Presenter: Grussendorf, Joel

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
6.82	6.93	6.94	6.9	6.9	7	6.89	6.25	6.5	6.4	6.5	6.63	6.75	6.7	0	0	0	E (47.08)

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Presentation Style Comments

Just a bit slow at times in transitions between slides

Joel did a good job with his style. He came across as slightly anxious during the presentation. Tended to stand right at podium and read from slide notes on the computer. Although I feel he knew his material very well, he could have benefitted from practicing the presentation multiple times prior to actual delivery. Oral presentation is a difficult social event, but repeated practice does help.

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)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Instructional Materials Comments

None

Instructional materials were put together well. Did not identify typos or other grammar errors that detracted from content. Did a pretty good job orienting audience to graphics / state maps.

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	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')	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5

Overall Presentation Content Comments

Very good introduction. / Needs to work on transitions between different slide topics.

Joel provided a very informative and though provoking seminar. I think he choose a controversy that has clinical relevance, but is also highly relevant to social science and public policy. These discussion always provide lots of gray areas and lend themselves to great discussion.

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

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Strong presentation of study data, although the data was not our normal prospective placebo controlled clinical trial.

Joel handled the studies pretty well. The studies all seemed quite different in their methodologies and what their outcomes were. Accordingly, there was increased difficulty relating these back to the controversy. I think Joel could have utilized the concept of discussing how each study contributed to a particulary objective of the presentation. I think that is was Joel was trying to do. However, with audience members, such as myself, who are somewhat slow, it is best to be obvious and overt with the relationship of study info to presentation objective.

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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

Very Good.

Seems like the big impact/role for the pharmacist was to become more aware of the issue and possibly politically active on this topic. Also, possibly to advocate for these items being BTC and an opportunity for pharmacist to educate.

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Question Answer Session Comments

Answered the majority of questions very well.

Not as a fault to Joel, but the audience generally ran away with questions. I think that reflects the ethical dilemmas presented in this topic. It also shows this is an area that pharmacy could make a tremendous impact. Overall, Joel did good with the question session.

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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

Joel did a very good job on this seminar.

Joel has a good knowledge base on this topic. Some other areas identified during the q/a session include storage and temperature excursions. These would also be good to incorporate into the presentation if it is presented again.

Overall Comments

Very well constructed seminar.

Joel did a very good job with this seminar. His materials looked very good. He provided great opportunities for thoughtful discussion. Only significant opportunity to improve is practicing the presentation delivery and eye contact with the audience. However, I think Joel has potential to be a good presenter.