

Presenter: Green, Angela

Seminar Date: 2013-11-05

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	6.95	6.91	6.88	6.93	6.93	4.75	5.14	4.7	4	4.25	5.75	4.1	0	0	0	E (44.46)

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	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	5
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	4.5

Presentation Style Comments

Some nerves displayed in the "um" oral frequency and some body postures.

Angela did not seem very comfortable with the information on the slides. She would start speaking toward the audience, but with each slide she quickly looked back toward the slide. It seem most often that she was reading directly from the slide.

Instructional Materials										
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4.5
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	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4.5

Instructional Materials Comments

No citations to literature in Introduction.

Angela slides were acceptable and included a few graphics. The handout was incredibly difficult to follow and turned out to be distracting and time consuming to find information. The handout had pretty good headings, but, as an opportunity for improvement, would suggest using more bulleted lists and graphics in the handout. There was a pretty good slide that had venn diagrams, that was helpful for understanding the background information. That could be included in the handout. The font on the slides could be made larger. Some of the slides only had a few lines of text, but the font was kept small.

Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
2	Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.5
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	4
4	Appropriate background information was provided	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.5
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.5

Overall Presentation Content Comments

Objectives not in handout.

Overall, I think more practice would be a learning opportunity for the future. At times, Angela seemed unsure of the content. Additional practice facilitates familiarity with the content and confidence in the presenter. I think this has the makings of a very good seminar presentation. There was a reasonable controversy, but as pointed out in audience questions, the turn around time of the lab result and the relative cost of the lab test are key factors that would need to be included in 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	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5
2	Outcome measures were stated and described, and appropriateness was explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	3
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.5
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3.5

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Statistical analysis was weak. Student seems unable to determine the meaning of the statistics applied by the authors or understand how these should apply to the studies. Withdrawals and dropouts not explicitly addressed. Strengths and limitations not that rigorously defended.

Angela did a good job listing out the various study design elements, methodologies, and statistical analysis, however, her own critical analysis of these items seemed on the weak side. As an audience member, I have confidence she can pick these items out of a published study, but would like to have learned more of her opinion as to whether the elements in the study were appropriate.

Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	4.5
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	5
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3.5
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	4

Conclusions Comments

Recommendations for clinical practice could be more detailed and more insightful from expert perspective. Role of pharmacist could be better and more explicitly addressed.

Again, Angela has great potential with this seminar topic, however, the apparent lack of practice and lessened critical analysis, seemed to take away some of the shine from the presentation.

Question Answer Session									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5.5
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6

Question Answer Session Comments

Mechanics was good, some answers lacked rigor (statistics).

Angela did an appropriate job to encourage audience 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	0	1	0	0	1	0	3.5
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3.5
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	4.5
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	4
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	5

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

Clinical and statistical differences not clearly resolved. Knowledge depth beyond seminar not impressive and knowledge of prior work in the area not convincingly deep.

Stated in previous comments, but Angela appeared to struggle in this area. I think she has the capability to be a very good presenter, but the key is advance preparation and practice.

Overall Comments

In these studies, how many more patients are needed to gain statistical relevance? Clinical relevance? Power analysis should be improved to understand how to provide a solid conclusion to the therapeutic value. // Influence to Pharmacy practice is unclear - clinical issue and value seems unresolved. Is this mission-critical technology to advance or not valuable to practice?

Overall, seminar was acceptable, but near the lowest level of expectations. Not sure if there were other factors that were interfering, but her biggest opportunity for improvement is in the preparation phase for seminar.