

Presenter: Jeppsen, Jason

Seminar Date: 2014-04-08

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
6.97	6.93	6.99	7	6.97	6.93	7	6.5	6.63	6.8	6.92	6.63	7	6.8	0	0	0	E (47.67)

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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

Covered a lot of material so the pace was sometimes to fast to follow

Overall a good presentation - you have a relaxed and effective style. You spoke quickly, trying to cover a lot of material. You also swayed a bit at first - not too distracting, but something to watch.

Instructional Materials										
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Instructional Materials Comments

The slides had a lot of material on them but he did an excellent job of explaining the graphics

Slides and handouts were generally good, a few grammar and formatting issues. One of the results slides in the first study (results for group 1 versus group 2) was a bit difficult to follow due to formatting.

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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

The controversy was very well defined. The relevance of the topic particularly for pediatric TBI was clearly presented

Objectives were measurable and aligned with presentation. For the controversy and seminar set up, I was not clear as to whether not being able to use ketamine represents a "gap" treatment options. Would have liked to have known what patient subgroups might most benefit from being able to use ketamine for sedation vs. other options.

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Excellent job of presenting the data and also understanding the difference between clinical versus statistical significance

Good presentation of study data, and recognition of study limits due to small sample size. I was expecting a more critical discussion of the limits of using patients as their own controls. There is a risk of bias (i.e., other aspect of care that could explain the reduction/no increase in ICP) that could have been reduced with randomization.

Conclusions									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Conclusions Comments

Great job of pointing out how important it is for the clinical pharmacist to be able to make patient specific recommendations to a physician particularly for sedative use in TBI

Your conclusions were well supported by the data. The "so what" in terms of translating this to clinical practice could have been more developed. I think you were on the right track, but the key message could have been more clear.

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

Knew the subject matter well and engaged in a very active discussion period

Addressed questions very well, and gave ample opportunity for questions.

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	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

Good job of comparing and contrasting data and conclusions from early studies with data from more recent studies.

Clinical vs. statistical significance - if not statistically significant, we do not have good confidence that the data from the study likely reflect the population, or if it was measured by chance. Thus, it's not safe to say a difference is clinically significant if it is not statistically significant.

Overall Comments

Overall an excellent presentation. He provided a very thorough evaluation of data from multiple studies and the resulting conclusions. His presentation was very smooth and confident but he tried to cover too much material at too fast a pace.

Overall good and effective presentation. As Dr. Biskupiak mentioned, it is a good example of practicing medicine on lack of or under developed evidence. This makes for a good seminar topic. My main comment is that the clinical implications for using ketamine in TBI could have been more developed. (I recognize this is not necessarily easy at this point with limited data, but it is also the time pharmacists may be looking for more concrete recommendations.)