Presenter: Lecheminant, Jill

Seminar Date: 2013-12-04

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
6.78	6.45	6.75	6.66	6.51	6.73	6.81	6.13	6	6.2	5.7	5.88	6.75	6	0	0	0	E (46.06)

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	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Presentation Style Comments

Your pace was good, although your voice was a bit low at times. I could hear from the back, but it would have been best to use the microphone. You did end up looking at the computer screen a bit because the remote was missing.

The volume of your voice was low - I don't know if this was just the normal volume or if some of it was due to nerves. Regardless, it probably would have been better to use a microphone.

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	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
3	Provided orientation to charts/graphs/pictures/diagrams (if applicable)	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6

Instructional Materials Comments

The slides were very clear and clean and easy to read. The tables you copied from the papers were also quite easy to read, although another option is to remake the tables yourself. They usually look better and you can then highlight the key points you want to make instead of presenting all of the data including some that may not be relevant to your presentation. The citations were lacking a bit - you need to have references for every figure and table in the handout.

There were a few misspellings and a few issues with file conversions - I know that can happen sometimes even when you did your best to prepare.

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
4	Appropriate background information was provided	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Overall Presentation Content Comments

The presentation flowed well and the background material was well presented. I was a bit concerned that some of the background may have been too basic for the audience. But it put us all on the same footing. The objectives were quite subjective and difficult to quantify.

Your content was presented well and you highlighted the current recommendations.

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	0	0	2	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	0	1	0	0	0	0	5

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Because you only used two studies and because those studies were quite weak and tiny, you should have given us a general orientation to the literature on this topic before diving in. For example, I assume you chose those studies because they were the only studies that specifically looked at adverse effects of opioid use. But is it possible that the adverse effects of opioid use are so well documented that we don't really need to look at that? Showing at least one of the larger studies that led to the approval of Ofirmev would have been useful to show efficacy.

The small size of the studies make this a challenging topic. It was not very clear what the power of the studies was and so the interpretation may overstate the significance of the results.

Conclusions

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

Conclusions Comments

In your conclusions and recommendations to the pharmacist it might have been nice to extrapolate beyond these two studies and give some recommendation that is more applicable to general pharmacy practice. I'd imagine that few of our students will be in a position to recommend IV APAP for postsurgical use. But there are big changes afoot for opioid/APAP oral formulations in the near future. I know that would be stretching a bit, but it would have been a more broadly applicable take home message for the students.

The conclusions of the studies seem in line with the recommendations but do tend to show that acetaminophen use decreases opioid use and decreases other adverse effects.

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

You did a great job of encouraging and answering questions. The one that could have used a more in-depth answer was the question about whether demerol (meperidine) is routinely used as post-surgical anesthesia as per your study.

You did a good job answering questions from the audience.

Overall Knowledge Base

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	5
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	1	0	1	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

Overall, great job with the questions.

You brought up other concerns - like respiratory depression - but the size of the studies were too small to address the broad range of potential adverse effects that could happen. The size of the studies does call into question the statistical v. clinical significance of the results.

Overall Comments

Nice job and thanks for the flexibility in presenting outside your section! Congratulations on a job well done and on getting seminar behind you!

You did a good job of addressing your question - unfortunately the size of the studies made this challenging. You did reference a larger, older study - it might have been worthwhile to include it in your presentation.