

Presenter: Turpin, Scott

Seminar Date: 2014-03-27

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
6.88	6.67	6.9	6.84	6.89	6.78	6.9	6.63	6.5	6.9	6.45	6.5	5.25	6.5	0	0	0	E (46.46)

Presentation Style									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.94
2	Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	6.69
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.88
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Presentation Style Comments

I liked the pace of the seminar. No distracting mannerisms.

Very good pace, you gave us time to comprehend your seminar.

The pace was excellent. Definitely one of your strengths.

His pace was great and seemed very relaxed. He did not rely on notes.

Ok to talk with hands, but try not to play with them

Very steady and methodical pace that never felt too fast but a little slow at times

Very professional with minimal reliance on notes

Great pace and eye contact throughout the whole presentation

Overall the pace was very steady. You relied on your slides a little more than I would like, but it wasn't too distracting either.

Had a good flow that allowed us to keep pace with the presentation knowledge.

Good pace and few distracting mannerisms. You had a very calm presentation style

Really relaxed and confident presentation style

He said "um" an awful lot at the beginning, but it got better as he went on.

Good, relaxed pace. Could have looked at the audience more, instead of looking at the screen or your computer. Spoke clearly.

Good pace and clear voice. Started off more focusing on the slides, but improved throughout the presentation to make eye contact with the audience.

Maybe increase your pace and your tone. Consider reading off the slides less

Instructional Materials

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	9	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
2	Slides and handout are devoid of spelling and grammatical errors	9	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.44
3	Provided orientation to charts/graphs/pictures/diagrams (if applicable)	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.94
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.81

Instructional Materials Comments

Handout was missing some labels in some of the tables. But was overall good.

Easy to navigate slides, you forgot number 3 on your objectives on your handout.

The text in your slides was kinda small, so it was hard to read sometimes. Otherwise they looked clean. There were some grammar and spelling errors on a few slides, but nothing major.

His slides and handout were easy to read. He had some errors and missing information in his handout. He provided good orientation to graphs and he cited appropriate references.

Good and quick orientation to graphs.

Seemed strange that only 9 references were used for the whole presentation. It made me feel as if there was more background information out there that could have been explored and brought to our attention

I really liked the pictures in the slides during the background section. Some information missing on tables (labels, statistics, results, etc)

I would suggest increasing the font. Also, slides contained a lot of "free" space. Maybe pick a different PowerPoint presentation design next time

This is the area that could use some work. Several slides had font that was too small to read, especially for those farther back. I noticed a few typos and formatting issues in the handout as well. There were also some spots that were missing information. However, most slides were great in their layout and I thought the flow within them was nice.

Some of the slides had rather small type that was difficult to read.

Slides were clear and easy to follow. The handout was good but was missing some information. / You did a good job orientating us to the graphs.

A few errors on the handout and presentation, but not too distracting

The printing in his handout was very poor, and I could barely make a few things out.

Slides were clear but some had very small font. Handout was a mess- it didn't follow the order of the presentation, so that hindered flow; spacing issues: there was a subheading in the firstly study that had nothing listed under it; the second study wasn't titled and didn't even have section headers in the chart; and the controversy section was in paragraph format, which is hard to follow along with during the presentation. Did give good orientation to the Kaplan Meier graph in one of the studies.

Slides were concise and clear. Handout seemed to missing some of the information presented in the seminar. Great orientation of the graphs in the studies. Would have appreciated more orientation to your mechanism of action slide with GLP-1.

Just minor errors in the handout

Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.88
2	Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.88
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	12	4	0	0	0	0	0	6.75
4	Appropriate background information was provided	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Overall Presentation Content Comments

I couldn't find anything to critique in this area. Each area was thoroughly covered.

I though your background information was perfect, I was totally able to follow along.

Some of your objectives were a little unclear (maybe too broad?), but overall you presented the material well.

He defined the controversy well and gave appropriate background information. The presentation was well organized and flowed well.

I would spell out acronyms the first time you use them (ie) GLP rather than later on

The controversy was the strongest part of this seminar in my opinion. The interest level could have used some work but overall it was good.

I really liked the the controversy timeline

Clear objectives and controversy

I think a little more about the controversy could have been described. Specifically, why is the risk of pancreatitis a concern when the risk is so small and these drugs aren't even first line? Overall the flow was really nice and you provided great background otherwise.

