# Presenter: Ta, Julien

## Seminar Date: 2014-04-09

### 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 |
| 6.67 | 6.85 | 6.72 | 6.89 | 6.7 | 6.64 | 6.86 | 6 | 6.38 | 5.9 | 6.5 | 4.38 | 5.5 | 4.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | E (45.44) |

### Presentation Style

| # | Question | A | A- | B+ | B | B- | C+ | C | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Moderate Pace | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6.5 |
| 2 | Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.5 |
| 3 | Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 4 | Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

### Presentation Style Comments

You had a great pace and the microphone really helped with projecting, especially considering that you were a bit sick. You did read off of your slides on the computer quite a bit - stepping out from behind the podium and putting fewer words on the slides could help you avoid this temptation.

seem to be reading notes from screen, could be more confident, soft spoken

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6.5 |
| 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) | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 4 | Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

**Instructional Materials Comments**

The slides were clear and visually attractive. I'd suggest fewer words and more figures (and don't forget to orient us to the figures).

Great slides, made effort to redo graphs

**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 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.5 |
| 3 | Objectives clear and useful for self assessment | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 4 | Appropriate background information was provided | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.5 |
| 5 | Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow') | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6.5 |

**Overall Presentation Content Comments**

The talk flowed well and your interest in the topic was clear. The controversy didn't come through quite as much as it might have - perhaps by taking a stronger stand in describing NAS, it's risks and costs you could have made this more clear. / / The objectives were a weak point - they were not quantifiable or measurable in any way. The last objective in particular is impossible to achieve in a seminar ("Counsel patients...").

not so sure of the controversy between using one or other of the agents. Did not present cost so do not know what role that plays

**Presentation of Clinical Data**

| # | Question | A | A- | B+ | B | B- | C+ | C | NA | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Presented concise objectives, methodology and treatment for each study | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6.5 |
| 2 | Outcome measures were stated and described, and appropriateness was explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 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**

The outcome measures were not well explained. For example, why were head circumference, birth weight and length included as outcomes? Are babies exposed in utero to opiates usually small? Large? What is the relevance of these measures? Also, since the mothers could enroll in the study at almost any time in pregnancy, it would seem impossible to control for length of treatment exposure vs birth size. / / As mentioned in class, you did a great job of discussion the statistics.

The trial data was presented well, the missing information was beyond the trials why would you use one drug vs. another?

**Conclusions**

| # | Question | A | A- | B+ | B | B- | C+ | C | Mean |
|---|----------|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|------|
| 1 | Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.5 |
| 2 | Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 3 | Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

**Conclusions Comments**

The conclusions section of the seminar was the weakest point (perhaps correlating back to the diffuse objectives?). You seemed really hesitant to give any solid conclusion. When you paused for questions at the end of the second study without a questions slide, I thought you were going to have a case study next. But we could not get you to narrow down a population of patients that you would suggest methadone vs buprenorphine for. This is a significant weakness, since a large part of your job as seminarian is to look at all of the data and give us a recommendation. Should we stick with methadone? Or suggest buprenorphine to affected patients? One way to do this would be to give a case study or two side by side scenarios, one where you'd recommend methadone, another where you'd recommend bup.

Not very sure on how pharmacists would help in drug choice or monitoring based on conclusions presented..

**Question Answer Session**

| # | Question | A | A- | B+ | B | B- | C+ | C | Mean |
|---|----------|---|----|----|---|----|----|---|------|
| 1 | Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.5 |
| 2 | Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.5 |

**Question Answer Session Comments**

Aside from your unwillingness to give specific recommendations, you encouraged interaction with the audience and got good questions.

several questions were not really 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 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 2 | Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.5 |
| 3 | Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4.5 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

**Overall Knowledge Base Comments**

See comments above.

Not convinced Julien knew difference between statistical significance and clinical relevance and how to use this information in practice.

**Overall Comments**

Solid first seminar, interesting topic, nice job researching the topic. For next time, focus on measurable objectives, strong conclusions and presentation skills (i.e. not reading off slides).

Presentation of data, slides, style (recognizing she was sick as stated by her) were good, what was lacking was the application of the material she presented in practice. Not sure why the cost slide was a back up and not presented as part of presentation, however the information in the slide did not present drug costs vs. time saved in NICU.