

Presenter: Blackham, Jebadiah

Seminar Date: 2013-12-04

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
6.98	6.81	6.98	6.91	6.75	6.79	6.88	5.75	5.25	5.9	6	4.88	5.75	4.6	0	0	0	E (45.35)

Presentation Style									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	23	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.96
2	Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	23	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.96
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Presentation Style Comments

The presentation style was very good as the pace was easy to follow and he made eye contact throughout the room.

Seemed very comfortable which allowed me to be comfortable as an observer and focus on the subject matter. Nice ice breaker joke, too! :)

Pace was great. Nice humor. Easy to listen to.

I appreciated the pace of the seminar. Jeb was very calm and relaxed and I think it helped him not rush through his seminar, like so many seminarians had. The pace was just right for absorbing all the information he was giving us.

You have a very paced and engaging presentation style.

Beginning the seminar with humor was effective in catching my attention. I hope that I can be as confident and professional in my future seminars as you were in yours.

He was really comfortable in front of the class. The slides, at times, were a little hard to read (the color scheme), so for next time maybe choose harder-contrasting colors.

You maintained eye contact the whole time and rarely glanced at your notes. I liked how you started with a joke, it makes people interested in what you are going to say.

Jeb sounded very natural speaking and his flow and pacing was perfect while paraphrasing the slides.

Great confidence. Rarely needed notes.

Your pace was appropriate and made following the presentation easy.

The seminarian hardly relied on the slides at all to present his material. Very well done.

I thought your pace was great and although you missed a student's raised hand for a while, you didn't appear to be relying on your notes.

Pace was easy to follow. Confident and conversational. Would have liked it if you moved around more and not read off of the computer screen as much.

Great job not turning your back on the audience, even when pointing something out on the slides

The pace of the presentation was adequate to allow for the information to be presented and the audience to have enough time to process the information.

Good joke at the beginning to create interest. I would have liked the objectives on the front of the handout and a title that is more specific to the q

I thought you had a great style, the humor you threw in was great!

Jeb seemed very comfortable presenting and was easy to follow. I also liked that he started with a joke

Well timed pace

Not enough time on study slides. They had more information that required more time to digest. Other than that, very well paced. Eye contact was appropriate and didn't rely on notes.

made eye contact throughout the entire presentation. kept a pace that was slow enough to understand everything but fast enough to keep us listening

I really enjoyed your presentation. You started with a joke and then proceeded to make the seminar relevant to all of us by asking who among us has given or received a flu shot. You were very confident kept a moderate pace that was easy to follow. Fantastic job.

You have a nice presentation style, that is easy to pay attention to. Good pace, no distracting mannerisms and the information that you presented was at an appropriate level for us.

Instructional Materials

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	16	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.67
2	Slides and handout are devoid of spelling and grammatical errors	21	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	6.79
3	Provided orientation to charts/graphs/pictures/diagrams (if applicable)	23	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.96
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6.83

Instructional Materials Comments

The presentation white font on sky blue background was hard to see from the back of the room. Therefore, for next time may be choose dark background with light font. Overall pictures were great.

I thought the handout followed along very well with the presentation and added information to without distracting from the information being presented.

Not too busy. Font was a bit hard to read. light and bad coloring.

There were several punctuation marks missing in slides. Periods need to be at the end of sentences both in the handout and the slides. There were also no citations on the slides on the background section, except for on pictures.

I thought the first few pages of the handout would have been easier to read if they hadn't been in paragraphs (maybe bullet points would have worked better?). The slides were very aesthetically pleasing.

I thought the slides were easy to read, but the bar charts in Appendix B are blurry and the words associated with the chart are difficult to read. In the future, you could recreate the charts, or try and copy the images over in a format that is not blurry. Also, I was wondering where the figures in Appendix B and Appendix C came from - I didn't see any citations for these.

The slides were really helpful, and complemented the slides. The only thing I'd recommend is again, try to increase contrast of font on slides

Your slides were not too wordy so they were easy to follow. At times the letters were a little too light to read which caused me to focus on the slide rather than what you were saying (I only noticed this on 2 or 3 slides).

Slides were well laid out and not too wordy, for the most part. However a few slides and the first couple pages of the handout could've been broken up into smaller paragraphs or even bulleted sentences. Sometimes it helps to break all that information up, because it makes it easier to read.