This was the strongest part of the seminar. Had thorough information and went into detail of studies

Good intro, and good explanation of the controversy. Some of the controversy came out at the end about DM pts on this med pts being sicker and that might account for the increased risk. That may have been good to point out up front too

Controversy was well explained and evidence was presented in a good order

This was the best portion of his seminar. He was clear in his explanations.

Great timeline of the controversy. Background was concise but covered the useful and appropriate information. One of the objectives was not directly met- demonstrate the strengths and limitations of

observational studies. I guess this was done very very informally, but not really. Flow was good but didn't leave much time in between topics/studies to process.

Good flow throughout presentation. Unsure of what your controversy was when you first presented your seminar. Maybe coming up with a title that may better define the seminar to help give us a general picture of what you will be addressing. Furthermore, the objectives may also be modified to help get your controversy across. The controversy was more clear as you started talking about your background and exenatide itself.

I liked the MOA discussion for pancreatitis. Consider revise the objectives to be more measurable

Presentation of Clinical Data

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Presented concise objectives, methodology and treatment for each study	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Outcome measures were stated and described, and appropriateness was explained	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.94
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.94
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6.63
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	6.5
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.94

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Covered statistics of the trials well, and provided good background on these types of studies.

I felt that you gave a lot of data about the strengths and limitations of the trials. You had a great topic.

You did a great job explaining the data and the graphs.

He did a great job explaining the studies. He was concise and touched on all points.

One of your slides included reported numbers from study 1. I would briefly include some numbers on the table for quick comparison

The clinical data was presented well and the power was explained

Great presentation of the data

Good analysis of the studies. I wish I could remember a bit more about observational studies...

This was definitely the strongest area of your presentation. I would have liked to see a little more about how the authors defined various outcomes and exposures and how they identified those in patients. Otherwise, great job in breaking down the studies for us!

Went into good detail about the results and whether they had appropriate power.

explained the studies well and pointed out the important points to focus on. Good job

The discussion of the clinical data was thorough and easy to understand

He did a good job of refreshing me on the types of studies he was working with.

This section was the best of all of the sections. Studies were explained pretty well and he did expand

on some things that were done in the study. He could have defined how the outcomes were measured better. Analyses were sufficient.

Great job setting up the methodology of the study and pointing out reasoning behind things that may have seemed unclear (why 63 years of age was the cut off, etc.). Outcome measures were described well, especially when you pointed out the Kaplan Meier curve.

Great job presenting the studies in a concise way

Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.88
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.81
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.88

Conclusions Comments

Good job on the clinical importance of studies.

I thought you may have benefited more from choosing one study that showed benefit and one that showed no benefit.

Good conclusions based on the data and points you presented.

His conclusions were supported by data and he explained clinical significance. He discussed the role of the pharmacist well.

I would include pharmacy recommendations on your handout

Great conclusions. They were spot on in my opinion and confirmed my suspicion that the pancreatitis side effect may not be that clinically significant.

Good conclusion and explanation of pharmacist role

No pharmacist role/recommendations were listed on the handout, however it was mentioned during the presentation

Overall you did a good job on your conclusion. I think you could have been more specific with what kind of recommendations would you make, which patients would you be more cautious in, etc.

Could have discussed the difference between the difference of clinical significance of the studies for the amount of events.

What we should do with all the data you presented didn't seem clear. I strong solid conclusion is always helpful

Evidence based conclusions were made

His conclusions were solid, but somehow I felt they weren't explicit enough.

Conclusions were based on the evidence, but no specific recommendations were made. Pharmacists role was good.

Conclusions were appropriate based on results of studies presented. Would have like more specific recommendations-painting a picture of who may be more at risk of pancreatitis from the baseline characteristics collected from studies presented. Would have also like more specification of clinical versus statistical significance in the studies to help define what the recommendation should be.

Your conclusions matched the data well

Question Answer Session									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	12	3	1	0	0	0	0	6.69
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.88

Question Answer Session Comments

Handled questions well.

You did a good job on your question and answer section.

Your background knowledge on the topic was clear in the Q&A session.

He answered questions well and encouraged them.

I would speak a little louder. I could hear you, but it was difficult at times

A little stumbling on the answers but appeared to know his stuff

Great job answering questions

Great Q&A, answered all questions with confidence

Good job with the questions, you tried to answer your best even if you didn't seem to really know the answer too well.

