

Presenter: Kastendieck, Diana

Seminar Date: 2014-03-26

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	6.89	6.95	6.96	6.9	6.98	6.98	6.75	6.75	6.7	6.67	6.75	7	6.7	0	0	0	E (47.57)

Presentation Style

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

Presentation Style Comments

Diana due to positioning at podium, you had to look behind you a lot. Position compute so you can look in front of you instead. / Good energy and excited about topic, confident.

outstanding professionalism and compassion

Instructional Materials										
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6

Instructional Materials Comments

Nice use of bolding/squares to help us key in on important information / Very personal introduction to seminar, caught our attention and made us engaged / Consider using more abbreviated citations in the future on slides

outstanding job

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
4	Appropriate background information was provided	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Overall Presentation Content Comments

Would have liked to see more focus on probiotics themselves in objectives (vs NEC) since this was key to controversy and clinical question / Went a little long on background, while thorough and very knowledgeable, how could that be streamlined since we don't need a full review of disease state but basics to interpret and understand data you are presenting

understood limitations of the background, and explained clearly the limits of current knowledge

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Would have like to see more safety data (or discussion of lack of it in peds!) included in presentation. I think it's hard to draw any conclusions about medications without assessing: efficacy, safety and cost - probably the three most important considerations for drug therapy selection. This could have been in background or presented after other data and discussion of sepsis findings in studies.

the only concern was with the quality of the trial data, severely limited by diagnosis, arbitrary choice of "treatment", and lack of control population of healthy neonates not in a NICU environment

Conclusions									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Conclusions Comments

I like that you engaged audience in drawing conclusions at end of presentation.

Recommendations virtually impossible based on limited clinical data as mentioned in previous comment

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

Would have like dyou to have more explanation for why you picked the two studies then you did (ie. US studies). You might have commented on these being largest studies or most well designed studies, using probiotics commercially available in US, etc. A study just being done in another country isn't enough to say its not applicable. we have lots of landmark trials we use that were conducted outside the US.

great job

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	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

Again more familiarity with safety data would have been helpful since this was the key to why you were concerned about recommending, although some (albeit poor) data supporting. / I would also highly encourage you to have an understanding of what is being done in current practice. What do they do at PCMC? How about at the U? Nationwide, what are recs?

Translating the understanding of clinical significance to actions as a pharmacist was a very minor weak link

Overall Comments

Overall good job. Healthy level of skepticism about this topic and felt you did a nice job reviewing the evidence. Next time, include more safety data, give us context for the studies you choose to present in detail, and would make some minor adjustments to format of slides. Great presentation style!

To get meaningful data, clinical design is key. Think about how to design clinical trials to answer the unanswered questions you had as a mother and as a pharmacist.