

Presenter: Turpin, Scott

Seminar Date: 2014-04-10

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
6.68	6.09	6.73	6.83	6.38	6.68	6.61	6.42	5.58	5.8	6.12	5.42	6.67	6	0	0	0	E (45.93)

Presentation Style									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	14	2	1	0	0	0	0	6.76
2	Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	14	2	0	1	0	0	0	6.71
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	13	2	1	0	0	1	0	6.47
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	14	2	1	0	0	0	0	6.76

Presentation Style Comments

pace was good /

Good pace.

Pace was excellent. Good flow overall

He kept a good pace, displayed professionalism, and presented the material at an appropriate level. He could have relied less on the slides.

A little slow, otherwise fine.

I felt as though the speaker was surprised at what was coming next on his slide. When he got there he often paused and didn't go over everything that was on the slide. Why put bulleted materials on the slide if you aren't going to discuss it?

Very confident presenter

Good eye contact

Your overall pace was good, however you did rely on your slides a little too much while presenting.

He didn't read off the slides too much.

Style was very relaxed and casual and easy to listen to.

Good pace, but more practice sessions would've helped flow

He stuttered a bit, and said "um" too much. He lacked confidence.

Good pace and flow of the presentation

Good pace.

Good pace, good eye contact

Good pace. It was difficult to follow what your controversy was...maybe adding more background so that the audience could better understand where you are coming from. Same idea with the different ranges for the scales used in the studies.

Instructional Materials

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	9	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	6
2	Slides and handout are devoid of spelling and grammatical errors	5	8	2	0	0	1	1	0	5.65
3	Provided orientation to charts/graphs/pictures/diagrams (if applicable)	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	6.5
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	11	4	0	1	0	0	1	0	6.24

Instructional Materials Comments

Handout could have been formatted better. Seemed to be some spelling errors in it.

Slides were well put together.

There were some discrepancies between the slides and the handout. There were also some spelling errors.

He cited appropriate references and oriented the audience to graphs. The slides and handout were clear, though there were some errors.

I would have talked more about the seizure threshold activity of the gaba/glutamate system to take the point of cross sensitivity home

I thought this was the weakest area of the seminar. Everything appeared as though it was a rough draft. There were several misspellings throughout the handout and slides. The spelling was so bad that the title of the second study had misspelled words. This is a point on professionalism: if you aren't going to put in the time to put up a good product how can you expect students and faculty to take the seminar seriously?

A few misspelled words in the handout and some of the slides did not have the full sentence on it

Font could have been a little bit bigger, otherwise good slides

Some slides were different font sizes, it would be good to make them more uniform. Also, the study section in the handout was difficult to glance through. Overall, I did see improvement in your materials compared to the first seminar. Good job!

Had several spelling errors on slides

There were multiple spelling errors and a lot of missing information from both your slides and handouts. Clear that a final proof read was not done

There were sections where it seemed like text was missing

His handout had some errors and poor grammar.

only a few minor spelling/formatting issues were noticed

Grammar was a bit off in your handout. Maybe get someone to read through it or read it out loud to your self to see if sounds right.

Slides and handout were improved from before, but still not perfect. The font size changed on slides and the citations were not standard. There were also misspellings and his conclusion slide had a sentence that was half complete.

Tables for the studies were laid out nicely. The different types of font in the handout made it a little bit harder to follow. There were also a few typos.

Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	11	4	2	0	0	0	0	6.53
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.82
4	Appropriate background information was provided	14	2	0	1	0	0	0	6.71
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	12	4	0	1	0	0	0	6.59

Overall Presentation Content Comments

interest in topic clearly stated

You tend to pace a bit, but its not overly distracting.

Good controversy and background information.

He explained his interest in the topic well, the objectives were useful, and appropriate information was presented for the background section. He defined the controversy clearly.

Again, I would have talked more about seizure activity since it's the primary outcome we want to avoid.

Flow was really good. Room for improvement would be in transitioning between the background and the studies.

Great interest in the topic and explanation of background information describing the importance of the subject

Very interesting topic

Flow was lacking at times, specifically because there wasn't a great controversy and lead-in prior to the studies. However, the background information you presented was good and inclusive.

transitions could have been done better

Controversy was clear and well defined

Interest in topic and controversy were laid out clearly

The objectives were somewhat vague.

good background pharmacology to help us understand the MOA in alcohol withdrawal

I liked the topic and felt that it was a good conversation to have.

Interest in topic was great and the background was good. Controversy was not explicitly laid out but was verbally discussed. Flow was thrown off for me because of the lack of controversy slide. There

seemed to be a big jump between intro and studies

Good introduction. Objectives were clear. Difficult to see what your controversy was within a slide dedicated to the stating what the controversy is. It was touched on a little in your introduction and interest. More background information on the difficult types of scales used and their ranges would have been helpful. Felt like a jump from introduction to studies.

