

Presenter: Chow, Keith

Seminar Date: 2014-04-02

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	6.81	6.81	6.99	6.96	6.92	6.98	6.63	6.5	6.4	6.75	6.75	6.5	6.6	0	0	0	E (47.19)

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	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

Fairly quick pace initially, eventually settled into a more moderate pace. Keith, you were looking behind you at your slides quite a bit. Think about how you can arrange yourself and computer to avoid having to do this in the future. Good confidence and enthusiasm!

connected well with audience

Instructional Materials										
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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)	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6

Instructional Materials Comments

Would have liked to see page numbers on handouts. Many slides did not have citations! Consider use of abbreviated citations for future seminars. Some slides were a little wordy, next time think about how to streamline slides.

Could have made more use of graphics to tell his story. Virtually every slide was text.

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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

Good review of scores, would have liked to see more to help with introduction. Objectives should reflect all content provided, need objectives related to efficacy and safety. I dislike question slides - think about other ways to transition, ask the audience for feedback, and take a mental break.

well organized. Excellent presentation

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	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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Would have liked to have heard more about adverse effects profiles of meds and pros/cons of using dex compared to other treatment options. This would have helped give us a context and be able to make better conclusions.

very through

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	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 were specific and good impact of pharmacist section, applicable for practice.

recommendations were consistent with the data and appropriate

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

Good job with some tough questions. Nice that you felt confident admitting when you did not know the answer, that's ok.

could have done a better job answering questions. Some answers were superficial

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	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	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

Would have liked more differentiation between author's conclusions and your conclusions, focus on what you take away as key points from study and how it pertains to your controversy.

strong performance

Overall Comments

Keith, overall great first seminar. You are enthusiastic, professional, and good clinical knowledge so excellent building blocks for next seminar. Things to work on for next time include: providing more context for discussion (more info about AE, cost comparison, etc. between drugs), fewer words on slides, and improved transitions.

Overall an excellent job.