

Presenter: Lane, Robert

Seminar Date: 2013-12-04

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
6.82	6.82	6.75	6.86	6.67	6.85	6.92	6.13	6.38	6.4	6.3	5.88	7	6.4	0	0	0	E (46.45)

Presentation Style									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	16	5	2	0	0	0	0	6.61
2	Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	18	5	0	0	0	0	0	6.78
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	20	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.87
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Presentation Style Comments

excellent pace and engagement with the audience

Be sure and speak up so everyone can hear you. Your voice trailed off on quite a few of your slide transitions.

Great pace and tone

Could have talked a little louder because it was hard to hear at certain parts of the presentation

There was a good amount of audience participation. I appreciated his calm manner, but his presentation was a little quiet.

Great job at not looking at your notes. You seemed very prepared. You went a little long on time, so be careful about that.

You were kind of quiet at times.

Robert showed good presentation style and composure.

there was an odd break at the very beginning, but after that he was smoothe sailing.

I thought that Robert did a good job but on a couple of occasions he seemed a little confused and had to skim through a powerpoint slide or two and then he would get back on track. Overall, not a big deal but maybe something to work on.

At times it was difficult to hear what was being said. Using a microphone may have helped.

Easy pacing to follow and very calm demeanor. It made it very easy to listen to you.

Relyed a little too much on notes in the beginning but got better near the end. You were a little quiet and mumbled towards the end of sentences and was a little hard to hear.

Very good presentation style. Good eye contact and didn't just read from the slides.

Very good pace, it was tough with out having a clicker which i think might have affected your style a bit

Presentation style was good, a little too soft-spoken at times

Overall, well one Robert. Your pace seemed a little slow and at times your voice would fade off and you would be hard to hear contributing to the slow pace but you remained professional and presented materials appropriately.

pace seemed a little slow in some spots of the seminar and your voice didn't carry across the room, maybe using the microphone would have helped.

Pace was good, you were behind the podium most of the time which helped you rely on you slides and notes more.

Good moderate pace with good audience eye contact. Voice level was a bit low though so it was sometimes hard to make out what you saying.

The slide format was nice with an appropriate number of words/items per slide.

Spoke clearly and had a calm, professional dialogue. The volume was quiet at times.

Good pace and confidence

Instructional Materials

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.91
2	Slides and handout are devoid of spelling and grammatical errors	14	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	6.48
3	Provided orientation to charts/graphs/pictures/diagrams (if applicable)	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	21	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.91

Instructional Materials Comments

I really like the handout; the use of charts/graphs/pictures helped keep it interesting as I followed along in the handout.

Slides were clear, simple, and easy to read

Several spelling errors on slides

Liked the white and black slides because they were easy to read

There were several typos and strange formatting. The items in the "nomenclature" section somehow switched columns halfway through the list. I did, however, think there was an appropriate amount of information on the slides; not too much.

Your slides had a few spacing/grammatical errors. Just 2-3; not a big deal.

Some errors in your hand out, don't forget to proofread and give it to others to proofread.

Some of the data slides needed to be remade to make them more clear.

slides and handout were very easy to read, but the flow was a bit different even though they had the same content

I thought it would have been more appropriate to cite the full reference at the bottom of your slides instead of using the numbering system with the references at the end.

I liked the layout of the handout. The handout complemented the presentation well.

I liked the slides (great color scheme) and thought the unique presentation material was very interesting.

Slides were clear and easy to read. The only comment is in the handout if you could put the pharmacist's role in that would be great!

Good graphs that explained the srutdies well

I really liked how the lecture matched up with the handout it mad it easy to follow

Slides were different style, I liked them

Robert's materials were crisp and clean and he referenced materials appropriately.

slides looked great, they were simple and I liked the light color background

Slides were easy to read, however they were almost too simple, perhaps spice them up just a tad.

Slides and handout were easy to read and you did well in orientating the audience to certain abbreviations and charts on your slides.

The outline was great and there were good transitions between sections of the presentation.

On your Powerpoint title page the last objective had a word missing. Also you could have lined up the OR data on the Tiv et al study and a reference slide could have been included. Of all the Powerpoint presentations, yours was my favorite when it came to simplicity and serving its purpose.

