Presenter: Newbold, Jonathan

Seminar Date: 2013-11-13

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
7	6.93	6.97	6.94	6.77	6.97	6.94	5.88	6.25	5	4.67	4.13	7	5.6	0	0	0	E (45.36)

Presentation Style								
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
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	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5

Presentation Style Comments

The presentation style was appropriate. Be careful with lack of formality (calling preceptors by their first names, saying "all that") and a closed posture during future presentations.

Pace was good overall, but seemed a bit fast when going through the data. I recommend slowing down a bit when presenting data since data takes longer to process. I really liked that you did not revisit some things that were presented about addiction in a prior seminar. See other sections for comments relating to presenting at an appropriate level for the audience. I think with just a few tweaks, you could have spent more time on your data and the interpretation of that data.

Instructional Materials

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.5
2	Slides and handout are devoid of spelling and grammatical errors	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Instructional Materials Comments

Instructional materials were appropriate.

The slides were clear. However, the references on slides were extremely tiny and difficult to read when projected. I recommend increasing the font size on the references for future presentations. References are important. They lend credibility to the things you're telling people. Orientation to graphs and diagrams was fairly complete. Again, would have spent more time lingering on slides with graphics to allow the audience to process the information.

Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
2	Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4.5
4	Appropriate background information was provided	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3

Overall Presentation Content Comments

The flow of the presentation was quite difficult to follow. Whether the conclusion is stated at the beginning or at the end, the audience should still be able to follow the controversy through the presentation. This was quite difficult to do throughout. A better "story" or more direct line should be used in future presentations.

Introduction was a bit long at 13 minutes. Could have pared down some of the background information. Also would have provided some information about the scales your studies used as their endpoints. That seemed more important for understanding the study data than some of your other background information. Some difficulties with flow. For instance, you addressed why you chose your studies near the end of your presentation when that should have been mentioned up front. Also, as mentioned in class, it is a good practice to build your argument for or against the use of the treatment in question during the presentation. It makes the conclusion much more convincing--and less surprising.

Presentation of Clinical Data

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Presented concise objectives, methodology and treatment for each study	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
2	Outcome measures were stated and described, and appropriateness was explained	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.5
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	4
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4.5

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

This section of the presentation was "okay." Some statistical flaws in the first trial were not stated and power was not presented correctly. Also, a lot of limitations were mentioned with each trial while presenting which often made it difficult for the audience to determine why the study was be utilized in the presentation to prove a point.

I think it's always important to include some information about the participants who end up in a study. Inclusion/exclusion criteria tell you some things, but generally a very select--and non-representative--patient population is what ends up in a study. In addition, at no time did I hear you mention the issue of the external validity of your studies. They were foreign studies, which automatically brings up the question as to whether the participants enrolled would resemble patients in the US. Again, seeing the baseline demographics of the patients might have helped reassure us as to the ability to apply the results of your studies to patients in the US. Some lack of specificity as to whether power was an issue for efficacy or safety (first study).

Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3.5
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6

Conclusions Comments

The was the area of the presentation that needed the most improvement for me. A recommendation for practice was not stated until deep into the Q&A session. This needs to be much clearer much early in the presentation. A practitioner should leave your presentation knowing exactly what to do in practice for a specific population.

The conclusion was a little difficult to process and understand. In part, I think that was because you weren't making firm conclusions about the studies all along the way. For instance, saying the results are promising is different than saying straight up that a study is insufficient to support use of tramadol because.... In addition, when making your final conclusion, it's a good time to summarize your interpretation of the results. "Based on this...., I recommend this...."

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

Appropriate during the Q&A session.

Questions were answered.

Overall Knowledge Base

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4.5
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

The Q&A session allowed for a better demonstration of the speaker's knowledge base. The order/flow of the presentation did not allow for the speaker to fully demonstrate his knowledge base.

Only discussed the fact that clonidine has more data when prompted to by audience question. This could have/should have been something that was mentioned as part of the presentation to provide context. Mentor provided some additional information after presentation.

Overall Comments

Overall, the presentation was "okay" for me. While I feel that the speaker is knowledgeable of the content area, the lack of a firm recommendation for practice and poor flow made it difficult for the audience to fully grasp. In future presentations, I recommend better establishing the controversy and working to relate each study/trial back to the overarching controversy. At the conclusion of each trial, state how that particular trial helps you form your conclusion.

Nice presentation style. Biggest recommendation for the future is to clearly articulate your rationale for your recommendation. The rationale should include specifics from the studies you've reviewed.