Slides were nicely organized and had great flow.

I noticed a few typos and formatting inconsistencies in the slides and handout. I liked your colorful

graphics and template as it made the content seem more exciting.

The primary literature was very well presented and slides matched the handout well.

I was impressed with your handout and slides.

Slides and handout were well organized. The light blue and white font were a little difficult to read at times.

Used great attention grabbing pictures, and good illustrations throughout.

The charts and graphics used in the handout greatly enhanced my understanding of the material. Some of the slides were difficult to read with the color of font on the background.

I noticed a few things: I noticed incorrect capitalization on two occasions: Elderly included in Author's conclusion; Lot to Lot. I noticed the IIV4 abbreviation for quadrivalent, but didn't catch an explanation, or key to the abbreviation. It seemed like the slides kept referring to strains, but what was repeatedly said was strands: a little more consistency would be nice.

I like the different pictures and diagrams that you used in the slides and handout, they allow for more easy following-

There was a minor spelling error on the handout- other than that I liked the color of the slides and I really liked that they weren't too wordy.

It would be beneficial to include all info presented in your slides on the handout

Table slides and handouts were a little dense. I prefer bullets in the handout for easy reading (just my preference). Table slides were too crammed. They were hard to read in the time allotted. Other slides were clean and easy to read.

try to match the handout a little more to the slides. personal preference: rather than paragraphs in the background section, put bullet points to make it easier for us to read while listening to the presentation

The visuals that you included were good. I particularly liked the diagram on pages 11 and 12 which clearly illustrated the danger of a virus mutating and jumping species. A couple of the slides were hard to read due to small font and seemed a little cluttered. The ones that stood out were the slides giving the study's results and your own conclusions.

I saw one or two errors in your handout, next time consider having someone else review your handout prior to presenting. Otherwise, I liked the format of your handout.

Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
4	Appropriate background information was provided	22	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.92
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Overall Presentation Content Comments

The presenter was very enthusiastic about his presentation and the objectives were clear to follow as well.

I enjoyed the background/introduction. I thought appropriate time was spent on the background information and it got me up to speed quickly so I could understand the presentation.

lot more info in the handouts which would be more interested to see in presentation.

I really appreciated the audience interaction, especially at the beginning of the seminar with the jokes and questions. It helped to draw in the audience and get them interested in the topic, because we all realized the topic was one that influenced almost every single one of us.

Your introduction of the topic and audience involvement really made your presentation good.

As far as I could tell, the presentation was very well organized, the objectives were clear and useful, the background really helped me understand the purpose and controversy surrounding the topic, and the introduction caught my attention and clearly summarized the interest in the topic.

He did a really great job hooking the audience in w/ the flu shot question at the beginning. I would have maybe just talked a little bit more about the availability of the quadrivalent options (flumist vs fluzone) to set us up

You provided thorough background information. This topic is very relevant to pharmacist especially pharmacist working in the community providing vaccines. The controversy was clear and your presentation was well organized. Your objectives were a little vague; instead of using words like "understand" use "identify" or "list" something that is more measurable.

Good job explaining the interest in the topic. Presenting something applicable to everyone and highlighting that makes for a good attention grabber.

Relevant and interesting topic.

You did an excellent job making your topic relevant to everyone.

The controversy of the topic was well laid out during the presentation and provided a good segway into

the data.

I enjoyed your introduction of the topic and felt that you explained the controversy adequately. I would have liked just a little explanation on why the rates of immune response to the flu shots are indicative of efficacy.

Introduction made topic interesting. Did a good job summarizing the important information and organized it to where the information lead up to the controversy.

Especially for something as common as a flu shot, the background was helpful and very appropriate.

The flow between the different topics was well organized and allowed for full understanding of each aspect of the new vaccine. His knowledge of national guidelines showed depth in his knowledge base.

I noticed that in the pharmacist's role section the speed was a little fast. It was said that you can just read this; but time was insufficient for me to read it. Saying them out would have been preferred. Also, I noticed that you were back behind the podium for most of the presentation, coming out and closer would have improved the presentation.

