

# Presenter: Fischer, Diana

Seminar Date: 2014-03-05

## 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	6.95	6.99	6.99	6.93	6.97	6.96	6.63	6.75	6.5	7	6.5	7	7	0	0	0	E (47.71)

Presentation Style									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

## Presentation Style Comments

Your pace was very good, level of material just right. / Some reliance on notes; please practice your pronunciation of "pharmacologic" or "pharmacological" as it comes up about 50 times in your presentation. You said several times "pharma-logic" just get the "co" in there :) "pharma-co-logic" This sounds very trivial, but it undermines your scientific expertise, which I know you have!

Great style. Pace was perfect.

## Instructional Materials

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

## Instructional Materials Comments

A very comprehensive handout. Nice appendix material, and referral to it during your talk. Your slides were clean, simple, with large fonts (nicely done). There were a lot of interesting graphics that you could have used the pointer a little bit more with. There were a few typos in the references (capitalization problems that are likely coming from endnote-- be careful; you need to check these always). Slide 17 graphic was blurry when blown up on screen.

Slides were well organized, easy to read, and attractive. I did not look at the handout. My preference for referencing is not to include references at the end. I very rarely see this approach used at national meetings. You did put enough data for the most part for your references for people to see the big things: the journal, year published. However, it is perfectly acceptable to use the commonly accepted journal abbreviation name. If you had done that, you would have had plenty of room to include the volume and page numbers so that you wouldn't have to send people to the end of the presentation for a full reference. Most likely you used that method to avoid having to provide full references for the pictures you used. However, I really do prefer having the full reference on the slide where the pic is used.

## 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	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

## Overall Presentation Content Comments

Content was excellent, background, relevance great. Liked your baby photos!

Your interest in the topic was compelling. Objectives were okay, but the real skill you were trying to give your audience is that of making (and supporting) a recommendation for or against PPIs in infants. Background information was good. However, I notably did not hear you talk about the guidelines that you discussed when you met for topic approval.

## 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)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

A lot of material covered, but well done.

Presentation of clinical data was good. Discussion was very clear and easy to follow. The missing piece here was providing information about why you chose these particular studies to present.

Conclusions									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5.5
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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

### Conclusions Comments

Thanks for the specific recs for Rx practice.

Conclusions seemed appropriate. However, for conclusions not specifically addressed in the data you presented, you need to provide your audience a rationale. Also, even when conclusions do come directly from the data you have just presented, it is good policy to summarize again the data that supports the conclusion.

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

Very thorough answering of questions.

Seemed more nervous with question and answer portion as evidence by not providing very much time for people to respond during Q&A sessions throughout presentation. Questions that were asked were answered clearly.

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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

You seemed to know a lot about the topic. Good depth!

Great knowledge base.

## Overall Comments

Excellent presentation! Small minor changes suggested only. Great job.

Very nice first seminar!

## Overall Comments

40.7855072

40.7855072

## Overall Comments

-111.736702

-111.736702