

Presenter: Hatch, Jilbear

Seminar Date: 2014-03-06

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
6.83	6.88	6.85	6.93	6.87	6.97	6.97	6.5	6.75	6.8	6.4	6.5	6.25	6.5	0	0	0	E (46.86)

Presentation Style									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
2	Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	6.58
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.84
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95

Presentation Style Comments

It seemed like you needed to read off the slides for a lot of the material that you presented.

Nice use of hand gestures.

Your presentation speed was great. It was easy to follow your what you said as you moved from point to point.

Presented the material at a great pace and at a level appropriate for the audience. He could have looked at the audience more, but he was very professional.

Often looked at the slides for prolonged times. Not too bad however

Very excellent eye contact

Looked at the floor a bit, but had a great pace for the presentation

Very confident speaker with very minimal reliance on notes. I really liked the way you moved around the room when speaking

Great pace! Jilbear appeared very confident and knowledgeable

Overall I though your pace was good. There was quite a bit slide reading, and when you did look at the audience you generally looked at the floor. Just make sure to improve on eye contact, otherwise, it was great that you moved beyond the podium.

Your pace and presentation style was comfortable to listen to. You were very professional and confident and only a few mannerisms that we all have and were not distracting. / The level of the background and studies was easy to follow and appropriate. /

Overall presentation style was relaxed and confident. Got tripped up on a few minor items, but it just takes practice.

He had his hand in his pocket the whole time. I don't know if that is unprofessional or not, but I noticed it.

Had a very difficult task of bringing everyone present up to speed on CE trial design/stats; did this very well considering time constraints.

You did a good job at not standing right behind or right next to the podium the entire time. That shows a lot of confidence and preparation.

I really liked your movement through the presentation, good pace and conversational style!

Great pace and really good about being out from behind the podium. Some reliance on notes and eye contact could have been a bit better. Also, at first I could tell he was nervous because he sometimes stumbled over words, but he got out what he was trying to say. As he went along, his speech was stronger and less nervous.

Able to synthesize background information to make it relevant to what was being presented. Eye contact could have been better with the audience (tended to look at the ground instead of at the audience).

Tended to read the slides a bit which shifted your body towards the screen instead of the audience. Try to know your slides better as a means to improve it.

Instructional Materials

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.89
2	Slides and handout are devoid of spelling and grammatical errors	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.68
3	Provided orientation to charts/graphs/pictures/diagrams (if applicable)	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Instructional Materials Comments

I noticed there were a few slides that had grammatical/spelling errors.

Handout was through and helpful.

I thought the slides were great. The light text on blue was easy on the eyes.

Did a great job explaining graphs and charts. His handout and slides were well organized. His references were appropriate.

I really liked the layout of the handout. It was easy to follow

Handout was very easy to read

A few grammatical errors but did a great job orienting us to the graphs

The handout was very clear and easy to read. I really enjoyed how informative the appendix was

Slides were easy to read and not crowded.

There were several typos on your slides. That being said, I thought your slides and handout were easy to read and well designed.

Slides were very good and easy to follow along with your presentation. The hand out was good but sometimes easy to get lost in while trying to follow along with what you were saying. / Everything was cited appropriately. /

Some slides were a bit heavy on the text and the font could be a bit bigger

I could have used more explanation on the tornado diagrams.

Very nice job explaining unfamiliar graphs, e.g. "Tornadoes"

I thought your diagram of the mechanisms of various anticoagulants was really helpful, and you did a good job at orienting us to the diagrams you presented.

You referenced

Slides were very clear and not cluttered- they were mellow and nice. Great orientation to graphs and also great referring us to the handout. Citations were done as numbers and then listed at the end, which is fine, but I've heard from many professors that they prefer to have an abbreviated citation at the bottom of each slide, if possible.

Slides were easy to read and follow. A few typos. Appreciated your explanation of QALYs and the diagram associated was extremely helpful.

I wouldn't put the title of the article at the top of the slide (use Author et al) and include references at the bottom rather than number superscripts

Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
2	Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.84
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.89
4	Appropriate background information was provided	14	4	1	0	0	0	0	6.68
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.89

Overall Presentation Content Comments

I liked the quality of the studies that were presented. As mentioned in class I also needed more background information on the measurements used in the study. I struggled with understanding what an ICER was.

