Presenter: Efimova, Ekaterina

Seminar Date: 2014-03-20

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
6.96	6.9	6.96	6.88	6.93	6.94	6.92	6.63	6.88	6.7	6.2	6.63	6	6.7	0	0	0	E (46.86)

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Presentation Style Comments

Presentation style was very good: great eye contact, stood away from the podium, very poised and professional. Also, the material was presented at a good level for the audience. / / For next seminar, try speaking a bit slower.

She may slow down her pace with talk. It was a bit complex topic and the audience needed a time to digest.

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Instructional Materials Comments

Instruction materials were excellent: slides were well laid out with at the right amount of material and a good mix of bullet points and graphics; I didn't notice any spelling or grammatical errors; others' work was cited and referenced on the slide, though the font point size was not very legible.

N/A

Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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

Presentation Content was also very good. I especially liked how Katya described her personal interest (grandfather) and the ace in the sleeve vs. the cart before the horse analogy for the controversy. Objectives were well framed, but I don't recall Katya mentioning them at the beginning. Please remember to do so for your next seminar. Background info was appropriate and transition slides had good graphics.

It is not easy to properly present/analize Phase II study results of an oncology drugs due to the lack of control groups and small sample size, requiring more statistical methods to compare three different cases. However it seems beyond the capacity of student seminars and she did a good job in handling a difficult topic.

Presentation of Clinical Data

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Presented concise objectives, methodology and treatment for each study	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Outcome measures were stated and described, and appropriateness was explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.5
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5
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

Katya presented three clinical studies, each describing a different therapy for CLL. Although each study was internally consistent, the lack of literature comparing the different therapies made it hard to draw any global conclusions how to treat different subpopulations of CLL patients. Very few statistics (p-values or CI's) were presented, making it difficult to assess data quality. It's also unclear whether any of the studies were powered, making it hard to assess whether negative results were statistically significant or not.

N/A

Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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

Discussions of clinical importance, recommendations for pharmacy practice, and the role of the pharmacist were all well considered. / / Conclusions were well grounded in the results presented in the three studies, though lack of convincing statistics makes it hard to assess their validity.

N/A

Question Answer Session

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5.5

Question Answer Session Comments

Good Q & A session! / / For next seminar, try engaging the audience by quizzing them about a specific case study that you can come back to at the end of your seminar.

It is sugggested to take pauses a few times to invite questions and comments during her seminar.

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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 base as evidence by both your presentation and your answers to questions. / / I'd caution against making blanket statements that a given result is "clinically significant" if a 20% difference is observed or 20% of patients respond. Clinical significance is often defined differently with different diseases. Generally, a result needs to be statistically significant in a well-powered study before it can be evaluated for clinical significance.

N/A

Overall Comments

Very interesting, informative seminar!

Due to the reasons of experimental oncology drugs commented before, the topic was challenging for audience to grade a significant part of items in the evaluation form. However, she did a good job in overall and I like to appraude her effort on this challenging topic.