He knew all the answers and was able to answer appropriately.

Did a good job fielding all the question.

Good job answering the questions asked of you.

He took some time to get to a definitive answer.

Did not do very well in Q&A. He stumbled quite a bit and wasn't sure hoe to answer some questions on his studies.

Great job with answering questions. Could tell that you knew your background information.

A little trouble in Q and A but held your ground well

Overall Knowledge Base

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.88
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.88
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.94
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.94
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.88

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

Definitely looked beyond the author's conclusions in these cases.

You were very able to summarize your opinion on the conclusions of each study.

It was clear from your presentation that you knew the material well. Good job.

He had a great knowledge base and was able to talk about clinical and statistical significance. He was able to think on his feet.

On one of your slides you talk about 0.88 being a good fit for something. I would define the parameters of that assessment

Theorized about the confidence levels on the graph

Great knowledge base. Would have liked a comment on clinical significance

You appeared very knowledgeable and confident

Great job in your overall knowledge base. The only recommendation I have is to try to form your own conclusions beyond what the author's say.

Did a good job on explaining to us about observational studies and the impact of drug uses and indications.

You knew the studies and background information really well. You were able to make interpretations beyond the data. Good job!

You clearly knew the information and additional background information

His answers lacked confidence, and looking things up disturbed the flow a little.

Had s pretty good knowledge base but wasn't able to discuss much on clinical vs statistical significance. Was only partially able to think on his feet. Didn't really go much beyond the author's conclusions.

Great overall knowledge base. Would have appreciated more regarding clinical versus statistical significance.

Liked the insight you brought to the results. Good risk v benefit analysis

Provide one comment on what you liked about this seminar

I really liked your clinical application of the data.

Great pace taken.

The data/studies were presented very well.

He kept a great pace and his presentation style was relaxed and he wanted to make sure he explained things clearly.

The patient population is vast and therefore the applicability also vast. good choice of topic

I liked the conclusions that were made and how he brought in some trials that were not our traditional randomized controlled trials

I really liked how you had so many pictures to explain what you were talking about. You relied very minimally on your notes and are a very professional speaker

Great pace

It's nice to see a presentation with an emphasis on observational studies; always a good review for us.

He had a good in depth review of both studies

I like the pace and relaxed presentation style. Also, I thought you did a good job orienting us quickly to the studies and all the graphs.

Really liked your presentation style, it was smooth and confident

His explanations were deliberate and complete.

Good timeline of the controversy.

Good pace, clear voice. Able to point out reasoning behind study design.

I liked your overall idea that maybe the disease state is the issue not the drug.

Provide one comment on what could be improved about this seminar

Remember to put headings in tables on handout.

You actually had a lot of um's, it was somewhat distracting, and you paced a lot.

Consider increasing the font.

His handout and slides and some grammatical errors and were missing information.

Speak up and don't play with hands

The interest level didn't seem there. Be enthusiastic and others in the audience will be too.

Your handout could have been a little more thorough. There were some important pieces of information missing on it.

I'm sorry to say this, but I really didn't like the way your handout looked. My suggestion would be to include more graphs/pictures in the background section. Also, watch out for spacing throughout the handout. You can do so much better!

Next time, polish up your slides and handout a little more thoroughly.

Could have done a better job on the readability of the slides and handout

Double checking your handout for completeness to check for any missing information.

Just polish the handout and slides for mistakes, but otherwise, great job!

He stumbled over things a bit.

The handout was poorly put together. This should be a focus of your efforts.

Handout was missing some information from the seminar and did not always follow the order the information was presented on the slides making it difficult to follow along.

Try to engage the audience a little more to keep them involved

General Comments

You really do a great job in making a difficult trial easy to understand, nice job.

Great job!

Great presentation style and interesting topic.

Overall great job. I left with some knowledge that I can use in my practice.

Great job!

Good job!

Great job!

Did a good job!

No additional comments. Great Job

NA

Nothing else at this time.

Pretty good overall presentation, but the handout really needs work. It is Pretty clear that he did not put in the same amount of work on this seminar as compared to most of the other students.

Great job overall. Very applicable topic. Appreciated a refresher on observational studies and how they can be used to help support or not support controversial issues.