

Presenter: West, Kyle

Seminar Date: 2014-03-25

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
7	6.96	7	6.95	6.91	7	6.96	5.88	5.63	6	5.44	6.13	6.25	5.8	0	0	0	E (45.96)

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6

Presentation Style Comments

See comments.

Grammatical flaws evident. Smooth but not polished. "Is there any questions?" put me off. Slide grammar errors in abundance. Not a good representative for correct educational quality from U of U.

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	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4.5
3	Provided orientation to charts/graphs/pictures/diagrams (if applicable)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.5

Instructional Materials Comments

See comments.

Does not distinguish plurals from possessives. Authors should be Author's. Seminarists Conclusions. Please....Possessives and plurals are different. Also repeated refs in handouts to HCP's. NO!!!! This is HCPs. It's plural, not possessive. Poorly represents U of U CoP.

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
4	Appropriate background information was provided	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6

Overall Presentation Content Comments

See comments.

No chemistry and this was all about chemistry, not just "perceptions". The facts are more important than perceptions when regulatory decisions are made. Innovative topic but weak premise and inadequate background.

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	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.5
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.5

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

See comments.

Insufficiently critical of studies performed. Too willing to accept published (anywhere by anyone) as credible. Again, despite novel topic, the critical analysis I felt was weak.

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

See comments.

see above

Question Answer Session									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Question Answer Session Comments

See comments.

good

Overall Knowledge Base									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

See comments.

good on his feet, but had problematic material to explain/rationalize/defend.

Overall Comments

Very interesting subject. Clearly presented. More discussion of chemistry in the context of drug abuse is needed. Introduction of topic with examples from real people was very effective to draw attention. Good discussion and outlining of the topics; a little animation would have been more helpful to make text less monotonic. Nice historical overview of the subject. Good review of controlled substances act. Nice background discussion of factors considered in scheduling. The studies and conclusions seem convincing. Made a good case for need for further education.

Chemistry is important and cannot be dismissed; it's the focus of pharmacy. Journal credibility is important. Critical thinking skills are important. Addressing the regulatory issue was novel, innovative, but was poorly supported by data and critical evaluation of studies was too cursory.