

# Presenter: Stock, Devin

Seminar Date: 2014-03-19

## 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
6.89	6.94	6.88	6.93	6.92	6.83	6.97	6.63	5.75	6.6	6.75	6.63	6.5	6.7	0	0	0	E (47.01)

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

## Presentation Style Comments

Good professionalism. Devin is soft spoken, so I would encourage him to stand close to microphone. Hand in pockets during most of presentation. Looking behind him a fair amount at slides.

Good presentation style. Whether style or by necessity, you spoke quickly.

Instructional Materials										
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.5
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6

### Instructional Materials Comments

Citations - increase font size, lacking some citations on slides / graphs - need more orientation to graphs / Good use of boxes to highlight what was important on each slide but overall it just seemed like the slides were too busy with too much text. I would keep the slides on separate slides vs. graying out sections. Font size needs to be increased overall.

The study table text was small - a bit difficult to see. Slides were mostly self evident, but it's good to get in the habit of orienting audience to charts.

## 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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

## Overall Presentation Content Comments

Good background but this took up the majority of your presentation and far exceeded what we needed to review - too much pathophys. I would trim this section to give you more time on the data and controversy. Great review of the pain scales - awesome slide - very helpful for interpretation of data.

Good objectives. The background was on the "long" side, especially given that you presented data from 3 studies.

## 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	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

Good discussion of analysis. Would have liked to hear more about limitations of studies and holes in overall literature.

Good summary of clinical data - adequate discussion of method, strengths and weaknesses.

Conclusions									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	0	2	0	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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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

conclusions fairly concise and specific.

Conclusions and clinical importance could have been a bit stronger. There was quite a bit heterogeneity in response to DM in these studies - which to me is a "finding" that has implications. Probably not so much an issue with a relatively benign product like DM, but what if risk/benefit profile had been different?

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

### Question Answer Session Comments

Stumbled a little with questions, seemed nervous. Relax you are the content expert! Overall, I dislike question slides, consider using an image or other reminder to take a break during your presentation vs. questions slide. Consider repeating back questions asked by the audience so everyone can hear the question.

Handled questions very well.

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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

Overall knowledge base was good. Dr. Stephens question about namenda and differences with dextromethorphan was probably one that you should have anticipated and been able to answer given introduction to material. /

Overall knowledge base very good. It was obvious you took time to understand the mechanism / theory behind the use of DM with analgesia in surgery.

## Overall Comments

Devin, very good job! Things to work on for your next seminar - clear slides with larger font, more energy, and streamline background to only the most important information so you can focus on controversy and data!

Overall very good and thoughtful seminar. You successfully presented a lot of information in a relatively short period of time - you did well and selecting the most relevant information to present. A shorter background section may have let you slow your delivery a bit.