

Presenter: Jensen, Riley

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
6.96	6.83	6.89	6.95	6.99	7	6.98	7	6.63	6.5	6.42	6.63	7	6.6	0	0	0	E (47.27)

Presentation Style									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Presentation Style Comments

you were a charismatic and engaging presenter. Good integration of humor and overall little reliance on your slides.

Good presentation. Pace/timing were good, as was eye contact. You moved around a bit a first, but movement seemed to decrease as you settled into the presentation and didn't become distracting.

Instructional Materials										
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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)	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

Your slides were the new more rectangular/wide screen format. Unfortunately, our screens in HSEB are square. This resulted in black area above and below your slides and your font/images looking rather small on the screen. I would encourage you to overall increase your font size wherever possible and use the old ppt settings. In the future, also consider using abbreviated citations to make slides look more neat.

Slides and handouts were well done. The immune response flow chart was too small to read. I liked your transition slides.

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	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	5
4	Appropriate background information was provided	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Overall Presentation Content Comments

Objective should really outline your overall presentation and be action items you want the audience to be able to do after you presentation. I think your objectives didn't quite match with the overall content of your presentation, with too much emphasis on background information vs. the meat of your controversy. // Very catchy activia story and great use of images on question slides to keep us interested. Very fun!

Introduction was well balanced - enough information to set up the articles an controversy but it did not take too much time. The controversy was well described, but your objectives could have been more aligned with the presentation. Most objectives could have probably been met just by sitting through the background; there were no objectives for applying the information from the studies presented.

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	1	0	1	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)	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

presentation of data seemed appropriate. would have liked more background to help us understand the context of the outcomes selected since they were unfamiliar markers of immunity to most of the audience and whether or not they were clinically relevant.

There was not much mention of statistical analysis. There was also data in the Olivares study on week 2 immune response that you did not present. That data seemed relevant - i.e. be careful about "picking and choosing" which results to present. Slide with primary outcomes did not have a key to say that the asterisk meant significance - or at what level of significance i.e., * $p < .05$. For strengths and limitations, I would not say basic statistical analysis were a study strength. They were appropriate but not unique - not something that improves upon the study.

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	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Conclusions Comments

Very thoughtful conclusions. Appreciate the advise about being open to patient questions... even if they seem ridiculous!

For seminarian conclusions, the data are inconclusive about clinical response (reduction of ILI). It was not fully powered to detect a difference of the magnitude seen. Thus, be careful about concluding a minimal/no decrease.

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

Very good Q&A. I would suggest repeating the audience members question so that everyone can hear... some of the folks asking questions were quiet and I had trouble hearing in the back of the room.

Did a good job handling questions. Allowed for time for questions during the presentation.

Overall Knowledge Base

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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	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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

Insightful and balanced presentation. You were clearly skeptical about your controversy but addressed the issue professionally which I really appreciate.

Good command of the subject matter, and communication of the knowledge.

Overall Comments

Riley, overall very good job. Work with you mentor next semester on improving slides (ie. citations, increasing font size) and improving objectives. Presentation style, humour, and professionalism are right on track.

Good command of the subject matter, and overall a solid presentation. The objectives could have been more aligned with application of the availability of the presented clinical trial data in practice.