**Presenter: Dobis, Dave** 

Seminar Date: 2013-11-14

#### **Presenter Scores**

| , ,  |                    |               |                  |       |      | ,,g                  |                |                    |                  |                  |       |      | Final Scores     |       |       |      |              |  |
|------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|-------|------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|-------|------|------------------|-------|-------|------|--------------|--|
|      | Inst.<br>Materials | Overall Pres. | Clinical<br>Data | Conc. | Q&A  | Overall<br>Knowledge | Pres.<br>Style | Inst.<br>Materials | Overall<br>Pres. | Clinical<br>Data | Conc. | Q&A  | Overall<br>Know. | Prep. | Prof. | Att. | Total        |  |
| 6.68 | 6.88               | 6.87          | 6.91             | 6.76  | 6.89 |                      | 6.63           |                    | 6.7              | 6.5              | 6.5   | 6.25 | 7                | 0     | 0     | 0    | E<br>(47.02) |  |

| P | resentation Style   |   |    |    |   |    |    |   |      |
|---|---|---|----|----|---|----|----|---|------|
| # | Question  | A | A- | B+ | В | B- | C+ | С | 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 | 1 | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 6    |
| 4 | Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience                | 2 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 7    |

## **Presentation Style Comments**

The pacing was appropriate. There was much slide looking and heavy use of the pointer at time which took you away from your audience. In the future, try to balance this with more interaction/looking at your audience. I saw that this did improve as the presentation progressed.

Nice work explaining a complex topid

| Ir | nstructional Materials   |   |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |      |
|----|--|---|----|----|---|----|----|---|----|------|
| #  | Question   | Α | A- | B+ | В | B- | C+ | С | 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)                  | 1 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 5    |
| 4  | Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature | 2 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 7    |

#### **Instructional Materials Comments**

Referencing was appropriate and the slides were easy to read. Almost no orientation to diagrams and graphs though which made it extremely hard to follow some of your studies. This was especially true when the line graphs used similar colors and you spent very little time on the slide.

.

| Overall Presentation Content   |   |    |    |   |    |    |   |      |
|--|---|----|----|---|----|----|---|------|
| # Question   | