**TiMM - Evaluation of Colleague Form**

Without good scientific communication, even good science has trouble making an impact on the thinking in a field. To help each other improve on our scientific communication skills, you will be assigned to evaluate the presentation talk of one group of your colleagues. These evaluations will be shared with the presenter without stating your name, so you should feel free to provide candid feedback.

The goal of this exercise is two fold:

1. For you. This is an added opportunity to think critically about the presentation. How can you provide constructive feedback to a colleague? What might you have done different? How can you incorporate the strengths and weaknesses of this presentation into your own TiMM presentation?
2. For the presenters. It is important to be cognizant of the gap between what a presenter intends to discuss and what a listener takes away from their presentation. Some of the attached questions ask you to discuss what you took away from the presentation – this will let the presenters know if their messages were clear or not. Other questions ask you to comment on more stylistic aspects of the presentation, particularly those which might help get more people thinking about the topic and engaged in the discussion.

Please submit your evaluation by email to Rahul Kohli ([rmkohli@gmail.com](mailto:rmkohli@gmail.com)) and Raj Jain ([jainr@pennmedicine.upenn.edu](mailto:jainr@pennmedicine.upenn.edu)) by 5 PM on the day after the TiMM presentation you are assigned.

**Session Title:**

**Presenters:**

**All answers below should typed and <5 sentences maximum for each question.**

What background information was presented in order to help frame the articles? Was the discussion level appropriate – neither too simple, not too cursory – in covering the background material?

XXX

What hypothesis of the research paper(s) clearly stated? Was the experimental design clearly explained?

XXX

What were the one or two most important results that you took away from the discussion of the research paper?

XXX

Did the presenters make a strong link between the clinical and science pieces of the topic? What did they do that helped make this connection and what could have been done better?

XXX

What part of the presentation was the strongest? What part could have been improved? Why?

XXX

Did the presentation stimulate a good discussion? What did they presenters do right and wrong to help engage the group in discussion?

XXX

Other Comments?

XXX