

Presenter: Poulsen, Abraham

Seminar Date: 2014-04-09

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
6.78	6.88	6.97	6.96	6.91	6.78	6.98	6.63	6.75	6	6.67	6.25	4.75	6.4	0	0	0	E (46.3)

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Presentation Style Comments

Good presentation style, except for questions.

Good delivery pace, but presentation ran long. You have a comfortable and effective presentation style; standing in front of the podium welcomed questions. You probably included too much detail in areas.

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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

Slides were clear and easy to follow.

Slides were generally okay. Font size differences between slides, when dramatic, was distracting. A few typos noted i.e. reference to wrong appendix in hand out. Some slides were wordy/busy.

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
4	Appropriate background information was provided	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5.5

Overall Presentation Content Comments

Background and specificity of ACHE inhibitor drugs was lacking. The issue of selectivity or the basic premise to describe why drugs were ineffective was missing.

Good introduction and liked that you included data on burden of illness/medication costs. Objectives were measurable and related well to the presentation. Background section could have been a bit shorter/streamlined.

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

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Data analysis was good, explained the observations well and explained whether it was significant.

Study approach was was complex for the first study, and you did a good job explaining it. However, methods and results could have been more concise - make it easier to "digest". While I like that you took time to think about limitations, there were a lot; sometimes it's worth focusing on ones with greatest risk of introducing bias and/or clinical implications. I liked the description of scales and inclusion of information on meaningful difference.

Conclusions									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Conclusions Comments

Conclusions were a bit unclear.

Good conclusion and recommendations. Did not go "beyond" data and provided meaningful recommendations for pharmacists.

Question Answer Session

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	4.5
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	5

Question Answer Session Comments

Didn't leave time for questions, the presentation was overly long and this discouraged questions.

Generally did a good job of thinking on your feet. It was distracting when you'd interrupt yourself when answering a question to say "thank you".

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	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	1	0	0	0	0	6
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

How galantamine fits into the whole picture was still a bit unclear. I would have liked to have seen something more about ACHE-Inhibitor therapy for Alzheimers in general. The disconnect between cognitive scores and quality of life wasn't really addressed. This seminar was a bit frustrating

Seems to have a good command of the information, and clear understanding of the clinical implications.

Overall Comments

For the most part the seminar was well done, but take home message was a little unclear. The "Thank you for your question response", repeated, was really annoying. Don't do this! It is distracting and comes across as disingenuous. A slightly less annoying (only slightly) response is "good question". Don't every say this in response to a question unless the question really leads you to explore an avenue you want to talk about. In general, just answer the question.

Good presentation with an effective style. Main critique is to "manage" the detail to keep the audience engaged and avoid unnecessary confusion. You may find it helpful to be more sparing with words on the slides to avoid going into too much detail.