I appreciated that you walked us through the concept of strains and titers and all; good background-

The background information was really helpful but not excessive. Parts of it got a little confusing when you started explaining something and then said you'd explain more later, such as why pigs are important in the flu but overall the background was really interesting and well presented

One objective on the safety of the vaccine was not covered in seminar. You should always cover your objectives.

Involved everyone in the beginning with the mention of immunizations given and gotten. Helpful review of virus components, influenza types, titers, and history.

Very thorough background information about the flu virus and production of the flu shots. maybe go into more detail about prevalence of flu and getting flu shots and cost

The introduction of your presentation was clear and to the point. You dedicated an entire slide to explaining what the controversy was. You mentioned safety, efficacy and cost. It was a great start and set the stage for the rest of your seminar. I also liked how you simplified the geometric mean titer. You ran through a basic calculation and made it clear what you were talking about and how the study was conducted.

The background section was presented at an appropriate level. Some would recommend incorporating 2-3 "higher order" objectives. Using words like compare and contrast, monitor, design, etc.

Presentation of Clinical Data

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Presented concise objectives, methodology and treatment for each study	23	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.96
2	Outcome measures were stated and described, and appropriateness was explained	19	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	6.71
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	23	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.96
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	22	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.96
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	20	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	6.91
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	23	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.96

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

May be differentiate and explain more about the clinical significance over statistical significance. However, the strengths and limitations were very well stated.

I enjoyed the diversity of the 3 studies. Although 3 studies often makes things tight on timing, I think it better validates the information and I appreciate that.

objectives were reasonable. presented the data well.

I really liked how he explained what a Monte Carlo study was; drug lit was awhile ago. I also liked how he explained the titers, because this was essential in understanding the study results.

I thought you were wise to explain the ratio on one of your slides, but I think you could have spent more time on it (and referred back to the explanation as you were presenting the clinical data). It was a foreign measure for most of us and I felt like the concept needed some reinforcement.

I would have taken a moment to give details about withdrawals and dropouts in the studies presented.

He had really thoughtful analysis of his studies, but I would have liked to see more study details.

It was helpful that you included extra slides to explain the GMT ratios. This helped when explaining your outcomes. You thoroughly explained the strengths and weaknesses of the trials. I am not sure that I agree that the patients being young is a weakness unless they are specifically testing the vaccination in an elderly population which I did not see from your summary.

I liked that you explained what a Monte Carlo simulation was and the problems of using it, as well. I also liked that you included cost as the controversy.

Clearly presented the details of the studies. Strengths and weaknesses were well thought out.

I liked how you explained the Monte Carlo simulation and geometric mean. Very helpful to follow data.

Clinical data was very thoroughly presented. Perhaps a little more detail into the subanalysis of the elderly population may have been helpful.

I think that you met your objectives with the seminar.

Utilized three different studies to make a well-rounded argument. Not quite sure that I understood the Monte Carlo data as well. Would have liked more clinical analysis and application of the studies.

Great job using an example to show the meaning of the statistics that were being measured.

Explaining the method of calculation of the ratios before presenting the data was helpful in preventing confusion I would have had otherwise. He gave a good background on each method which was helpful when evaluating and learning about the studies.

For the 1.5 statistical threshold it was unclear what the clinical significance of that was. A little more detail on the matter would have been nice.

I guess the study outcomes did not stand out much to me. It may have helped to discuss their relevance more, and their clinical applicability...

The data from the study was a little confusing, you did a great job explaining how to interpret the results but The numbers were still hard to understand in terms of clinical significance.

Objectives were reasonable, but not covered in class

I enjoyed the variety studies, showing different areas of interest. Thorough review of strengths and limitations It felt like you rushed through the statistical information, such as means, superiority measurements, and inferiority measurements.

Afterward i was still a little confused about the outcome measures and how they were measured and calculated but i understand it is difficult to explain that whole process in the short time allotted.

You presented the necessary data and were clear with what the outcomes were. My only thought was that each study had different primary outcomes. I would have liked to see more of the same outcomes in order to bolster your end conclusions.

I thought your analysis of strengths and weakness was strong, as it was more in depth, not just "randomized, control, double blind" or other very basics strengths and weaknesses.

Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	19	3	2	0	0	0	0	6.71
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	19	4	1	0	0	0	0	6.75
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	19	4	1	0	0	0	0	6.75
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	20	3	1	0	0	0	0	6.79

Conclusions Comments

The presenter made great points on pharmacist role in flu vaccinations. His conclusion was very well presented and were clear to understand.