I thought your slides were really classy but a little wordy

Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	15	7	1	0	0	0	0	6.61
2	Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	17	6	0	0	0	0	0	6.74
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	21	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.91
4	Appropriate background information was provided	17	5	1	0	0	0	0	6.7
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	18	5	0	0	0	0	0	6.78

Overall Presentation Content Comments

There is definitely room for debate on the topic of whether a pharmacist's role improves patient adherence. Well done pointing out the controversy

Your content was appropriate and your objectives were very clear and measurable.

Background was a little brief. Good controversy /

.

I liked how he set up the seminar, particularly the "revisiting the controversy" slide.

I enjoyed how you used a whole article to display your controversy. It presented a complete "story".

Good specific objectives.

I like how the controversy was defined by using a study.

thought he could have increased the length of his interest in topic and controversy... objectives were very easy to understand and use.

The controversy was whether or not improved medication adherence can lower healthcare costs but all of the objectives were related to medication adherence only. None of the objectives specifically mentioned lowering healthcare costs.

I thought that the objectives were very concise and very helpful for identifying the topics to focus on through out the seminar.

Great seminar topic and interest in the topic was obvious. I also like how you introduced each study and what additional information they brought to the seminar. I got a little confused on the exact controversy when you launched straight into that first study, but excellent job!

Liked the outline in the beginning of the presentation. It was a little choppy between studies but overall good!

Good background information and easy to follow

I like how when you started the presentation you gave us a map of where we would be going. I found that it was easy to follow along with because I had an idea of what was coming next

Could have used a little more interest in topic

Robert's material was well displayed. The controversy was a little convoluted and unfortunately depressing for pharmacy, but he presented the material appropriately and drew accurate conclusions.

objectives were written very well. They were simple and you fulfilled them

Good coverage of background information and introduction into the purpose of the seminar.

Nice job discussing the background of the topic and introducing the audience to the topic and why its a controversy.

The introduction to the topic and reason for interest was clear and well presented.

I liked the diagram about the triad (doctor, patient, pharmacist)!

good objectives, I was little lost with the controversy

Presentation of Clinical Data

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Presented concise objectives, methodology and treatment for each study	21	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.87
2	Outcome measures were stated and described, and appropriateness was explained	19	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.83
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	19	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.83
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	6.84
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	6.89
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	21	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.91

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

I liked how the objectives were written in the handout and discussed without a slide at the beginning. I also thought it was unique to included a brief outline of the material to be discussed during the seminar. Nice work

Clinical data was somewhat lacking. Consider placing more emphasis on the statistics in the future.

Great detailed analysis of each study

Would have liked a little more explanation of the statistical methods

The was a good, logical flow to the presentation of the data.

The second study was a little confusing. I struggled following the outcomes and methodology, and how they were applied. More clarity would've been appreciated.

Good analysis of the studies, hit all the appropriate details.

Robert did an excellent job talking about the study strengths and weaknesses.

MPR was an easy topic to understand tho might have been decribed wrong

I liked how Robert used multiple types of surveys to look at the controversy from multiple angles.

I thought that concepts that may have been foreign to the audience were explained very well.

Very different type of studies than what we typically deal with, but I liked how you gave a "study roadmap" and described what each study brought to the seminar. You also came up with all the weaknesses and strengths I could come up with.

Was a little confused with the first trial presented in the handout. Realized that the first study in the

handout was the controversy study. Didn't correlate with the slides.

Data was good but hard to follow. You did a good job explaining it.

I like how you told us what the study was going to tell us before discussing it. It allowed us to know how it fits into the presentation so we know what to look for in that study

I liked "The Beta" it provided a good outline of what you were going to talk to us about

Robert thoroughly analyzed the literature available and succinctly presented the pertinent information to display the whole picture.

I like how each study had a little intro before you got into the meat of the study

Studies were almost not related directly to subject which was a little misleading at first, but you tied them together in the end.

I liked how you separated the trials out into different areas and based it back to the original diagram of medication compliance. It was easier to see where each of the studies fit in to the whole picture.

The analysis of the strengths and limitations for each study was thoughtful and clearly stated.

I liked the discussion of MPR and how it was explained (90 day supply @ 100 days)

I like that you used different data to lead us through the topic

Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	17	6	0	0	0	0	0	6.74
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	18	4	1	0	0	0	0	6.74
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	15	7	1	0	0	0	0	6.61
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	15	7	1	0	0	0	0	6.61

Conclusions Comments

good job drawing conclusions and relating it to the pharmacist

Your conclusions were supported by the data presented.

Conclusions were not entirely clear.

Had a vague conclusion, would have liked a explanation of a solution to improve adherence.

