**Interactive Session Evaluation Criteria**

**Session title \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Authors (Last Names):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

The following form is a template intended to be used by EAHIL interactive workshop evaluators to assess workshops for awards. This may also be used if desired to give feedback to session leaders.

Workshops are evaluated on two main categories of criteria: CONTENT and DELIVERY. The two are weighted equally. Each question is scored out of 10, for a total maximum of 100

Please score each item on the scale, with 1 (lowest) = marginally adequate, and 10 (highest) = excellent.

Enter the initials of your name (for e.g. for "Jane Marie Smith", enter "jms"). This is to ensure we don't double count evaluations for the same workshop. \_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Content (each criterion out of 10) (required)** | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1. Accurately followed the title and abstract and stayed on topic - ON TOPIC | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1.2. Well structured, flowing logically and with good transitions between sections - LOGICAL | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1.3. Appropriate quantity of content for allotted time - QUANTITY | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1.4. Overall quality of the content - QUALITY | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1.5. Designed for audience participation and interaction - SENSE OF AUDIENCE AND FORMAT | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Delivery (each criterion out of 10) (required)** | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1. The activities and what participants should be doing was clear - CLARITY | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 2.2. There was an appropriate and effective mixture of leader presentation and participant activities - ACTIVITIES RATIO | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 2.3. Participants were encouraged to participate actively - ACTIVE PARTICIPATION; LEARNER- CENTEREDNESS | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 2.4. Consideration was given to the understanding of English by the participants, i.e. clear pronunciation and speech rhythm - VOCAL DELIVERY | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 2.5. Session leader(s) handled questions well - FIELDING QUESTIONS | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

**Total Score \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**3. Evaluator comments (optional)**

3.1. Do you recommend that this workshop be selected to receive one of the two prizes for best workshop?

Yes / No

3.2. If YES indicated above, please state your reason(s) for suggesting this as a best workshop: