	Not Applicable
4.1 Professionalism, Sense of responsibility	□ 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.	
4.2 Authorship	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				

## ASSESSMENT OF RESIDENT:

The expectation is to complete the poster or research presentation at a Proficient level or higher.

	Advanced beginner	Competent		Proficient	Expert		
ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE							
	Requires significant guidance to prepare poster/slides at the proficient level.	Competently pre poster/slides with guidance. Some gaps that require further developmen	some identified focused	Proficiently prepares poster/slides with minimal guidance.	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. <u>https://www.uvm.edu/sites/default/files/media/Criteria for Assessment of Research Article.pdf</u>

Swygart-Hobaugh AJ. Rubric for original research project. Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa, USA. <a href="https://www.cornellcollege.edu/LIBRARY/faculty/focusing-on-assignments/tools-for-assessment/original-research-rubric.pdf">https://www.cornellcollege.edu/LIBRARY/faculty/focusing-on-assignments/tools-for-assessment/original-research-rubric.pdf</a>

• Research paper rubric (Figure 1). Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa, USA. <u>https://www.cornellcollege.edu/LIBRARY/faculty/focusing-on-assignments/tools-for-assessment/ResearchPaperRubric.pdf</u>

Last updated May 2023