Presenter: Bastow, Travis

Seminar Date: 2014-04-09

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
6.91	6.94	7	6.97	6.99	6.95	6.97	6.5	6.5	6.7	6.75	6.88	6.75	7	0	0	0	E (47.65)

Presentation Style								
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
2	Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
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

Pace was good, and the delivery was easy to follow

Speaking pace was good, but the presentation ran a bit long. Eye contact could have been better, may have been due to looking at notes. Watch for swinging arm/hand with pointer.

Instructional Materials

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.5
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Instructional Materials Comments

Some of the slides did have small print, hard to read. Should have expanded/emphasized important data.

Several slides with tables could not be read from the back of the room. Remember to orient audience to tables and figures.

Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
2	Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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 presentation was good.

Decent background and objectives were measurable and related to the presentation. Unsure of your interest in the topic. The meta-analysis information would have been helpful to have as part of the background vs. conclusion. Prevalence of NEC plus cost/burden of illness information would help to establish the "problem" from a societal perspective.

Presentation of Clinical Data

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Presented concise objectives, methodology and treatment for each study	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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

Clinical Studies were interesting, impressive that need to treat was so low.

Objective and methods accurately presented. Rationale for treatment window would have been useful. Results were presented, but several tables could not be read from the back of the room. In study 2, slide was titled null hypothesis, but the actual hypothesis was presented.

Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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

Pharmacists role was a bit nebulous, but the recommendations were solid.

Conclusions were probably more strongly supported by data from meta-analysis briefly reviewed vs. the studies presented.

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Question Answer Session Comments

Well done

Did a good job answering questions. Be sure to give enough time for people to formulate questions before moving on when asking for questions mid-presentation.

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

Knowledge of the material was clear.

Good command of subject.

Overall Comments

Very nice job.

Overall a solid presentation. Work on eye contact and readability of key information in slides. A main critique is on the flow. While the study data was presented well, presenting the meta-analysis data at the end seemed to do more to support conclusions than the data presented. Suggest using meta-analysis to demonstrate what is known and what gaps remain, and then use the data from the studies to help fill the gap and move closer to resolving the controversy.