Topic was appropriate for our current practice of medicine.

I thought you did a good job with the background, especially given that most of the audience really doesn't know very much about cost-effectiveness analyses.

Explained his interest in the topic well. Did a great job setting up the controversy/importance of looking at this topic. Clinical background information was well explained. Great flow of the presentation.

It was difficult to need to give background on the study design and the topic background. You did a good job however

Background information was really good for our education level

I thought the flow was very logical and the background provided was excellent

I thought it was very helpful to give a review of cost effective analyses

I liked that the controversy was revisited in the end of the presentation. Thw whole presentation was well organised

I thought that there were some key points missing from the background section: more detail about A fib, such as what causes it. Also, a little more with some of the unique statistics that we see in pharmacoeconomic studies. However, I understand that you were crunched for time with the material.

Your interest in the topic was clear. The intro and explanation of the studies was very good. Cost analysis is a difficult study design to understand but you hit the points that we needed to know in order to move-on and talk about the data. The controversy was clearly defined and everything fit together wee and had good flow.

Controversy was not introduced early enough

The controversy and interest weren't too clear.

I would consider less pathophysiology background and focus more on CE stats background.

I think you could have put more emphasis on your objectives, maybe by mentioning them as you talked about things that pertained to them or bringing them up again at the end of the seminar.

The context was awesome! Very timely topic! Thank you!

Very very good intro- very thorough background on afib, why this topic is important, and also about cost effectiveness studies. It would have been nice to have a bit more info on the ICER and what it means to us, but overall the intro was good. Controversy well defined, objectives were clear, and flow was pretty good.

Appreciated interest in topic. Background information provided was succinct and clear. Could have summarized randomized control trials a little bit better to be able to emphasize their relevance to the seminar and controversy at hand.

As we mentioned in class, maybe less background on AFIB and more on the stats and eval methods

Presentation of Clinical Data

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Presented concise objectives, methodology and treatment for each study	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.89
2	Outcome measures were stated and described, and appropriateness was explained	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.89
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.89

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Thought you did a good job on mentioning the strengths and weaknesses.

Presentation flowed nicely with your incorporation of data.

You were able to take foreign statistical terms and explain them in a way that the audience could understand.

Did a great job explaining the applicability of the studies and talking about the strengths and weaknesses. Did a good job explaining the objectives and methodology of the studies. Could have used a bit more explanation about these sorts of studies though.

Again, good job with such a difficult undertaking. For your next study there would be no shame sticking to the traditional template

I thought you did a great job really deciphering study details

I though Jilbear did a great job of discussing the strengths and limitations

Great job explaining the data. I felt like the. Strengths and weaknesses were somewhat contradictory due to the fact that the durations as both a strength and weaknesses, it would have been helpful if that was clarified a little.

Seminarian provided a very thorough analysis of the studies and was able to explain were the data was coming from. Good job!

I thought your analyses were pretty strong for the studies. There were some undefined terms that were used, and you didn't really cover what "inputs" the authors used. Those are very important in determining the plausibility and validity of the models. Great job on your limitations sections!

Your explanation of the study methodology was very good. Cost-effect analysis are very difficult to

understand. You didn't hit everything but for the majority of the audience you gave us enough info to understand the data that you wanted to discuss. / Great Job.

It is very difficult to analyze cost-effectiveness studies and to be able to present them to an audience who doesn't have that much knowledge of them, but you did a great job at boiling it down to the nitty gritty

His presentation of the studies was excellent.

Excellent ability to describe the stats, well-researched

I was really impressed that you did modelling studies. They aren't what we normally think about when analyzing studies, but they are still important.

Thank you for review of these types of studies! Holy cow I had forgotten so much of that!

Studies were well evaluated and thoroughly analysed. He was great about distilling down the important information for us.

Great job discussing cost-effectiveness studies and pointing out the relevant information.

Not sure we "gained an understanding of cost-effectiveness studies" because we didn't dive into that so maybe change it as an objective. Not sure where the third non-warfarin trial came from--a little disconnect there.

Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	6.79
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	6.79
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95

Conclusions Comments

I would have like to see more differentiation between the clinical and statistical application.