I think the conclusions are appropriate based on the findings.

Conclusions seems a little unfinished. should specific patient populations have priority?

I felt his conclusion was a little bit too general. He admitted in his question section that he was basing it more off of CDC guidelines than his studies. I also think the specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice could have been expanded more. Also, the role of the pharmacist was not in the handout, and I liked it in question form, but I think it would have been best if he had answered the questions as well.

I appreciated your direct conclusions. You weren't wishy-washy, which is good.

I would have discussed the role of the pharmacist in more detail. You could have provided some more details about how pharmacists can educate patients about influenza vaccines.

I think he did a great job coming up with appropriate conclusions from his studies, but it would have been worth mentioning that it is only FDA-approved for 18-49 years (and keeping that in mind when framing the conclusions)

I would have liked you determine who was the best candidate for the shot in the event of a shortage (as per Dr. Young's question). Also, you stated that all patients who can receive the IIV3 should receive IIV4 but I did not see any data on patients younger than 18. Since no data was presented for this group maybe the recommendation should be any one 18 years or older should receive IIV4.

The recommendations and role of the pharmacist was clear and i appreciated the additional information in the back of the handout. It was also a nice of change of pace for you to present the author's conclusions before telling the strengths and weaknesses of the studies.

Conclusion was strongly asserted. Confident.

I would have liked more specific recommendations.

Conclusions were very well thought out and supported by the evidence. Nicely done.

I thought your conclusions were valid. I would have liked a discussion about who should receive quadrivalent flu shots before the faculty's questions, but you did well.

Did not necessarily agree with some of your conclusions, but you did theorize your answers and stuck to them. Again, would have liked more clinical application when discussing the role of the pharmacist.

I really liked that you showed the authors conclusion followed by the strengths and weaknesses of the study and then your conclusion. It made the basis of your analysis very clear.

The conclusions seemed somewhat questionable and lacking confidence. I would have liked to have had a more definitive confident recommendation to conclude the presentation.

At the end of the presentation, I was having a hard time understanding exactly what recommendation I should be making. A little clearer recommendation and explanation of the data to support that recommendation would have been nice.

I know you presented a list of important questions we may be asked, but it may have been helpful to discuss them a little more-

Conclusions were backed by data but not all the data that was used to make the decision was presented- be clear about why your conclusions are justified in the literature during the seminar.

I was not clear on who you concluded would be an appropriate candidate for the vaccine

You didn't talk about the safety aspect and the different groups, which would have been helpful when making recommendations. You discuss the CDC recommendations. It would have been nice to have a slide regarding the recommendations and how you feel they relate to the new vaccine. You didn't provide very specific recommendations.

I wish you would have actually gone through the questions we should know how to answer at the end of the presentation.

The data supported your conclusion and I liked how you were able to call upon CDC guidelines to support your conclusions. Using official guidelines always increases your credibility.

I thought that the conclusions were well supported. For my own interest, I would have liked a little more discussion about patient populations such as pediatrics within the presentation, especially since they were included in your recommendation, but not the studies. However, I did think your rationale for including them in the Q&A was appropriate.

Question Answer Session									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	21	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.88
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	18	5	1	0	0	0	0	6.71

Question Answer Session Comments

For future presentation, may be stop after each study to ask audience about any questions they possibly have. The reason is because one of the student from audience had to interrupt in the middle to clarify a point.

Great knowledge base was demonstrated during the Q& A section. I thought some of the questions posed were interesting but since that was not the direction you were going with your focus, I felt they were interesting but irrelevant and did not impact my opinion of your subject knowledge.

answered questions well. put more questions breaks into lecture.

Really good job of bringing in the audience with the jokes and questions at the beginning. You really grabbed our attention. Maybe have a break for questions at the end of each study so the audience doesn't interrupt you during your seminar.

I thought you did well with the questions and were able to think of things, on your feet, that you probably hadn't considered before.

I think that it would have been effective to invite the audience to ask questions after each study presented, or at least after the two studies about safety and efficacy and then again after the third study. Also, you could have asked the audience some questions to encourage participation and to further engage them in the presentation.

