

Presenter: Ajwani, Nancy

Seminar Date: 2014-04-16

Presenter Scores

Student Survey Data Averages							Faculty Survey Data Averages							Final Scores			
Pres. Style	Inst. Materials	Overall Pres.	Clinical Data	Conc.	Q&A	Overall Knowledge	Pres. Style	Inst. Materials	Overall Pres.	Clinical Data	Conc.	Q&A	Overall Know.	Prep.	Prof.	Att.	Total
7	6.98	6.93	6.95	6.9	7	6.97	6.75	6.86	6.9	6.91	7	6.75	7	0	0	0	E (47.97)

Presentation Style									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Presentation Style Comments

Mostly did not need to rely on slides, but sometimes the presenter turned to face the screen and left back to audience.

Nancy had good presentation style standing in front of the podium and maintaining excellent eye contact except when she was explaining things on the screen. She was a bit nervous and used the filler "you know" several times.

Instructional Materials										
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
2	Slides and handout are devoid of spelling and grammatical errors	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
3	Provided orientation to charts/graphs/pictures/diagrams (if applicable)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Instructional Materials Comments

Good slides and clear transitions. Some of the fonts may be a bit too small.

Instructional materials were excellent. I didn't notice any misspelled words or types. Information and data in all sections was meticulously cited.

Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
4	Appropriate background information was provided	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Overall Presentation Content Comments

Overall excellent, but could have presented a bit more on the safety of turmeric. Good background and intro.

Nancy did a good job of describing her interest in medicinal uses of turmeric. Her objectives were well framed. Her controversy focused on whether there's evidence supporting the efficacy of turmeric in O.A. treatment.

Presentation of Clinical Data

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Presented concise objectives, methodology and treatment for each study	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Outcome measures were stated and described, and appropriateness was explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Nice presentation of strengths and limitations and pharmacist perspective.

Nancy did a good job of describing all aspects of both of her clinical studies, though she didn't seem to grasp the impact of under or unpowered studies on negative results.

Conclusions									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Conclusions Comments

Good highlighting about the lack of complete / limited data.

Nancy did a good job of reconciling the different conclusions of her two studies and didn't over interpret either study. Her recommendations for pharmacy practice were well considered

Question Answer Session

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Question Answer Session Comments

Excellent job with questions that demonstrated deep knowledge of the subject, despite limitations in studies.

Did a good job of answering question, though there was some confusion about parametric vs. non-parametric statistics. At the start of her seminar, Nancy asked if anyone had been asked by patients about turmeric supplements. This was a good way to encourage audience participation. For you next seminar, you could try starting your seminar with a case study or quizzing the audience.

Overall Knowledge Base									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

Presenter clearly knew her data and displayed poise and confidence.

Strong knowledge base about osteoarthritis and medicinal properties of turmeric.

Overall Comments

Excellent seminar.

Good job!