I think he evaluated the studies well. I agree with the limitations he pointed out.

I felt that your conclusions lacked specific information for what the pharmacist was supposed to do beyond what we're already doing. And it wasn't clear in the studies if what we're already doing is enough.

Would have liked the pharmacist role included in the handout

The recommendations and role of the pharmacist were both not well defined.

his pharmacist role needed to be stated in the handout but he has great analysis of data and conclusions

I would have liked to hear possible ideas that the seminarian would have recommended to improve adherence and lower costs.

I would have liked to see more specific recommendations on how to apply to results to practice.

I thought the conclusion was good and level of recommendation appropriate for evidence.

The conclusions made were good with what studies and evidence you had. Would like to see more of what you would recommend

The conclusions were good and supported by the data

The conclusion didn't seem to stick out real clear

I didn't feel like the conclusions were necessarily supported by the studies presented

Overall, due to the material presented it was hard to draw appropriate conclusions and recommendations for the pharmacist. Robert did a good job with the literature available.

good slide on the role of the pharmacist.

The conclusions were well thought out, though depressing.

The topic was very applicable to the profession of pharmacy and you did a good job tying everything back in to the topic and convincing the audience why our services matter.

More discussion of the seminarians overall conclusions would have been interesting.

I felt the study conclusions were in line with your conclusions and liked how you made a difficult topic more relevant to practice.

Still, the best study you had said that pharmacists don't help with adherence. I feel like we just skipped that

Question Answer Session

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	6.91
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	18	5	0	0	0	0	0	6.78

Question Answer Session Comments

Maybe could have use a couple more slides/moments to discuss questions. Otherwise, very good job answering questions

Answered questions thoughtfully and confidently throughout the presentation.

Great job answering questions in a confident, succinct manner

Answered the questions posed great

I think he did a great job involving the audience.

You gave adequate pauses and opportunities for questions. Could've added a slide asking for them, but that's my preference only.

Great job answering through out the presentation, but since you weren't over time I think many didn't get the opportunity to ask at the end.

Great job answering questions on the fly.

he did answer the questions that were asked and asked if there any questions but it is nice for that break slide to just think about what has been presented.

Robert did a good job of stopping to address questions throughout the presentation.

It felt like the presentation was rushed and there wasn't sufficient time allowed for questions during and after the presentation.

I thought the answers were good, maybe a bit concise.

Great job at answering questions. Maybe a little more time during the presentation to pause and let the audience ask questions.

Encouraged questions but sometimes in the middle of sections until waiting to the end of the section

You get a great job at fielding audience questions

You did great job answering questions and stayed on topic

Robert displayed professionalism and was able to think critically to answer questions appropriately.

your did a great job defining terms for individuals and correcting people when they seemed confused

You answered questions well and did not lose your place or pace in your presentation.

Good job answering questions that came up during the presentation. It wouldve been nicer to have a bit more time left at the end to ask a few more questions but the time went over just a little bit.

Great job answering questions and then picking back up again with the presentation.

I thought the questions were answered professionally and with precision.

fielded questions well

Overall Knowledge Base									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	20	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.87
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	21	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.91
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	21	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.91
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	22	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.96
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	22	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.96

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

I could tell by the ease with which Robert answered questions that he had studied the information very well.

Rob demonstrated a very strong knowledge base on this topic and presented it well.

Strong knowledge base

Great seminar

Did well. I think he was able to show a high level of content understanding.

Great fielding of questions. Your knowledge base seemed sound and expansive.

Could tell you knew your studies well.

The knowledge base was demonstrated by the ability to answer questions and think on his feet.

he seemed to think on his feet very well, his conclusions were well based on the studies, but he might have narrowed his topic too much for his data

Robert did his research and was prepared to answer questions and looked at the topic from multiple angles.

Your knowledge of the subject was displayed well.

It seemed that you had thought through the material and knew the material outside of the presentation.

This was a hard topic so it was hard to make conclusions and expand but he did a great job!!

Great overall knowledge of the subject

Good over all knowledge really helped you answer questions

Good insight into this important topic.

Robert was knowledgeable and distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance during his presentation.

your knowledge base really shown through with your answers to questions.

Talked about future studies that may add more to this subject, had an overall good knowledge which showed when answering questions.

Good job answering questions on your feet. You were also able to demonstrate knowledge gathered from the data and presented it in a way the audience could understand.

Patient case was a good way to conclude the presentation.