He had some really tough questions, and I thought that he handled them with great composure. I would, however, recommend adding question slides in the middle to encourage questions throughout

You were able to answer all questions and think on your feet. It would have been nice to have a chance for questions after each study.

Good job quickly and thoroughly answering questions. There were a lot of hard questions presented to you and you kept your poise well.

Was quick to answer questions. Well prepared.

You were very detailed in your answers to people's questions which showed you were comfortable at the podium.

The student did very well during the Q and A session. A little more detail into the elderly subanalysis would have been a good addition.

You answered all of the questions posed to you and demonstrated great knowledge of the subject.

This is more of a style thing, but it is nice when there are pauses for questions so that students don't get lost throughout the seminar.

Good job overall, you could have used the results and inclusion criteria of your studies to give more clear answers and recommendations

Referring to national guidelines and the ability to think on his feet enhanced this portion. He seemed very confident when answering all questions.

Good job citing the guidelines in the Q and A. Soliciting questions earlier in the presentation would have been nice, especially in the instance where an audience members question went unnoticed for a time.

You were great at answering questions, maybe just solicit them more often-

Did a great job thinking on your feet- a personal preference of mine would be to encourage questions throughout the seminar rather than just at the end

You had some difficult questions. You would,t have had those hard questions if you had a solid conclusion.

Would have been helpful to have question times. You fielded difficult questions with poise.

Able to pull out information from the studies easily to answer the questions posed

I would have liked a couple of pauses in the presentation to allow for questions. It helps me to focus on what is being said and not having to think about what my question was as I wait for the end of the seminar. I did like how even though you were interrupted during your seminar and had multiple questions thrown at you, you were able to answer them intelligently and you continued on afterwards as though it had not phased you.

I thought you did well with the complex, theorhetical questions given. One style comment that I would provide is that rephrasing and repeating the question back helps ensure that you understand the question and that your whole audience hears the question.

Overall Knowledge Base

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	22	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.92
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	16	7	1	0	0	0	0	6.63
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	23	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.96
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	23	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.96
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	22	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.92

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

The presenter was very knowledgeable about his topic and was able to answer majority of the questions. He seemed very prepared for this presentation and clearly specified his own conclusion.

Clearly a lot of time was spent on this seminar and the knowledge base was there to back it up. I felt he exhibited extensive knowledge of the subject.

Thought on feet well.

I liked how he referenced current guidelines; it made it clear that he looked at more than just his articles for his seminar. I would have appreciated it if he discussed the difference between clinical significance and statistical significance with his studies. Do the results of the studies have any clinical relevance???

I thought you did a good job "thinking on your feet" when presented with questions.

The seminarian is probably able to distinguish between statistical and clinical significance, but he didn't discuss this in his seminar. I would have liked to have heard your thoughts and analysis about whether there is clinical significance to what the authors of the various studies found to be statistically significant.

It was very evident that he knew more about his topic than what he presented. I would just recommend focusing on clinical vs statistical importance

It was great that you referred to the guidelines when answering questions; it showed that you read more than just your studies. I thought overall you were able to think on your feet and provide answers supported by the literature.

Preparation was evident since you referenced guidelines during the Q & A. That really demonstrates your knowledge and research on the subject.

Demonstrated through knowledge of the topic. Expert of the field.

Your answers were appropriate and supported by guidelines which increased your credibility.

This was a very relevant topic and it was delivered with great detail. I enjoyed the flow of the seminar and the seminarian did a great job analyzing the data and presenting it in a way that would be applicable in all circumstances.

Absolutely showed that you knew more about the subject beyond what was presented.

Was able to theorize answers and develop conclusions when asked to do so.

Showed great overall knowledge, especially when asked about the efficacy of the quad rivaling shot in the elderly.

Differentiation between statistically significant and clinically significant outcomes and recommendations was lacking.

I thought the background section may have been a little long and drawn out; but it turned out to be important to understanding the quadrivalent and trivalent points. Perhaps a more concise summary would have improved the presentation. You demonstrated a good knowledge base during the Q and A, but some items you had to look up; you can't know everything and I thought that response was appropriate.

