SEMINAR EVALUATION

CAIN PROJECT

Your Name: _____   Date: _____

Name of Speaker: _____

	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor
Content					
Explained significance / relevance of work	1	2	3	4	5
Objective of research was clear	1	2	3	4	5
Appropriate level of background	1	2	3	4	5
Coherent pattern of organization	1	2	3	4	5
Material was appropriate for audience	1	2	3	4	5
Clarity and quality of arguments from data	1	2	3	4	5
Speaker demonstrated expertise	1	2	3	4	5
Delivery					
Speaker showed enthusiasm about topic	1	2	3	4	5
Speaking volume	1	2	3	4	5
Pronounced words clearly	1	2	3	4	5
Varied pace of voice for emphasis	1	2	3	4	5
Used gestures for emphasis	1	2	3	4	5
Eye contact with audience	1	2	3	4	5
Avoided "uh"s, "um"s, and other fillers	1	2	3	4	5
Visuals					
Appropriate amount of content per slide	1	2	3	4	5
Fonts could be read easily	1	2	3	4	5
Diagrams were not excessively detailed	1	2	3	4	5
Colors were easy to view	1	2	3	4	5
Questions and Answers					
Addressed response to all audience members	1	2	3	4	5
Appeared open and confident during Q&A	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of response	1	2	3	4	5
Preparation	1	2	3	4	5
Overall impression	1	2	3	4	5

Other Comments on the Delivery or Improvement Suggestions:
(Please put content comments on the back.)

THE CAIN PROJECT IN ENGINEERING AND PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION

SEMINAR EVALUATION

CAIN PROJECT

What are the strengths of this seminar?

What are the weaknesses of this seminar?

Scientific questions/suggestions for speaker: