# Presenter: Allen, Scott

## Seminar Date: 2014-03-06

### 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 | 6.91 | 6.96 | 6.99 | 6.92 | 7 | 6.97 | 6.88 | 6.75 | 6.9 | 7 | 6.75 | 7 | 6.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | E (47.92) |

| 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 | 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**

Pace was perfect; exceptional eye contact; posed, confident and no distracting mannerisms; material positioned perfectly for the audience.

Scott's presentation style was comfortable and casual yet highly professional. He maintained consistent eye contact with his audience and seemed to be engaged in conversation. He was easy to follow and he did not speed thru the content. He provided appropriate gesturing. He did not get flustered with the dysfunctional pointer.

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

**Instructional Materials Comments**

Excellent slides and handouts (I didn't notice any spelling or grammatical errors). Excellent orientation of graphical information. Literature sources were well cited in each slide.

One spelling error was noted on the Alumni slide. "Alumni" has 1 "L" and not 2 "L's". He used boxes to highlight groups of data which made his slides easy to follow. The slide dealing with the important question of the controversy was an excellent tool to provide continued transition into the topic at hand. Nice touch. Scott knew his slides very well and was very organized. He used pictures to demonstrate IC bleeds to provide background for P1P2P3 audience which was very helpful.

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

**Overall Presentation Content Comments**

Great introduction to clotting cascade and warfarin's origin (interesting story about the suicide attempt). I also like how your controversy was based on questions about the CHESS guidelines. / / Suggestion for next seminar: 4-5 objectives are probably ideal.

Scott did an enormous amount of work to build this seminar. As an audience member who is not an expert in coagulopathies, I felt that he offered a tether to keep me on track during the seminar because he really wanted his audience members to understand the controversy. He provided excellent transitionary flow between outline headings and within topic sections. Objectives were written with action verbs and were utilized and met. He used a warfarin risk slide to bring the importance of patient safety home to the audience. Excellent selection.

**Presentation of Clinical Data**

| # | Question | A | A- | B+ | B | B- | C+ | C | NA | Mean |
|---|----------|---|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|------|
| 1 | Presented concise objectives, methodology and treatment for each study | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 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) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 5 | Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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**

Excellent presentation of clinical data. I can't think of anything to improve.

Overall analysis of studies was thorough and presented to the audience in a manner that was easily understood. One could walk away understanding the data. Given the complexity of the data, I am not sure that everyone walked away with understanding how to use the information but it provided the audience with additional food for thought! His own conclusions were well thought out and reflected a discriminating analyses of the authors.

## Conclusions

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

## Conclusions Comments

Conclusions, clinical importance, recommendations and pharmacist's role were all "right on". No suggestions for improvements in this category either.

Conclusions were based on analyses of the studies. I would have liked to have heard what the experience has been for pharmacists and physicians at the U or other hospitals in the community regarding the FFP and PCC controversy. This would bring a more practical aspect for the study versus the authors' conclusions. The role of the pharmacist was outlined and easy to understand.

**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**

Superb Q/A session. I also liked how you used your case study to engage your audience.

Scott was very comfortable with the topic and seemed excited to share with the audience. He was ready for questions and seemed to have anticipated some of them which is good. This reflects a broader breadth of his reading and exploration. Please consider repeating the questions asked of the audience because it was very difficult to hear the questions asked from the back of the room. This is a method utilized by poised speakers and reflects well on the speaker.

**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 | 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 | 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**

Excellent knowledge base and strong ability to think on your feet, both of which came across strongly during your Q/A session.

Scott's presentation and Q/A session reflected that he had beyond basic pharmacology and the primary studies. He was able to answer questions rather easily. He also was able to answer questions which had less evidence and did so rather gracefully. If he was unsure of the answer (because there was no answer due to less evidence), he was able to provide some primary literature to show a direction for the answer so the audience was not left empty-handed. Overall, an excellent presentation.

## Overall Comments

Truly outstanding first seminar. You set a high bar for the rest of the semester.

Scott provided an excellent presentation. He kept the topic stream-lined so that he would not "lose" the audience due to the complexity of the topic. He did not add fillers to the presentation so he did not lose his audience's attention. This quality will serve him well on rotations where physicians want succinct answers. Scott also stood away from the podium to pose his conclusions to the audience. This elevated his credibility in this topic and encouraged the audience to ask questions. Excellent work!

## Overall Comments

40.7855072

38

## Overall Comments

-111.736702

-97