You come across as really knowing your stuff, which you do. Good preparation-

I would have liked to hear more about the clinical significance of the results so I know how to use it in practice but you clearly were very knowledgeable about the topic

Jeb demonstrated his solid knowledge by handling several challenging questions.

Would have liked to have seen more clinical significance as Dr. Young mentioned. I didn't feel like we received useful recommendations for us to take into our practices.

I like that you told us what studies were coming up. Maybe go into a little more detail about how significant the outcomes were.

Your knowledge of CDC guidelines and other official guidelines showed you were prepared for this seminar. The study's you presented were each different in what they were looking at. It demonstrated how deeply you had delved into this controversy. You clearly did a lot of research and thought through this controversy and came to what I believe were insightful conclusions.

I thought you were able to think on your feet and provided additional information within your answer. One comment, that I forget sometimes, but is important, is discussing the clinical significance.

Provide one comment on what you liked about this seminar

I liked the pictures presented throughout the presentation and how the presenter elaborated on each one to make his point clear.

I liked his sense of humor, his approach to the subject and I really liked that the subject is applicable in all of our lives as future healthcare providers as well as recipients of the flu shot.

Nice humor input.

I really liked his calm demeanor and friendly attitude. It helped him be relaxed throughout the seminar which meant he didn't rush through his seminar so we could understand and absorb the information he was giving us.

I think your presentation style, pace, topic introduction, and sense of humor really added dimension to your presentation.

I liked how the topic and information presented was pertinent to most practicing pharmacists - it was information that most pharmacists could use in their practice vs. information that only pertains to a small group of specialty pharmacists.

I really liked his charismatic attitude that he brought to the stand...keep that up on future presentations. When you're confident, your audience will trust what you have to say.

I thought you picked well designed studies. I liked that they had wide inclusion criteria so that the results could be applied to a broad population. I also thought you did a good job with your handout. You provided more background information (I especially like the diagrams explaining drift and shift). It was great that you included pricing. With new health care legislation flu shots are supposed to be covered by insurance. Some insurance, however, does not cover getting the vaccination at a pharmacy so this information was very helpful.

I liked the images in the very beginning of the presentation. They really helped to capture my attention and interest. You knew the power of pictures! Good job.

Opening with a great joke drew the audience in and lightened the mood. Very effective.

Presentation style was comfortable

The background information and the way the controversy was laid out was very well done. A very relevant topic and one that will be helpful in all areas of pharmacy.

I really enjoyed this topic. It was relatable for all of us students and pharmacists.

I liked your conversational tone and pace. Makes it very easy to follow and stay interested in the topic.

I thought the pace was very appropriate for the material presented and the audience.

The introduction of the seminar was great for drawing in the audience and engaging them in the topic.

I liked the presenters use of casual style and language to help the audience feel comfortable. Good use of humor and images.

I liked the applicability of the topic, and it is interesting to learn more about it-

I really liked your pace and how easy you were to follow. It didn't feel too rushed and the topic was a great idea because it applies to everyone.

Interesting topic with relevance to pharmacists practicing in all settings

You fielded a wide variety of questions with poise.

Flow that was conducive to learning and made it interesting. Picked a topic that is applicable to everyone

I liked your pace, your jokes and your laid back behavior. It made everyone else more comfortable and it made your seminar more enjoyable to attend.

Jeb, I thought you gave a strong presentation. I liked the flow and the organization and that you add a hint of humor and personality, while remaining professional.

Provide one comment on what could be improved about this seminar

The improvement could be made on presentation style such as template and choosing a font color that is easy to read from the back of the room. In addition, ask question after each study if audience need any further clarification.

I felt he did a really thorough job and there was nothing glaring nor anything that disturbed me otherwise as an observer that I would say needs to be improved.

more question breaks.

Talk about clinical vs statistical significance. Also spell and grammar check your slides and handouts please.

I think it would have made your presentation even better to have spent more time on explaining the outcome measures (that ratio) and what it means clinically.

I think that the seminar could have been more helpful to the audience if the seminarian had invited the audience to ask questions throughout the seminar and not just at the end, or if he had asked the audience questions during his presentation.

I would just recommend giving specific information about the quadrivalent products; that's what we're going to encounter in our pharmacies, so it would be nice to know which products are quadrivalent (I know it was in the appendix, but maybe just mention it out loud).

