

## Presenter: Smart, Adam

Seminar Date: 2013-11-13

### 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
6.96	6.87	6.94	6.66	6.69	6.85	6.78	6.5	6.25	5.5	3.27	3.88	6	4.5	0	0	0	E (44.61)

Presentation Style									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
2	Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6

### Presentation Style Comments

Pacing was appropriate and mostly displayed professionalism throughout the presentation. The speaker lacked distracting mannerisms.

VERY easy to follow presentation. Pace was conversational, but perhaps a bit slow--particularly in the background section. See additional comment sections for more feedback on presenting material that is appropriate for the audience.

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6

### Instructional Materials Comments

The largest area in need of improvement in this section was orienting the audience to graphs/diagrams used in the presentation. It was often very difficult to follow the presentation, especially during the meta-analysis, but of this lack of orientation.

References were too small to project well for the audience to read. I don't often feel that the slides have too little information on them, but in this case, that may have been true. There wasn't a very in-depth discussion of some important aspects of the studies presented.

## Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
2	Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
4	Appropriate background information was provided	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	4.5

## Overall Presentation Content Comments

I found the clinical controversy quite weak and one that does not directly apply to practice. This led to difficulty during the seminar, because it was difficult to "prove your case." The flow was also a bit rough at times making it hard to follow the presentation.

The background was appropriately short. Would have liked more in-depth and analytical discussion of studies presented. I feel that one objective should have related to communicating with patients or providers the risk of insulin contributing to increased cancer rates. I also think that should have been included as part of the pharmacists' role.

## Presentation of Clinical Data

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Presented concise objectives, methodology and treatment for each study	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
2	Outcome measures were stated and described, and appropriateness was explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3.5
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.5

## Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Overall, I found this the weakest part of the presentation. The inability of the speaker to properly present the trials, better orient the audience to the meta-analysis, properly assess the statistics used in the presentation and relate this back to the overall controversy led to lower marks in this section. The ability to better present this section also made it difficult to follow the presentation.

Not a lot of specific and in-depth discussion of strengths and limitations of the data presented. When you were asked questions, you seemed to know a lot more about the weaknesses of the data you were presenting than you told us about in the presentation. Talk about things like the average length of follow-up and the potential sources of bias in the individual studies included in the meta-analysis when you talk about the data. They were key pieces of information for assessing the applicability of your data. // The meaning of "suggestive results" not clear in the second study presented. Be more specific about your conclusions. // I also would have liked more information about the Origin Trial, since that study had a 5 year follow-up. What was the N?

## Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3.5
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	5

## Conclusions Comments

Unsure of overall recommendation as none was stated until the Q&A period. When presented, the speaker inappropriately assess the data and therefore provided a weak recommendation for practice. In future presentations, more thought needs to be given to the data and its place in "proving the point."

Conclusions were supported by the data presented, but missing was the final strong statement to the effect of, "based on this data (then summarize that points in the data that are important) I recommend....." Again, including a short summary of what a pharmacist should say when asked if there is a risk of cancer associated with insulin would have been helpful and appropriate for this seminar topic.

Question Answer Session									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	5
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

### Question Answer Session Comments

The Q&A was appropriate. Interaction was encouraged from the audience.

Answered questions. Ideally, would have been able to talk a bit more about the studies that were included in the meta-analysis.

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	5
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	4.5

### Overall Knowledge Base Comments

The lack of solid conclusions with this presentation did not allow the speaker to demonstrate his full knowledge base. What was observed did not indicate a full understanding of the topic.

Overall knowledge base appeared adequate.

## Overall Comments

Overall, I think there are many areas for improvement with this presentation. The speaker was unable to adequately assess the data and reach a full conclusion. During the Q&A session, the speaker was able to finally provide a recommendation for practice. In future presentations, I encourage the speaker to more clearly state the controversy as well as the conclusion for the seminar. Regardless of where the conclusion is stated, it needs to be clearly stated.

Very nice presentation style. Area to work on is addressing in-depth the strengths and limitations of the data presented and finishing with a strong conclusion.