

# Presenter: Pratt, Hannah

Seminar Date: 2014-04-15

## 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
6.85	6.91	6.89	6.85	6.83	6.5	6.77	6.5	6.38	6.5	6.33	7	6.25	6.5	0	0	0	E (46.79)

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

## Presentation Style Comments

Great pace and flow. Seemed to target the level to the audience well.

Slight hesitation when presenting some of the data.

Instructional Materials										
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
2	Slides and handout are devoid of spelling and grammatical errors	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

### Instructional Materials Comments

The slides were really well designed and legible, except for those containing tables. The tables were imported from literature and not legible from the audience. The writing was just too small. So either the highlighted sections needed to be enlarged, or the selected data should have been re-drawn. The handout was useful, probably could have directed the audience to the handout during the talk a bit more.

No additional comments

## 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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
4	Appropriate background information was provided	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

## Overall Presentation Content Comments

Objectives were mis-worded. The objectives are the objectives for the audience. They should all be able to read "at the end of this seminar you should be able to ..." Also they all should be measurable or testable. So things like "understand" or "assess" are not correct for objectives whereas "describe" and "list" are. Good introduction and flow.

No additional comments

## 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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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

Good presentation and analysis of data. The only weakness was the audience not being able to read the data slides. The data were nicely highlighted and pointed out, they were just too small to see.

Minor confusion with how the results were distributed among the different age groups - although the presenter did an excellent job showing that the study included their target population, it wasn't clear if the pediatric results were different from the entire study cohort.

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

I thought the conclusion were well justified and that the recommendations for the pharmacist were particularly well done. It was a good take-home message.

No additional comments

### Question Answer Session

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

### Question Answer Session Comments

Good job answering questions. Handled the one question where she got flustered well by asking to defer it to the end. It would have been good to ask for that question again at the end, but it is hard to remember to to that. Otherwise had the answers at the tip of her tongue.

No additional questions

Overall Knowledge Base									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6

### Overall Knowledge Base Comments

Good understanding of the material and the larger area. Was able to describe the actual treatment protocols well.

Could try to anticipate potential questions from the audience in the future to help answers be more clear and concise.

## Overall Comments

Good job.

Overall excellent presentation. More practice in the future may help with nervousness.