Presenter: Egbuta, Onyemachi

Seminar Date: 2014-03-18

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
6.7	6.63	6.84	6.83	6.84	6.75	6.81	6.25	5.88	5.9	5.67	5.25	6	5.6	0	0	0	E (45.7)

Presentation Style

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6

Presentation Style Comments

A bit hard to understand at first and initially read verbatim from slides. But this decreased as he got more comfortable. / Very professionally dressed; and serious.

You did a good job here. You could use practice with presentation -- keep practicing, but a good start.

Instructional Materials

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
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)	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.5
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Instructional Materials Comments

Very dense handout. Slides more clear; but some graphs etc were unreadable, and we were not oriented to what they were - but could not have seen them anyway. Consider tools to focus on key areas or remake them to be more clear.

The main thing that would help would be to redo the very complex slides that have small figures and charts. These are hard to see.

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	0	0	1	0	0	0	5.5
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5.5
4	Appropriate background information was provided	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5.5
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6

Overall Presentation Content Comments

Topic of students was somewhat different than title and objectives alluded to. Studies presented well but background should have been more specific to cost effectiveness vs c.diff in general since this was focus of studies. Some smooth transitions, some not - continue to work on this area.

This was appropriate.

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	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.5
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.5
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)	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.5

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

fine - although first study very different from others.

I did not feel convinced by the studies, or that I understood them well enough at the end. I think you had a very good starting effort, but could use some additional analysis.

Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	5
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	4.5

Conclusions Comments

Recommendations and pharmacist role were not specific to topic. This is always hard in the first seminar - so really work on this for second seminar - ask - if I was asked x question - what would I need to provide the audience to be able to answer it.

The conclusions are good, but not as strong as they could be.

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	1	0	0	0	0	6

Question Answer Session Comments

no specific comments.

Good.

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	1	0	1	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	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	5

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

Great topic (cost effectiveness) but consider being more specific in objectives, background and conclusions/recommendations next time. Everything should go back to those things. I definitely think Onye knew the material and was impressed with his command of the literature.

You did a good job. The main problem that I noticed was that you still don't have the best strategy for dealing with questions when not absolutely certain of the right answer. There are certain strategies that work, we can go over them.

Overall Comments

A solid first seminar. For the next one - focus focus focus on the topic, and give very specific recommendations for practice.

I found your seminar to be very interesting and informative overall.