

# Presenter: Blackham, Jebadiah

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
6.98	6.81	6.98	6.91	6.75	6.79	6.88	5.75	5.25	5.9	6	4.88	5.75	4.6	0	0	0	E (45.35)

Presentation Style									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	0	2	0	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	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4.5
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6

## Presentation Style Comments

Pace was nice. Style was engaging, but perhaps a little too informal with language for a formal presentation. Precision in language is always necessary for a formal presentation. For instance, throughout the presentation, used 'flu' rather than 'influenza,' 'strand' rather than the correct term, 'strain.'

You pace was even throughout your presentation. You did a nice job maintaining eye contact with our audience throughout your presentation as well. You also did a solid job presenting your material at the level of your intended audience. You stood behind the podium almost the entire seminar, I would suggest moving out from behind the podium to be more actively engaged and inviting to your audience. You had good tone, volume, and inflection so were easy to hear throughout your presentation.

## Instructional Materials

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	0	0	1	1	0	0	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)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3.5

## Instructional Materials Comments

Many slides were easy to read, but some had noticeably small font and too many words to easily read in the time allotted to do so. Also, there were some referencing difficulties. APA format is not typical for a presentation or article in the medical sciences, but I suppose not technically wrong. I did not see references for many of the pictures pulled from the internet or dates accessed (e.g. on slide 3). References on slides in general were in such small font, they were not readable from the back of the room. I recommend including references in the largest font possible. I try for 20 point font, but accept smaller font when it's absolutely necessary. In addition, when I went to the handout to find the reference information that I couldn't see well on your slides, I noticed a reference that did not have the page numbers included (Kieninger, 2013).

You slides overall were solid. The light blue background with white lettering worked well for the most part. However, there were several slides that were hard to read due to the color contrast (eg name of pandemic slide, virus slide the reference covered up the virus). Be sure to reference slides especially in your background section as that is information that you obtained from other authors. Your handout devoid of references throughout all of your paragraph sections. I would suggest adding some more graphic slides especially during your clinical data section to make them more visually appealing.

## Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
2	Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	0	1	1	0	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')	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6

## Overall Presentation Content Comments

Very engaging style, so no problems with flow. I felt that your comment about some seminar topics being esoteric was--although true--could perhaps be alienating to your audience. Good descriptions overall of some rather complicated information about influenza in the background, but the error on your slide that seemed to indicate that only influenza type A has hemagglutinin and neuraminidase was problematic.

Good pictures and intro to draw your audience in to your topic. Your objectives need to be more specific so that they are measurable. Your controversy slide was very effective at setting up the rest of your seminar. Background was well balanced. Your presentation flowed well. I would consider being more deliberate about your transitions.

## 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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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)	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5

## Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

I felt that you did a nice job describing the geometric mean and a Monte Carlo simulation. This was a section, however, where there were largely too many words on each slide, making keeping up difficult for me. I would recommend putting the key results that you want to highlight on a separate slide to make them stand out to the audience.

Overall presentation of clinical data solid. I would have liked to have seen expanding the strengths and limitations sections and their clinical implications.

## Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	5
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	5
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	0	0	2	0	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	0	1	1	0	0	0	4.5

## Conclusions Comments

There was not a clear rationale provided to support your conclusion. This came out in the Q&A, but really should have been included in your presentation. The relatively large number of questions about the conclusion highlighted the audience's lack of clarity on how and why you came to that conclusion. The role of the pharmacist did not specifically relate to the clinical question at hand. Pharmacists are involved in the allocation of influenza vaccine within health systems and really should have been included.

Conclusions were adequate but could have been much more specific based on the data presented and would assist your audience in making specific recommendations (ie what age of patients should we recommend or not recommend this vaccine in)

Question Answer Session									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	5
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

### Question Answer Session Comments

I felt that questions were encouraged. Some difficulty answering some questions.

You did a good job of encouraging questions from your audience. You handled most of the question well. How missed the opportunity to demonstrate your expertise on your topic by giving more specific recommendations.

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

### Overall Knowledge Base Comments

I felt that you were knowledgeable about the topic area overall, but the error in the background and the difficulty answering some questions introduced some question about the depth of knowledge in this area.

Again, you answered a number of questions adequately. However struggled on more specific questions. For example, when as if there was a limited supply of this vaccine, who would you recommend it in. You stated, "first come, first serve." The is never a good answer with respect to vaccine under short supply. You would want to recommend its use in the populations that are at the highest risk of disease.

## Overall Comments

Engaging style. Top recommendation is to work on supporting that conclusion.