Your objectives could be more concrete. Use words that are easily measurable instead of vague words like "understand" or "know." These words are open to interpretation whereas statements like "identify three points" is measurable.

The data on safety of the quadrivalent vaccine was not as clear in the presentation slides as information on efficacy and cost was. I would've liked a little more information concerning the safety, whether it be differences or similarities to the trivalent, in the presentation.

Slightly more encouragement for questions from the audience throughout the seminar.

More discussion on clinical significance

Perhaps more detail into the elderly population to address the question asked during the presentation.

I greater discussion about the import of your conclusions would have been nice.

Would have liked more clinical applications and discussions to how this will change our practice.

Could have more succinct recommendations for who benefits most from this shot, if the data is available.

The lack of a definite confident conclusion regarding who should receive the vaccine hurt the presentation.

For me, the data seemed a little bit hard to follow in the trials. More explanation of the clinical significance of the outcomes and greater discussion about how the costs were calculated in the third study would have helped tremendously.

While I agree with you on the quadrivalent vaccine doing no harm, I do still wonder if it is worth extra cost. I guess I could have used a little more explanation and convincing....

I would've liked to hear more about how the numbers and data from the study can be translated to a real life situation

Stronger conclusions based on the data presented

I would have liked more specific recommendations for pharmacists and clinical significance of the studies.

Talk a little more about cost of the vaccine on average for patients for both vaccines. Also discuss availability since the quadrivalent vaccine is on back order mostly.

I would go over some of those slides and make them a little less wordy and increase the font size. Not all of them just a couple.

You had a strong understanding of meaning of the data, evidenced by your answer to Emily's question. Next time don't forget to address clinical significance.

General Comments

Overall the presentation was great with details, interesting pictures and a good pace throughout the presentation.

Overall a very interesting topic presented in a fun way that is very applicable to the entire population. Thank you for your time in preparing and presenting your seminar-I feel it was worthwhile and I learned a lot.

great job

Overall really good seminar. I think you were the only one who cracked a few jokes. Your topic was relevant to not only my rotations but to my job as well, and I really appreciated that; it made the topic relevant to me so it made me more interested in your seminar.

Loved your title, too!

In 2009, there were criteria used to determine who should receive flu shots first, but I'm not sure if it was a good idea, or not. I think that first come first serve might work, but in some cases, it may be necessary for pharmacists to follow predetermined guidelines outlining who can receive flu shots first. When flu shots are in short supply, it might make more sense to save them for people who are at greatest risk.

Very professional, engaging, and informational seminar. Keep up the good work as you move forward in your career

Now that pharmacists can provide vaccinations this is a very relevant topic. I thought it was very clinically relevant to the pharmacy field and will be useful for me at work. I feel like I will be better able to answer questions about the IIV4.

I thought this seminar was going to be too complicated and go over my head, but you did well explaining it in terms I'd understand. It was wise to give the most basic background information, rather than the detailed science behind it. However, given the complexity of the subject, it would've been nice to stop and see if there were questions during the presentation just to be sure of the audience's understanding.

Great seminar. Information I will be able to apply to practice.

Your introduction was very engaging! Nicely done.

Overall this was a very strong presentation and the seminarian demonstrated both a natural presenting style as well as a fantastic overall knowledge base.

Overall I think you did a great job. It was a great way to finish up the semester!

Great job overall, I thought your mannerisms were good, and the presentation was well constructed and had good flow.

Very interesting seminar with a good knowledge base. Enjoyed how multiple topics of the subject were covered from clinical to financial.

In the Q and A section, it was asked who would have the highest priority to receive a limited supply of quadrivalent vaccines. You said that it would be on a first come first served basis. Like the professors had hinted at, there must be some criteria (for example, inclusion criteria of the studies) to differentiate how this would be used. Perhaps it is a question to research further, it seems pretty relevant to pharmacy practice in dispensing quadrivalent vaccines.

You are a great presenter, and I like how relevant your topics are-

Overall, a good presentation. Next time work on stronger conclusions and more discussion on the limitations of the studies.

I liked your attempt to peak our interest in the topic, showing us it affects us all.

You did a great job. I liked the topic you selected. It is of import to every pharmacist no matter where they practice.

I thought it was well presented. You did a great job last year, but was impressed by your extra improvement this year.