

Presenter: Richards, Kelsey

Seminar Date: 2013-10-23

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
6.63	6.69	6.83	6.84	6.93	6.81	6.95	6.5	6.38	6.2	6.36	6.63	7	6.9	0	0	0	E (47.1)

Presentation Style									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Presentation Style Comments

good pace, would consider using microphone or incr volume / position computer so that you never have to look behind you to read off slide

Pace, eye contact etc all very good.

Instructional Materials										
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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)	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Instructional Materials Comments

Work on decreasing words per slide / appreciated that you tried to orient to charts/graphs but these slides were difficult to understand, try using laser pointer or mouse to help point specifics out

Slides all looked good - it might have been easier to teach the audience CE methods if slides had been ordered relative to methods used in each study you presented - would have saved you some slides and also made the applied learning immediate relative to each study.

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	1	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	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	5
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Overall Presentation Content Comments

would have liked more discussion about current treatment options and clear discussion of how fingolimod fits in and why it is important to use a cost effectiveness model in this case. I think your point got muddled a little here.

I admire your resilience in taking on a quick CE review. But at the same time, this detracted somewhat from the clinical controversy - as suggested by the audience, a slide that listed step-wise therapy progression with pro's & con's of each drug and associated finances might have been helpful for the take-away

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

good discussion of limitations

I think presentation of your studies was where you really shined. You did a great job describing/discussing each study, but would have been nice to have a summary table of studies/models at the conclusion. This plus a step-wise therapy summary would be 2 great take-aways for the audience

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Conclusions Comments

next time, try for more audience participation - conclusion is a nice place to do this to make sure that they got your message

Conclusions were acceptable - again - mini-summaries would have been helpful

Question Answer Session									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Question Answer Session Comments

good job answering questions

Great audience rapport - your presentation confidence has improved greatly since you were a P1 - congratulations!

Overall Knowledge Base									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

good understanding of topic - good for you picking a tough cost effectiveness presentation!

This was where you shined!

Overall Comments

interesting topic, different format/topic then other students - liked that you focused on cost effectiveness
knowledge of subject - nice review of CE methods

Overall Comments

try to work on engaging the audience more, asking them questions / slow down transitions between slides, often complex material so give audience chance to think it through / decision tree analysis slide was blurry

think about slide organization & places where you can save energy/time when reviewing study methods such as those with CE, especially when you are going to do immediate application through review of published literature

Overall Comments

excellent job! i think this was good improvement from last semester and this is a presentation to be proud of!