

# Presenter: East, Shayley

Seminar Date: 2013-11-07

## 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
6.84	6.93	6.93	6.98	6.87	6.97	6.96	6.75	6.75	6.6	6.67	6.63	6.75	6.7	0	0	0	E (47.37)

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	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

A bit quick in delivery at times.

Shayley demonstrated very good pace and professionalism with her presentation. Clearly, practice her content.

Instructional Materials										
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	1	0	1	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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

### Instructional Materials Comments

Left the flood lights over the slides on during the entire seminar making the slides difficult to read.

Handouts seemed very polished and professional. Did not see any typos or grammar errors. Good use of graphics.

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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

Very Good

Shayley did very good job with the overall presentation content. As an audience member it was difficult, at the beginning to remember that SVT was superficial venous thrombosis and not supraventricular tachycardia. I cannot think of a better way to abbreviate superficial venous thrombosis, but it took some getting used to.

## 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	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)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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

Very good presentation of the clinical data.

I have good confidence in Shayley's ability to critique the literature. I think she achieved balance between packing details into the written handout and orally discussing those details with particular relevance to the controversy.

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

### Conclusions Comments

Very good conclusions which agreed with the data.

Part of the difficulty with this section is that one of the studies was for a drug that is not approved for use in the US. Automatically, that causes some pause and reflection on how, exactly, that impacts pharmacy practice. I suppose it is something to watch for. Generally, I think Shayley did a very good job organizing and discussing approaches to therapy on this particular controversy.

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

### Question Answer Session Comments

Strong Q and A period

Had a couple of I'll get back to you responses, but I think she did a good job responding to 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	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	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

### Overall Knowledge Base Comments

Knowledge base on SVT was very good.

Yes, Shayley demonstrated good overall knoweldge on the subject. Still not completely sure how to process the information on the non-US drug.

## Overall Comments

Very good seminar with only minor changes needed.

Shayley make a very good presentation. Clear that she had great coaching and mentoring from Dr. Vasquez. In addition, Shayley embraced the serious nature of seminar and made a very good demonstration of her maturing professional skills. Well Done.