A strength of the seminar was Robert's overall knowledge base. This was evident with the case at the end of the seminar as well as how he presented the information throughout.

Good job

Provide one comment on what you liked about this seminar

Very smooth, balanced and engaging. Robert was easy to listen to and he made the topic real and important.

Good conversational tone and style throughout

Great flow, choice of words, presentation style, etc.

I liked the different topic of the seminar

I liked the uniqueness of the content and the relaxed presentation style.

Overall great job. I enjoyed your outline at the beginning showing where we were heading with the seminar. It was nice how you told a story with your articles as well.

Good applicable topic.

Robert has a good presentation pace.

i really like the outline at the beginning of the slides even though it may have taken extra time

I liked that he used a variety of different types of study to address the controversy.

I liked how the controversy was presented by using a study. It increased the strength of the seminar by demonstrating an actual controversy.

I like overall the flow of the presentation and original method.

Good at putting relevant facts on the slides and not making them too wordy. Seemed very calm cool and collected.

Good seminar. You had a very nice presentation style and a good topic.

I liked how you laid out where we were going with each study as well as initially for the presentation

The style was different, but I really liked it

I really like how Robert organizes his presentations. He tells a story and outlines what he is going to talk about then tells it to us then reinforces why we need to know it. Great job!

I really liked "the beta" slide.

Pace and question answering were very good and kept me interested.

I liked how you broke down and organized all the studies according to how they fit in the medication adherence chart/path. The labeling and introduction of each study was clear and made it easier to

follow along.

Seminarian showed how studies presented linked together even though they were somewhat different.

I felt that the information on each slide was the perfect amount. It wasn't too simple or too wordy. Well done!

I liked the topic

Provide one comment on what could be improved about this seminar

Maybe condense material a little more to avoid going overtime.

I would have liked to see more opportunities for the audience to ask questions during the seminar.

The studies and the order in which you presented them seemed to confuse the audience more than lead them to a specific conclusion

Slides could have used more main bullet points and less words on some of them

As I thought back about the seminar, most of the questions the audience posed dealt with confusion about abbreviations and acronyms and measures of data that were unfamiliar. In most of these cases, the seminarian had just barely finished explaining these concepts. I think a little more emphasis should have been placed on helping the audience understand these new and foreign types of measures.

Because you used three nearly completely different types of studies, it was hard to draw conclusions from just one study. It's a pro/con to your strategy, cause you told a story, but lacked repetition which helps reinforce and provide evidence for points you're making.

Practice timing so you don't go over. Speak up!

The time went long.

once again add in some break Q & A slides not only for you but for us as well

A little less reliance on notes.

I felt the presentation was lacking energy. It may have been the low volume of voice, but I would have liked to see more enthusiasm.

I would have liked maybe another trial looking at an answer for your controversy (1 or 2 of the trials seemed led up to it), but overall, great presentation!

You were a little quiet and mumbled towards the end of the sentences. Speak up a little and carry the volume throughout the whole sentence.

Nothing

At some times you seemed to quite down when speaking

Quite a few ums at beginning of slides and seemed like you got tripped up a few times

Perhaps a better topic would be Can pharmacist improve patient outcomes with pharmacist led interventions in patients with diabetes?

possible cut down on the number of slides to keep your seminar within the allotted time.

Even though you were "tied to the keyboard" try to move out from the podium when possible and less reliance on notes and slides.

It would help if you could keep you voice level even throughout the seminar because it seemed like you had a tendency to mumble a little or get really quiet during parts of the presentation so it was really hard to hear what you were saying.

Seminarian could have spoken a little bit louder.

I felt that eye contact with audience was broken and you would look at the ground and put your hands in your pocket. Overall though, it was a great presentation and you did a great job.

less words on the slides

General Comments

Excellent job overall!

Great Job!

Interesting presentation. I'm not sure how well the chosen studies portrayed the controversy, but the information was interesting.

n/a

great job!

Robert has smooth presentation style and he does a great job answering questions on the fly.

great job Robert.

Well done!

Overall great job! Very interesting, yet somewhat depressing topic! Great job presenting.

over all great job

Great seminar, cool topic. I was legitimately interested to see what the data had to show

Presentation was professional and gave good conclusions, even though it may not be what we want to hear.

Overall, great job!

The outline and transition into each part of the presentation was great and made the presentation flow really well.

You should be really proud of your effort and how you presented this. You provided a great example for us P3 students! Thank you and best of luck in your rotations and practice!

great job