CANADIAN REFORMED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Sermon Evaluation - Scripture Passages

This form is to be completed by one or more elders. Your feedback will be used to help students to develop their ability to preach and lead a worship service, and to evaluate their readiness for the ministry. Please answer the following questions.

Name of Congregation:

Date of Worship Service: Time of Service:

Name of Student:

Text Passage:

1. Please evaluate the **EXEGETICAL ASPECTS** of the sermon.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The text passage was explained adequately, within its context.	○	○	○	○	○
The redemptive-historical context (connections between OT and NT) was taken into account.	○	○	○	○	○
Important aspects of the text were explained without getting lost in too much detail.	○	○	○	○	○
The main message flowed from the text passage.	○	○	○	○	○

If you have additional comments on the exegetical aspects of the sermon, please comment here.

2. Please evaluate the **DOCTRINAL SOUNDNESS** of the sermon.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The message was theologically sound and within the boundaries of Reformed doctrine.	○	○	○	○	○
The message highlighted God's work for our salvation (theocentric).	○	○	○	○	○
The message was appropriately (not artificially) Christological.	○	○	○	○	○
The message was appropriately (not artificially) covenantal.	○	○	○	○	○

If you have additional comments on the doctrinal soundness of the sermon, please comment here.

---

3. Please evaluate the **APPLICATION** in the sermon.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The message was applicable and edifying.	○	○	○	○	○
The application was drawn from the text passage.	○	○	○	○	○
The application was in tune with the life of the hearers.	○	○	○	○	○

If you have additional comments on the application in the sermon, please comment here.

---

4. Please evaluate the **STRUCTURE AND COHERENCE** of the sermon.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The message was well-structured, making it easy to follow.	○	○	○	○	○
The theme and points summarized the message well.	○	○	○	○	○
The points were balanced, parallel and memorable.	○	○	○	○	○
The introduction was effective.	○	○	○	○	○
There was good procession of thought while maintaining cohesion.	○	○	○	○	○

If you have additional comments on the structure and coherence of the sermon, please comment here.

5. Please evaluate the **STYLE AND LANGUAGE** of the sermon.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
There was effective variety in sentence structure.	○	○	○	○	○
The language was fresh and contemporary, yet appropriate to text and occasion.	○	○	○	○	○
Images (metaphors, analogies, etc.) were used, and used effectively.	○	○	○	○	○
Illustrations and/or narratives were used, and used effectively.	○	○	○	○	○

If you have additional comments on the style and language of the sermon, please comment here.

6. Please evaluate the **DELIVERY** of the sermon.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The delivery served to get the message across.	○	○	○	○	○
The student connected well with the audience.	○	○	○	○	○
Volume, tempo, variety in pitch, gestures were appropriate.	○	○	○	○	○

If you have additional comments on the delivery of the sermon, please comment here.

7. Please evaluate the **LITURGICAL ASPECTS**.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Scripture readings were done with appropriate clarity and expression.	○	○	○	○	○
Psalms and hymns were well-chosen and appropriately placed in the liturgy.	○	○	○	○	○
The student led the congregation well in the ministry of prayer.	○	○	○	○	○
Overall, the student led the worship service in a way that was reverent and edifying.	○	○	○	○	○

If you have additional comments on the liturgical aspects of the service, please comment here.

8. Please evaluate the following **CONCLUDING ASPECTS**.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
The gospel was preached.	○	○	○	○	○
The congregation was edified.	○	○	○	○	○
The student was NOT boring.	○	○	○	○	○

Please share any final thoughts or recommendations.

How many brothers were involved in putting together this evaluation?

Feel free (but not obliged) to provide your name.

Submit