Presented guidelines very well, perhaps include more specific pharmacy recommendations based on research.

Your conclusions were accurately based on the studies you presented. Great job.

Explained the role of pharmacists appropriately. Discussed the applications if the studies really well, though I would've like to have seen more concrete recommendations.

Due to all the information presented/required for your seminar I don't know if I could give meaningful feedback on data analysis. But your discussion on pharmacist role was well done

I would have liked a more defined pharmacist role

Only comment would be to tell us a little bit more what this means to us pharmacists besides general counseling points

Great job explaining the role of the pharmacist. I really appreciated the fact that you put the patient preference on when to start the medication and which medication to start

Great pharmacist recommendations

While your conclusions were supported by the data, I would have liked to see some more specifics in the recommendations for practice. These would include which drug you would recommend, are there certain patients in which you would choose one over another? Even though the studies are somewhat inconclusive, we could probably say that patients with uncontrollable INRs are good candidates for apixaban whereas those who are older than 80 are probably not.

Your conclusion was not as strong as I would have liked it but the limited data may justify this. / The role of the pharmacist with counseling was clearly outlined and discussed. What the pharmacies should recommend and why was not as clear. /

Don't forget to counsel patients on signs and symptoms of stroke, DVT, etc...

Counseling on stroke signs, symptoms, and treatment is important too, as part of what we as pharmacists do.

Would have been interested to see the seminarian's clinical recommendation, i.e. "I would recommend apixaban for stroke prevention in this type of patient..."

I thought your including the importance of treatment duration was a good conclusion that will be important to consider in my career.

Ok, I seriously agreed with everything you said but 3 years of brain washing tO / Not use NOAC's in the elderly is hard to overcome!

Conclusions were supported by the data, but they were more guidelines than specific recommendations. More specificity would be better, but through the Q&A we were able to get more specific recommendations.

Great conclusions. Would have helped to have a case to help us see how to apply the conclusions made.

Try to make more concrete recommendations eg, This drug would become cost effective with an anticipated use of XX years

Question Answer Session

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95

Question Answer Session Comments

Did great answering questions

You answered all the questions very professionally.

You handled the Q&A session very well. You seemed well prepared.

Answered questions excellently! Took the opportunity to really enlighten us even more about the topic. Could tell he knew a lot on the topic.

Well fielded. A little more eye contact with audience.

Great job with the questions

I thought the audience asked a lot of tough questions but you did a great job in answering all of them and were clear when you were speculating

Great job answering questions. You were very confident and I could tell that you had done your research

Jilbear was very thorough in his answers and appeared knowledgeable. Nice work!

You handled the many questions very well!

You were asked a lot of questions and handled them all very well. It was clear you knew the studies and the topic very well.

I thought you were able to answer the questions well.

He made sure to understand the questions asked him, and gave great answers.

Fielded the many questions in a very professional manner

I thought you did a really good job at explaining how iterations work in modeling studies, and that made it a lot more clear.

Thank you for being so patient with my questions!!

Encouraged questions and did a great job answering the many questions in Q&A.

Excellent job fielding questions and answering them.

Handled difficult questions well

Overall Knowledge Base

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.89
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	19	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	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

Good job answering the question about how it may fit in the affordable care act.

Knowledge of material evident throughout presentation.

Again, based on how you handled the Q&A session, you seemed very well prepared.

Offered additional insight about the studies beyond what the authors said. Definitely was able to think on his feet and use his knowledge base to come to a conclusion. Compared the conditions of the studies to today's conditions.

It was obvious you put in a good amount of time into this. You had a strong grasp of the material and could give recommendations. /

You did a great job thinking on your feet with the Q & A

I thought you did a great job answering the question regarding the Affordable Care Act

Great knowledge base of the studies, topic, and study design.

Jilbear was very well prepared and had no issues expressing his opinions on the topic

You seem to have done your research, which was evident in how you handled the questions asked of you.

Your knowledge of the subject was clear from your presentation and how you evaluated and answered the questions.

You were able to think on your feet and I could tell you looked at other studies

I was impressed that he promised to look up answers.

It was evident he was well-prepared

I thought that you were very well prepared. This was shown in how you answered questioned even when they were about anticoagulants you didn't specifically talk about.

Great knowledge base, great topic-awesome seminar!

