

Presenter: Doan, Kate

Seminar Date: 2013-10-29

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
6.93	6.95	6.94	6.89	6.93	6.95	6.92	6.25	6.38	6.4	5.75	5.75	6	5.6	0	0	0	E (46)

Presentation Style									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Presentation Style Comments

Kate has a good presentation style. She exhibited a few mannerism (e.g., "um") toward the beginning, that were more likely anxiety related.

Presentation style great overall; good pace and voice projection. Tended to look back at slides often which was slightly distracting. I noted the seminarian ends many sentences with an up inflection making it sound like a question is being asked. To improve credibility, work on noting this and trying to reduce it as much as possible. It may not be noticed by others but could effect how confident you sound.

Instructional Materials										
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.5
2	Slides and handout are devoid of spelling and grammatical errors	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Instructional Materials Comments

Overall, I thought the written and visual materials were well done. The handout had a nice organization to it. The tables with the break down of the clinical students will slightly dark. I don't think they needed the shading. Also, the slides had a nice format, but again, the background was slightly dark and would suggest in future presentations using a background that gives better contrast to the text.

Instructional materials were good overall; a couple figures were difficult to read (eg, assessment for GERD slide) and a couple typos noted.

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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

Kate did a good job with the overall presentation and content. She indicated this topic presented during her clinical rotation in infectious disease. I would be curious if this was from one single patient experience, or if the team encountered numerous patients during her rotation. This might give slightly more relevance to the frequency of seeing this condition. Overall, Kate had good balance between controversy, background, and clinical evidence.

Presentation flowed nicely and appropriate background was provided.

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.5
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Although Kate did very well in this section, during the post-seminar discussion the opportunity for improvement was brought forward. Generally, I have confidence that Kate understands the evaluation of the evidence. There were a few items, such as relationship to renal dysfunction, and relationship to H2 blockers that were relevant to her discussion.

Reasonable job with the data; however, a more detailed discussion of study design as well as stats was warranted. Results were presented rather quickly, and since studies were not compared side by side, or compared and contrasted much during presentation or in handout, it was a little hard to keep track.

Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	0	1	0	1	0	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	2	0	0	0	0	0	6

Conclusions Comments

Overall, Kate did good job with this section.

conclusion is sound, but not very specific. I agree the data are limited, but you could make a conclusion in a couple bullets that is strong and has clinical impact. The pharmacist's role was covered well. One clinical area that was not covered as thoroughly as it should is who PPI's are clinically appropriate for. .GERD mentioned, but what about pts with a h/o GIB or PUD, it would have been really helpful to provide a table or recommendations surrounding appropriate PPI use so the audience had a quick reference to take with them.

Question Answer Session

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Question Answer Session Comments

Good Job with this as well. A few questions were presented that caused her to think through the material, but she handled them satisfactorily.

Good interaction with the audience; could be more succinct with answers, tended to think aloud it seemed.

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	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	0	1	1	0	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	2	0	0	0	0	0	6

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

She was challenged a bit, but responded well.

Reasonable knowledge base for this particular topic; would have liked to hear more information regarding PPI appropriate use and a very clear summary of cdiff tests that are appropriate.

Overall Comments

I feel that Kate has the potential to be a very good presenter, however the main advice, I would give is practice, practice, practice. I improves confidence and presentation skills. Overall, good job.

great job overall with an interesting topic.