

Presenter: Davis, Alexis

Seminar Date: 2013-10-30

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 |
| 6.97 | 6.95 | 6.86 | 6.88 | 6.87 | 7 | 6.96 | 6.63 | 6.63 | 6.7 | 6.73 | 6.88 | 7 | 6.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | E (47.7) |

| 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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 3 | Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 4 | Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

Presentation Style Comments

Very good presentation style, very professional; just needs to project voice to the back or the room.

The presenter was a bit nervous but had excellent information

| 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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6.5 |

Instructional Materials Comments

Slides were clear and easy to read, inclusion of the road map was appreciated by all.

Excellent materials - great slides and handout. Provided orientation to graphs. The "roadmap" was an excellent way to provide internal summaries and orientation to what had been explained and what was to follow.

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 | 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 | 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

Exceptionally good job of explaining the controversy, really gave purpose to the talk.

Excellent explanation of hemolytic disorders of the newborn. A good explanation about issues with therapeutics and cost controversies. The roadmap was a good way to do smooth 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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 3 | Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 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 job of presenting trial details, exceptionally good was the re-plotting of the AAP ET threshold and putting study 1 data on it.

Very good interpretation of the available literature.

| 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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 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

Lack of clinical benefit to IVIG in HDN was convincingly presented.

Nice analysis of the studies and how this led to appropriate conclusions drawn. Very specific recommendations provided and emphasized role of fiscal responsibility of the pharmacist.

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

Took questions throughout without breaking stride, well done

Good answers; poised and confident.

| 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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6.5 |
| 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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

Good command of topic

Preparation was evident.

Overall Comments

Very interesting and informative seminar.

Excellent presentation. The only thing I would have added is to repeat the question to the audience when asked.