

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.67
2	Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.67
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.33
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	6

Presentation Style Comments

Pleasant presentation style. I thought it was a little slow and the material presented didn't have the depth that I think would have been ideal.

Scott had good pace and delivery. Although he often stood behind the podium, he gestured frequently and faced either the screen (while explaining things) or the audience while discussing. He sounded both confident and knowledgeable.

Well presented lecture, pace appropriate.

Instructional Materials

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5.33
2	Slides and handout are devoid of spelling and grammatical errors	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
3	Provided orientation to charts/graphs/pictures/diagrams (if applicable)	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5.33
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5.67

Instructional Materials Comments

I found the handout very difficult to use during the presentation. It didn't seem to follow the presentation very well. The format, using paragraphs made it difficult to read and pick out what I wanted to see. I would put important results in the body of the handout rather than in the Appendix. The charts and other materials in the Appendix aren't labeled or referenced so you can't tell where they come from. Figure 1 and 2 have the legend flipped. In Figure 1 Gabapentin is an open square. In figure 2 gabapentin is a black square. There should be consistency. I don't know whether this was your problem or it was a problem from the paper.

Six of Scott's introduction slides contained an interesting mix of content and clip art to underscore the content. I thought this was a good accent. This was the right amount of clipart. More than six slides would have been overkill. // Scott cleaned up the typos and spelling errors in his handout and slides that I alerted him to earlier. I didn't notice any others. // Good job of orientating data figures, though you went through the 2nd outcome results too quickly. // Both scientific content and clipart was cited properly on the slides //

Slides and handouts were instructive; some slides could have been combined.

Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	5.67
2	Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	5.33
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	6.33
4	Appropriate background information was provided	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	6
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	5.67

Overall Presentation Content Comments

I'm not sure that I understand the controversy. I guess it is whether Gabapentin should be used in place of Benzodiazepines. At the end it wasn't clear that you could answer the question which makes me wonder whether this was an appropriate topic. You state that the guidelines recommend benzodiazepines. If that is the case, then I would be reluctant to say that Gabapentin should be used as an alternate unless there is substantial evidence that it is at least as safe and effective.

The introduction and Scott's interest in the topic were well described (I liked the "person touch" in his interest). Objectives were okay, but could have been more measurable. I thought "Why not a Benzo?" was an effective way to frame the controversy and resonated well with the audience, though one could argue whether "Benzo" was too colloquial for a formal presentation. Objectives were useful for self assessment, though it would have been nice to have a couple measurable ones.

The information from the literature was passed on to the audience effectively.

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.33
2	Outcome measures were stated and described, and appropriateness was explained	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.33
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.33
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.33
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	6
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5.33

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

I think the studies were reasonably well presented. It was hard to understand some of the data, particularly as it relates to differences related to standard deviations.

Both studies were described thoroughly with Scott providing additional insight about the exclusion parameters of the first study. // The "CIWA-Ar" acronym was defined in the slides, and Scott referred the audience to pg 14 of the handout for a more detailed definition. // Scott did a good job of explaining the deficient description of power in the first study and the more complete one in the second. // Descriptions of the studies' strengths and weakness were good (and sometimes insightful).

Clinical data were presented objectively - the limitations of trials explained.

Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	5.33
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	5.67
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	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	0	2	0	0	0	0	5.67

Conclusions Comments

I had a lot of trouble with the conclusions. In the handout there are statements made that aren't consistent with the evidence or statistical analysis. For example in study 2 it says that there is no difference seen for a variety of endpoints, but there isn't adequate power to say that they are not really different. There need to be firm conclusions. The statement for each that it "shows great promise" is not a firm conclusion. There is either data to support its use or there isn't. I think that from what was presented that the evidence is weak at best which would lead me to the conclusion that there isn't adequate evidence to support the use of gabapentin, particularly in light of well recognized guidelines that recommend benzodiazepines.

Conclusions seemed warranted based on data. // I appreciated Scott's three prescribing recommendations for gabapentin

The conclusions and the role of pharmacist could have been explained more clearly.

Question Answer Session

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.67
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.67

Question Answer Session Comments

Did a good job of trying to involve students in the discussion and questions. Answered questions appropriately.

Good Q & A session. I like the question about how the ill-defined power in the first study impacted the negative results. Scott's "Why not a Benzo?" slide at the beginning of his seminar was a good way to engage his audience and keep them interested.

Thorough answer to 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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	6
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	6.33
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	5.67
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	5.33
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.67

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

Most of the conclusions mirrored the authors' conclusions. Conclusions were pretty soft.

Scott seemed knowledgeable about the topic. He addressed clinical vs. statistical significance of high dose gabapentin compared to low dose and lorazepam.

Student was able to recognize the relevance of clinical data.

Overall Comments

Overall I think the presentation was adequate. My major issue was not the style and manner of the presentation, which were fine but rather the choice of the topic since there isn't adequate data to come to a firm conclusion and the weakness of the conclusions presented.

Good job!

Good presentation overall.