Presenter: Smith, Michael

Seminar Date: 2013-10-22

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
6.96	6.96	6.93	6.92	6.93	6.94	6.99	6.63	6.5	6.4	6.33	6.38	6.75	6.8	0	0	0	E (46.98)

Presentation Style

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
2	Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Presentation Style Comments

Mike had great eye contact - when he moved he looked at the audience, instead of the slides. He was poised and comfortable with the material. He was a little fast- but the first semianr probably went long on top of the seminar introduction.

Michael's presentation style is relaxed yet professional. His eye contact with the audience was excellent. He walked to opposite sides of the screen but it was not distracting; actually was refreshing to see a different style! Momentum of the seminar was just abit FAST. Michael was good to utilize his slides to help the audience stay on track. During the initial part of the seminar when the mechanisms of opioids and benzo's were discussed, I think Michael lost some of his audience regarding this higher level of pharmacology. I was in the back of the room and some of the nonverbal cues looked alittle "lost".

Instructional Materials

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Instructional Materials Comments

Some of the graphs on the slides were busy - but Mike did a nice job of helping us to focus in on important parts. References with inconsistent capitalization.

Michael did not always orient the audience to the axis of graphs. The interpretation for the audience was not difficult, but the speaker should provide this orientation. Michael did a nice job to emphasize primary literature thru this seminar.

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	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

Interest and purpose clear- not sure the literature really helped address the topic well. Not really a controversy - just a lack of objective data. / Very strong objectives- specific and measurable.

Michael's interest in the topic was presented to increase audience curiosities. The purpose of the seminar was presented and was easy to understand. However, the selected studies, as presented, did not seem to tie in with the main theme of the seminar; What is the relationship between sleep apnea and doctor shopping?? Also, one might also wonder if the presentation of the study of Michael's boss, might have represented a conflict of interest of sorts (and may have warranted presentation of another study to show balance). Michael followed his outline and offered several opportunities for questions.

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.5
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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	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

The purpose of the first study wasn't totally clear. There was a comparison of the rates of sleep apnea to the general population - but since the drop outs went to other sleep studies- our population appeard to be not the general population so that comparison didn't seem correct.

The analysis of each study was appropriate but I did not see the tie-in between the two studies. More transitional flow might have been a benefit to help alleviate this discrepancy. Michael spent time to determine strengths and limitations.

Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Conclusions Comments

Conclusions were broader than provided by the papers - but while I think there were appropriate statements the studies didn't necessarily prove the point

Clinical importance of each study was provided to the audience but the tie-in between the studies was not evident. Michael did a nice job to define potential roles for the pharmacist and the interdisciplinary needs involved in this topic.

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

While you didn't have question slides- you did remember to stop and ask if there were questions. Not sure why people didn't ask - but could have been the hour was getting late - or I like Dr. Biscupiak's recommendation to ask the audience questions.

Michael provided several opportunities for audience questions. He demonstrated a professional style while answering questions and was conversational with his audience. He provided thorough answers for the respective 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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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

able to provide insights into the topic - not sure about the specific studies themselves

Michael's overall knowledge base was intact during the seminar. He demonstrated organization and preparedness. He definitely understood the studies and was able to answer questions. I am still confused as to the actual selection of the given studies as noted on a previous review slide.

Overall Comments

Passionate about the topic and it has important public health implications and pharmacists can play an important role

Michael presented his seminar with ease as evidenced by his preparation and organization. His style was very professional and he invited interactions with the audience.

Overall Comments

Not sure the data supported the conclusions - but I don't necessarily disagree with the conclusions.

Transitional flow could be improved to help the audience understand the importance of the selected two studies for the seminar and how the two studies interrelate.

Overall Comments

Overall - nice presentation. Poised, good pace, well presented.

Overall, Michael demonstrated skill in seminar presentation style and organization. He set a good example for the P3 students to follow.