



## ORAL PRESENTATION EVALUATION RUBRIC

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Presentation Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Presentation (abstract) #: \_\_\_\_\_

Presenter Category (check one):

- Undergraduate Student     
  Graduate Student     
  Professional Student (MD, DMD, PharmD, etc.)     
  Medical Resident

Criteria	Excellent (5 pts)	Good (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Needs Improvement (0-2 pts)	Points
<b>Clarity and Organization</b>	The presentation is logically structured, with clear introduction, methods, results, and conclusions. Easy to follow.	Mostly clear and organized; minor lapses in flow or structure.	Organization is uneven; some parts unclear or difficult to follow.	Lacks clear structure; difficult to follow or confusing.	/5
<b>Content Knowledge and Accuracy</b>	Demonstrates a strong understanding of topic; content is accurate, thorough, and well-articulated.	Good understanding; mostly accurate and well-presented content.	Basic understanding; some inaccuracies or vague explanations.	Limited understanding; significant inaccuracies or weak explanations.	/5
<b>Relevance and Significance</b>	Clearly explains the significance of the work and its contribution to the field or community.	Significance is explained, though not fully developed.	Relevance is mentioned but lacks depth or connection to broader context.	Little or no explanation of significance or relevance.	/5
<b>Use of Evidence and Data</b>	Effectively integrates relevant data, evidence, or examples to support key points.	Data and evidence are mostly appropriate and supportive of the topic.	Some evidence is presented but may lack clarity or integration.	Little or no use of evidence or supporting data.	/5
<b>Methods and Rigor (as applicable)</b>	Methods are clearly described and appropriate for the type of work; demonstrate rigor and	Methods are described but may lack clarity or depth.	Basic description of methods; may have weaknesses in rigor.	Methods are unclear, inappropriate, or missing.	/5

**Rubric continues the other side. →**

Criteria	Excellent (5 pts)	Good (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Needs Improvement (0-2 pts)	Points
	validity. <i>(e.g., research, education, EBP, QI).</i>				
<b>Impact and Innovation</b>	Demonstrates strong potential impact, originality, or innovative contribution.	Some aspects of impact or innovation are present and clearly communicated.	Limited discussion of impact or innovation.	Minimal or no evidence of impact or innovation.	/5
<b>Visual Aids/Slides</b>	Visuals are clear, professional, and effectively support the presentation.	Visuals are mostly clear and appropriate; minor design or content issues.	Visuals are present but may be difficult to read or not well integrated.	Visuals are poor quality or missing; do not support the presentation.	/5
<b>Delivery and Engagement</b>	The presenter speaks clearly, confidently, and engages the audience effectively.	Generally clear and confident delivery; some audience engagement.	Delivery is uneven; limited audience connection.	Poor delivery; hard to hear or understand; lacks engagement.	/5
<b>Time Management</b>	Presentation fits within the allotted time, with good pacing.	Slightly over or under time; pacing is mostly appropriate.	Noticeably over or under time; rushed or drawn-out segments.	Significantly over or under time; poor pacing.	/5
<b>Response to Questions</b>	Responds to questions thoughtfully and accurately, demonstrating depth of knowledge.	Answers most questions well; may hesitate on some points.	Struggles to answer some questions; responses are vague or limited.	Unable to answer questions or provides unclear responses.	/5

**Total Score** \_\_\_\_ / 50

**Evaluator Comments (optional):**

---



---



---

**Evaluator's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_