Very clear that he has a solid knowledge base on the subject. He was able to think on his feet very well and answer a slew of intense questions.

Could definitely tell that you put in a lot of work and that you have a lot of knowledge regarding the subject matter. Would have appreciate more insight between clinical versus statistical significance and applicability to which patient populations (defining which patient population your conclusions apply to).

You knew a lot about the clinical aspects and also the cost-effective portions.

Provide one comment on what you liked about this seminar

I enjoyed seeing a seminar analyze the cost effectiveness of something. Not an easy topic to present and I thought overall you did a great job,.

Pace was right on.

I thought the slides were very easy to follow, which made the complicated topic easier to understand.

He did a great job explaining the clinical background on the topic, as well as explaining the studies and their appropriateness. Answered questions really well.

No additional comments not mentioned earlier

I thought you did an excellent job overall. I loved your topic, and thought you presented it at the appropriate level.

I liked how concise Jilbear was. It would have been easy to over explain in the background, but I think he had the perfect level of background material for the audience.

Great job explaining the trials. Cost effective analyses are very complicated and you did a great job explaining them and providing the background. Needed

The overall seminar organization! Seminar was well prepared

It's nice to see a different seminar format that focuses on the pharmacoeconomic side of drug therapy.

Your explanation of cost-effective analysis was done very well. You have limited time and the methodology of a cost-effective analysis is not the focus of your seminar but it needed to be covered and you did a great job.

Great way to start the semester of seminars! I thought your presentation was calm and really confident. Good work!

He provided an ample and well rounded background.

I liked your boldness in taking the CE approach

I liked how you told us when there was something in the appendices. You did it just as I was hoping to hear something like that.

Great topic, timely topic!

THorough background and good analyses of studies we typically don't look at.

Appreciated the seminarian's ability to define certain terms used in the presentation (cost-effectiveness studies).

You knew your studies and I liked that you ventured into a less-traditional arena for the seminar

Provide one comment on what could be improved about this seminar

As mentioned earlier I would have liked to see some more differentiation between statistical and clinical application. If the average age of the people in one of the studies was 70 years, and they had to be treated for 10 years for it to be cost effective, were we expecting this population to even live that long?

Provide more specific recommendations.

Consider more development of the background for cost-effectiveness analyses in the future.

He could make more eye contact with the audience, explained the statistical background a bit more, and draw more concrete conclusions.

No additional comments not mentioned earlier

The conclusion could have been a little more specific as to what pharmacists should actually do

The presenter didn't seem very comfortable the whole time. I think if he practiced a few more times he would have gotten there.

Clarify the strengths and weaknesses where you had the length of the study outcomes as both a strength and weakness, although when prompted in the question and answer section you did a good job explaining your reasoning

More information in the background section

More definitions of terms and a focus on the inputs of the models would be good.

A more solid conclusion supported by our presentation should have been included.

A little more practice on specific wording would be helpful.

I needed more reorientation about the statistics.

Better description/background of CE design and CE stats

I would have liked a better explanation of why some things are strengths and weaknesses, particularly things related to the modeling study, which i'm much less familiar with.

Hmmm maybe tell us WHY we care about ICERs and what I can do with this info.

Work on less reliance on notes/slides and better eye contact.

Would have liked to be able to come away with knowing which patient populations your conclusions support.

Really work on the crispness of your seminar and presentation style.

General Comments

I felt you were well prepared, great job.

You did a great job! Well done!

He did a wonderful seminar overall and I enjoyed learning about the topic and it was interesting to look at cost effectiveness.

Overall, great job. I enjoyed the topic and came away with new knowledge regarding the pricing on these novel anticoagulants.

Awesome job!

Good job on your first seminar!

No additional comments.

I've said everything I can think of.

Well done, sir.

I was just wondering if cost-benefit analyses always used models? That seems likely, but may be been helping in showing why you chose 2 modeling studies.

Great job-thank you!

Great job! It's clear you know your topic and you tackled a type of study that is difficult. You were great as the first of the first seminars for the semester! With a little work on your nerves, you can be even better next year.

Excellent job overall. Could tell that you put in a lot of work and that you knew a lot about the subject matter. You were able to take questions well and theorize an answer if you didn't know for sure.