Presentation of Clinical Data

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Presented concise objectives, methodology and treatment for each study	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.88
2	Outcome measures were stated and described, and appropriateness was explained	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.82
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.82
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.88
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.88
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	13	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.71

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Described outcome measures well.

Presented the trials effectively. Seems you could have spent a bit more time understanding the trial graphs.

I thought you presented the data well and went into appropriate detail in the studies.

Explained the studies well, especially the statistical analyses. Outcomes and power were explained, and he provided a thoughtful analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the studies.

One of the gabapentin groups showed significance when compared to the benzo, but the other slightly lower dose was considerably lower in efficacy. I think this anomaly warranted some discussion.

The speaker covered all of these topics within the study. I think a more clear discussion of the limitation could have been made. I had the same question as Dr. Orderda about the P values in the secondary outcomes. Mentioning that the power wasn't there most likely for these outcomes is important to mention.

Great analysis of strengths and weaknesses

Very thorough analysis of the studies

You did a good job breaking down the studies. The only thing I disagree with is labeling it a strength that the study exists. I think it's fine if you only have one strength if that is all they have.

He explained the outcomes well for outcomes.

Data from studies was presented well although not complete. Some valuable information was missing. / Your analysis of the statistics used was superb.

You explained the study methods and were able to explain the key results

He presented the data very well, and his analysis was also great.

very thoughtful analysis of strengths and weaknesses

I still don't feel comfortable analyzing studies so I thought you did well. I hope we get better at this!

Studies were well explained and the statistical analyses were clearly defined, which was good.

Thoughtful discussion of the statistics. Made an true effort to really analyze the studies and assess strengths and limitations.

Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	10	4	0	2	0	0	1	6.06
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	12	2	2	1	0	0	0	6.47
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	11	3	2	1	0	0	0	6.41
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	13	2	1	1	0	0	0	6.59

Conclusions Comments

Please only draw conclusions from material you present. Some of the conclusions seemed confusing as well.

Good summing up the conclusions.

Conclusions were not totally clear in the presentation, but you cleared it up during questions.

He discussed the clinical significance and gave specific conclusions based on available data. He discussed the role of pharmacists well.

I think that "if the physician asks for another option for AWS" is too limited a scope for recommending the treatment for AWS based upon the results. In mild where AWS where the patient has no history of seizures it seems a reasonable recommendation based upon the findings.

A conclusion was made based on another study not discussed in the lecture. This was very confusing to the audience.

Great conclusions. Would not have based some of your final conclusions on studies not presented, but overall conclusions were well supported

Good pharmacist recommendations

Your conclusions were specific, which was nice. Though it would have been good to present that other study you mentioned to support your recommendation of which CIWA scores to treat with gabapentin.

Did a good job explaining the role of pharmacist.

Presentation of your conclusion was confusing. I think this was due to the inconsistencies in the handout. /

The conclusions were a bit unclear and stated awkwardly

His assertion that having no placebo control in a head to head study showed that he may not understand when they should be included in studies. He also was vague in his recommendations for practice.

I very much enjoyed the specific clinical practice recommendation; you provided an algorithm that explained when you would and would not use gabapentin for etoh withdrawal that was great

You presented your conclusions in an interesting manner. I think you are correct to say you cannot recommend nor can you NOT recommend gabapentin. But in the real world I would guess that you would not be let off the hook so easily. A decision will be made.

Conclusions were supported by data. Recommendations could have been a bit more clear.

Conclusions were appropriate, but it was difficult to see how you came to the conclusions at first (prior to the question and answer session). Appreciated your breakdown of the pharmacist's role into inpatient, community, and all.

Question Answer Session									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	12	3	2	0	0	0	0	6.59
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	14	2	1	0	0	0	0	6.76

Question Answer Session Comments

Handled questions fine.

Good job answering the questions.

Great job clearing up some of the confusing points.

Did a great job fielding questions and encouraged them.

Asked few, if any questions of the audience

The speaker was able to answer questions about the studies and did not shy away from them.

Great job answering questions asked

Great Q&A

You did fine with the questions.

Good job to encourage questions and answered good.

Clarified a lot during the Q&A section

Question and answer session could have gone smoother with additional research

His answers were good overall, but a few times he seemed very unconfident.

questions were well-fielded and answers were succinct with appropriate explanations

Good answer session.

Did have some tough questions, which he dealt with pretty well.

Great job with the question and answer session. Kept poised.

