Presenter: Gygi, Tracy

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
6.86	6.89	6.87	7	6.9	6.97	6.87	5.63	6.75	6.6	6.3	6.13	5.5	5.9	0	0	0	E (46.22)

Presentation Style

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5.5
2	Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5.5
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5.5
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6

Presentation Style Comments

Need to spend a bit more time practicing your talk with a live audience to be more comfortable

Tracy was posed poised and confident with good eye contact. One suggestion for future presentations would be to get out from behind the podium. I also thought that the material was presented at a good level for the audience.

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)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6

Instructional Materials Comments

Nice job of directing the audiences' attention to the relevant section of the slides

Slides and handout were both informative and looked professional. Tracy also oriented the audience to several graphs in slides nos. 40, 41 & 43. Authors of the primary studies were cited by "last name, et al." format citations, but complete references were not given in the slides. Nor did Tracy mentioned that they were listed in the Handout.

Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
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')	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Overall Presentation Content Comments

It seemed that at some points in the presentation that the audience was not engaged and following along. I thought the content was at an appropriate level so not sure why the audience was disengaged.

Presentation content was generally very good to excellent, though I don't remember hearing what interested Tracy in the topic.

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	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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Need to describe want a meaningful clinical benefit is for some of the endpoints

In general, clinical trials were well presented, although I did notice the following omissions: statistical methods should have been described; some discussion of statistical power should have been made for all three studies.

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5.5
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5.5

Conclusions Comments

Hard to judge the recommendations for practice as the drug is still in development for this use

Tracy's "hopeful, but cautious" approach to both his conclusions and recommendations is okay, but I would have liked him to be more bold about them.

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	5

Question Answer Session Comments

There were not a lot of questions posed. Need to reach out to the audience with questions to encourage interaction.

I liked the way Tracy asked his audience for questions a couple times during the seminar.

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5.5
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5.5

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

Clear that the student possessed info beyond what was presented.

Tracy's knowledge base was excellent and he's able to think on his feet, but I wondered if some of the results both statistically and clinical significant?

Overall Comments

This was a solid good performance on a difficult topic

Interesting and informative seminar. I wasn't aware that there was a potential role for allopurinol in CVD.