

Presenter: Hinckley, Paul

Seminar Date: 2013-10-22

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	6.93	6.92	6.89	6.96	7	6.97	6.13	6.71	5.9	6.11	6.38	7	6.2	0	0	0	E (46.51)

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Presentation Style Comments

In general was a good pace and good eye contact. Looked at slides and turned towards slides/board a lot - would encourage to try to maximize eye contact with audience. Had some mannerisms that were a bit informal. Moved back and forth which is good - but I found it a bit distracting.

Presentation style was relaxed and conversational. Paul was not glued to the podium; utilized the slides as triggers while maintaining eye contact with the audience. Paul moved around the front of the room so that he was not located only at the podium which offered a different style for routine seminars (and was refreshing).

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
3	Provided orientation to charts/graphs/pictures/diagrams (if applicable)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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

appropriate literature citations for most - although some #13 - don't know the source

Slides were easy to read from the back of seminar room; Two handouts were presented to the audience: 1) slides handout, and 2) text handout. The references utilized from Brazil and Canada are not immediately clear within framework of seminar.

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	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
4	Appropriate background information was provided	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5

Overall Presentation Content Comments

This was a good topic - and an opportunity to showcase experiences. There really wasn't a controversy and the literature evaluation were okay - but didn't really flow or fit together in a cohesive manner to tell a story. They were two papers that were critiqued to meet the seminar requirements.

Objectives were briefly written. The 3rd objective involving the evaluation of pharmacy practice in Germany and the US should have also provided more specific criteria so that the audience would be more aware of the elements to be discussed transitional flow can be improved. Since the 2 studies analyzed DRPs in US and another in Germany, the title of the seminar should have been more reflective of the goals/outcomes of these 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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Study presented in overall succinct and complete manner. Not clear if this is representative of US population

Studies presented were descriptive in nature so some of the evaluation criteria were less important; presentation of each study was easy to follow

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	0	2	0	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

Again to me it was interesting to hear about the experiences- I wasn't convinced that the literature presented were important to the overall seminar message.

Conclusions were supported by data presented during seminar; conclusions were less balanced in that the audience was lead to believe that more was to be learned from the German experience. This makes one wonder what the German pharmacists could learn from US pharmacists.

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

Good use of question slides throughout.

Paul spoke with authority on the given subject; he definitely enjoys speaking on this subject and was happy to entertain questions.

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	0	2	0	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	0	2	0	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

Strong understanding of practice of pharmacy in other countries

The studies were descriptive so did not require high level statistical analyses (at least for these studies); Paul was able to integrate his own pharmacy practice experience with that gained while in Germany. He did note that his time in Germany was limited and that more time would be needed to fully experience German pharmacy.

Overall Comments

Learned a lot about the practice of pharmacy in Germany and opportunities for pharmacists in the US

Paul was very relaxed and comfortable with the given topic. The momentum of the seminar was fairly smooth.

Overall Comments

The literature presented didn't seem to be important to the message of the seminar.

Two studies were presented, one US and one German, regarding DRP in pharmacy settings. One could say that it was a comparison of practice on two very different levels. The seminar was presented more as a show and tell in the beginning and then proceeded to an analysis of the DRPs. I felt there was somewhat of a disconnect between the front-end of the seminar to the time of study presentation. As a listener, I had to draw my own conclusions regarding practice in the two countries. Paul seemed to be more impressed with German pharmacy.

Overall Comments

Good pace and poise. Great job at engaging the audience in questions.

Overall, Paul was well prepared for his seminar and met all deadlines. The presentation of German pharmacy attributes was interesting. More transitional flow would have been a benefit for the seminar between the introductory material and the presentation of the studies. The objectives need to be narrowed to reflect the ultimately presented.