Overall Knowledge Base									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	13	3	1	0	0	0	0	6.71
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	12	4	0	0	1	0	0	6.53
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	10	6	1	0	0	0	0	6.53
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	13	3	1	0	0	0	0	6.71
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	12	3	2	0	0	0	0	6.59

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

You had a knowledge of the facts beyond what was presented.

Showed an overall knowledge of your trials.

You answered questions well and showed you knew the studies well.

He was obviously very knowledgeable about the subject. He was able to look beyond the authors conclusions and was able to think on his feet.

Again, several anomalies were present in the data, but you didn't address them. I feel the treatment is valid enough to warrant expounding on these various anomalies.

I think the speaker did have knowledge beyond the facts; however, it was not always clearly discussed and succinct in nature. This may be a confidence issue.

I could tell you knew the subject well and had done a lot of research on the topic

You seemed very knowledgeable in the subject, great seminar

Good overall knowledge. However, I would encourage you to develop more original conclusions than what the author's come up with.

He had a good knowledge of the subject, was able to answer the questions presented to him.

Demonstrated you read more than just the two trials to gather information. This information shaped your overall presentation and conclusions and needs to be included in your references.

The lack of references indicates more research could have been done

He knew a good amount about the topic, but once again lacked confidence.

Nice job discussing the clinical vs statistical significance of the weaker trial especially

Good knowledge base of outpatient withdrawal. I think it would be useful to know how many people pursue outpatient withdrawal as opposed to inpatient and whether your findings could be correlated to an inpatient setting. After all, they are in a more controlled environment.

He knew his info and sited other studies. He thought pretty well on his feet.

Overall knowledge base is strong. Clinical and statistical significance was difficult to understand--needed more context of what clinical significance means relative to the scales used.

Provide one comment on what you liked about this seminar

Good topic. Hadn't heard of using gabapentin before.

Liked how you explained your trials.

Pace was great and the whole seminar flowed well.

This topic was very interesting, I enjoyed his background, and his pace and tone for the presentation was very relaxed.

Very relevant topic as alcohol withdrawal is a common problem. I think this was a very appropriate choice of topic

I thought the flow was the best part. If this is the best part though, is the seminar a success?

I liked your descriptions of the studies. You emphasized the strengths and weaknesses really well and how the data can be applied clinically

Very interesting topic

It's a great topic that shows promise in a good therapy.

That he did a good job explaining the role of the pharmacist in practice

Good calm and comfortable presentation style.

Interesting topic and opens up discussions about other agents for this indication

His pace allowed me to follow along easily and he clarified when we got confused.

Beautiful clinical practice recommendation

Very appropriate and timely topic.

I like the intro case patient that his interest stemmed from and how he returned to it afterwards to analyze it after the studies were discussed.

Good flow and audience interaction.

Provide one comment on what could be improved about this seminar

As mentioned earlier, please draw conclusion only from what you present, or at least tell us you are using other research you did to aid you in conclusions.

Review your graphs beforehand more in detail.

More careful preparation may be helpful in resolving discrepancies and/or grammar problems between the slides and handout.

His slides were plain and the text size could have been increased to compensate for that.

Have more confidence/enthusiasm or whatever it was that seemed to lower your energy for the presentation.

Overall I think the seminar needed to be edited about 3 more times in terms of both the handout and presentation. It all felt incomplete and put together at the last minute.

Do not base your conclusion on studies not discussed or if you do, include the studies that talked about the CIWA >15 study

Nothing comes to mind

Polish up your materials a little more.

Review slides before seminar to ensure any spelling errors are caught

Proof read your slides and handout prior to presenting. Include all references that were used.

Practice and refine the presentation prior to presenting it to a large audience

We as an audience became confused more than we needed to, because he was unclear at times.

fix the typos

More recommendations.

Lack of spelling checks and finalizing slides and handout. These we're better than before but still could see some sloppiness.

Set up controversy better. Handout touched a little more on the current guidelines, but was not mentioned in the presentation

General Comments

Great job overall.

Great job overall!

Great presentation on an interesting topic.

I had a hard time giving a score of higher than a B on almost all areas because I feel as if I saw the

final product at 80% complete. I felt that the speaker did not put adequate time into the project to deserve a passing grade. When there are such egregious errors such as spelling mistakes within the titles of the studies in both the handout and slides how can one feel comfortable presenting? I felt as if my time was wasted this afternoon. I have always appreciated the effort people have put forth into their seminars and applaud them for their effort. Because I felt the effort was not there, I can't say that this was a successful seminar.

Great job!

Good job!

Good job!

Did a good job on the presentation.

none

N/A

Way to do 2 seminars in just a f weeks! I hope you don't have to do any more.

well-done overall

Great seminar

Good work

Great job overall. Huge improvement from first seminar given. Interesting topic.