

Presenter: Khong, Stephanie

Seminar Date: 2013-11-12

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
6.99	7	6.95	6.98	6.93	6.97	6.96	6.75	6.86	7	6.67	7	7	6.9	0	0	0	E (47.92)

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

Try not to spend too much time looking at the laptop

Stephanie's pace and eye contact were both ideal. Also, I thought her material was presented at the optimum level for her audience. I did notice a few colloquialisms (e.g., "you guys").

Instructional Materials										
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Instructional Materials Comments

I liked the factoids with each of the question slides. Nice way to ease the audience and encourage questions.

Both the slides and the handout looked professional and were devoid of typos and spelling/grammatical errors. I only noticed one graph (Slide 4), so I checked the orientation question as "not applicable". Stephanie's two primary studies had partial references at the bottom of the slides, but there wasn't a bibliography in the slide deck, nor did Stephanie mention that complete references were available in her handout.

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Overall Presentation Content Comments

I thought having an insulin pump on was a nice touch.

All aspects of overall presentation content were very good to excellent.

Presentation of Clinical Data										
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Presented concise objectives, methodology and treatment for each study	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

It was a bit difficult to follow some of the groups in each study. Not sure how this could have been improved on but a legend or something along those lines to give the audience a heads-up on the various groups being compared would have been useful.

Study objectives and treatment were present clearly and concisely for each study. Methodology was discussed in general, but I didn't notice any discussion of the statistical methods employed in the two studies. Outcome measures and the authors' rationale for using them were clearly stated. The results discussions for both studies were thorough, with a good analysis of strengths and limitations.

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

Discussing the role of the pharmacist in both the clinical and community setting is very useful

Stephanie's conclusions were supported by the data that she presented. Clinical importance was significant as it may result in more patients being treated with metformin.

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

Question Answer Session Comments

Was able to handle all questions asked

I liked the way Stephanie asked her audience a question at the beginning of her seminar to help engage them.

Overall Knowledge Base									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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

Was clear that she understood the role of metformin in practice

Well researched seminar. It was clear that Stephanie was an expert on her topic.

Overall Comments

This was a very good seminar and what should be expected of a P4 student.

Great job!