



## RANZCR Research Project Oral Presentation Assessment

### Instructions for marking the Research Project Oral Presentation:

- This can occur during the course of the research project (if there are interim results), or at completion of the project
- Presentation can occur during Phase 2 or Phase 3 of training
- The presentation is to be marked by at least 2 supervisors, ideally coordinated by the Branch Research Mentor (if a Branch has this), to ensure balanced views and fair marks are obtained, with marked averaged
- Marking will be undertaken according to a standard marking template (see below)

### Trainee instruction on completion:

- Upload signed assessor sheets into the ePortfolio



## Research Project Oral Presentation Assessor Score Sheet

Event Description: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Time: \_\_\_\_\_

Title of Paper: \_\_\_\_\_ Name of Presenter: \_\_\_\_\_

Training Network: \_\_\_\_\_ Project Supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_

1	Ethics Approval (this can be local hospital/health board approval processes)	Yes	No		
2	Prospective controlled study If no, state type of study: _____	Yes +2	No +2		
<b>Presentation Content</b>					
3	The purpose of the research is clearly stated and valid	1	2	3	4
4	The method description is appropriate and valid	1	2	3	4
5	The results are clearly explained	1	2	3	4
6	The conclusions drawn are valid	1	2	3	4
7	The relevance of the results to radiological practice is clearly stated	1	2	3	4
8	The study generated appropriate discussion	1	2	3	4
9	The work is original	1	2	3	4
10	The study has scientific impact / overall impression	1	2	3	4
				Content Subtotal	



Presentation Skills					
11	The presentation was clear, concise and kept to time	1	2	3	4
12	The presenter maintained the audience interest	1	2	3	4
13	The presenter sounded comfortable and confident	1	2	3	4
14	The text slides were clear and uncluttered	1	2	3	4
15	Images used contributed to the presentation	1	2	3	4
16	The presenter answered questions confidently and satisfactorily	1	2	3	4
				Presentation Subtotal	
				<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	

**Comments/Feedback:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Assessor's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Assessor's Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_



### Research Project Oral Presentation Marking Rubric

	Stem	No		Yes	
1	Ethics Approval (this can be local hospital/health board approval processes)	Appropriate approval (e.g. local approval for audit, formal approval for observational or interventional research) has not been gained		Appropriate approval gained	
2	Prospective controlled study If no, state type of study:	Retrospective or cross sectional design		Data collected prospectively (observational or randomised)	
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
3	The purpose of the research is clearly stated and valid	Not clear and logically flawed	Some issues, detracts from presentation	Overall clear, but few issues	Clear and valid explanation
4	The method description is appropriate and valid	Methodology flawed or inappropriate	Significant flaws which limit generalisability	Minor methodological flaws	Study design is optimal to answer stated question
5	The results are clearly explained	Results are not able to be understood	Significant problems	Some of results are unclear	Thorough and well explained
6	The conclusions drawn are valid	Conclusions do not follow from data / analysis	Significant flaws limiting overall conclusion	Minor flaws	Solid scientific reasoning
7	The relevance of the results to contemporary radiological practice is clearly stated	Problematic or unclear	Minor relevance to radiology	Moderately relevant	Highly relevant to contemporary radiology practice
8	The study generated appropriate discussion	No discussion	Brief discussion	Some discussion	Lively and relevant discussion
9	The work is original	Derivative, no significant change to what is known	Limited original thought	Solid contribution to literature	Significant and novel contribution
10	The study has scientific impact/overall impression	Limited	Fair	Good	Outstanding



		1	2	3	4
11	The presentation was clear, concise and kept to time	Not succinct, not clear and ran over time	Two of: Not succinct, not clear and ran over time	One of: Not succinct, not clear and ran over time	Clear, concise, and kept to time
12	The presenter maintained the audience interest	Was not able to engage audience	Engaging at times	Mostly engaging	Entertaining / engaging while being professional
13	The presenter sounded comfortable and confident	Presenting style limited explanation of research	Nervous or anxious but message able to be conveyed	Mildly distracting presentation style	Professional and well spoken
14	The text slides were clear and uncluttered	Text distracting and hard to read	Problems with some slides limiting ease of understanding	Slides suboptimal but remain understandable	Clear text which contributed overall to presentation
15	Images used contributed to the presentation	Images distracting and hard to understand	Images did little to help understanding or irrelevant	Images contributed to understanding	Excellent images which significantly improved presentation
16	The presenter answered questions confidently and satisfactorily	Unable to answer questions	Limited response to questions or no questions asked	Answered questions to clarify study	Questions answered thoughtfully or with additional insight