

Presenter: Lemaster, Brooke

Seminar Date: 2013-11-20

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
6.99	6.99	6.95	6.96	6.93	7	6.95	6.38	6.75	6.5	6.08	6.13	6.5	6.7	0	0	0	E (46.64)

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6

Presentation Style Comments

Nice pace. Eye contact good - with occasional looks back to the slides. Professional and generally poised- although appeared a bit timid.

Very nice presentation style. Presentation was well practiced. The inclusion of the patient case was a great unifying theme. Material wasn't inappropriate for the level of the audience, but I felt that the background was long. It took up almost half of your slides!

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Instructional Materials Comments

Handout was very neat and well organized. Used bolding and bullets to organize material. Nice use of appendices. A few of the slides (strengths/weaknesses) had more text than you needed. Consider separate slides for strengths and weaknesses.

Instructional materials were nice. I liked the bolding of words that you wanted to draw our attention to.

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
4	Appropriate background information was provided	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Overall Presentation Content Comments

Introduction drew my interest. Made it relevant based on your experience. Objectives were clear. I liked the use of the case as a transition with the opportunity to get audience feedback, act as an internal summary and engage for understanding.

Again, less background would have provided more time to discuss your data in-depth. Objectives were some of the most practical and useful I've seen this semester. The case really helped with flow. I was a little confused when you initially discussed that first study in your background (the Kiefer study). After I saw the studies you presented for varenicline, I understood why you had included it. Providing more information about why we needed to look at how this other study was carried out would have helped a bit with flow. It also would have foreshadowed some of the difficulties we encountered in the varenicline data.

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.5
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)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
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

I don't recall your conclusions for the first study - just the second. I think would have been helpful to discuss the methods a bit more - about the scales, their validation, etc

The discussion of the clinical data was good, but I felt we really missed some detail. It takes a lot of work, but when you're presenting a topic where there are pretty subjective primary outcomes, it makes all the difference if you go the extra mile to find out--and then explain to your audience--the value of the scales (such as the cravings scale) used, whether or not the scales are validated, and what the clinical significance is of any change observed on them. A more clear discussion of the types of outcomes utilized by the FDA-approved products to gain approval might also provide some context for the outcomes we saw in the varenicline study. // I also would recommend making comments about the appropriateness of methods and significance of outcomes as you go throughout the presentation. It helps build to the conclusions.

Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
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

Overall the data aren't terribly strong and there are obviously lots of concerns - making it difficult to identify its role. Despite that - I think your conclusions were appropriate based on the data you provided. I liked that you included reporting to medwatch as a role of the pharmacist

Conclusions were very good. To make them stronger, I would be more clear about stating that we have no data that this drug induces abstinence. I also would have included in conclusions the recommendation that you basically made earlier in the presentation that varenicline can be used in stable psychiatric illness. /

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6

Question Answer Session Comments

Did a nice job with questions at the end. YOu engaged the students throughout using the case - that helped to draw out the students, gage their understanding and provide an opportunity for questions

Answered questions well. Since you weren't stopping during the presentation for questions, might have asked the audience at the beginning to hold all questions to the end or let people know they were welcome to ask questions along the way.

Overall Knowledge Base									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5
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

Good knowledge on the topic. In her introduction discussed the downsides of the current therapies to allow us to put into perspective varenicline. She was able to think on her feet regarding role in therapy at the end and I thought had a strong response

It appeared that you know a lot about this topic.

Overall Comments

Overall I thought Brooke did a nice job. She had attention to detail with a very nicely organized handout and slides. She provided a strong introduction to the topic that drew me in. She presented the studies in a clear and concise manner and didn't overstep her conclusions. I learned something from the seminar.

Good seminar presentation. One area for improvement would be the inclusion of more detailed methods and additional insight into the clinical significance of the results.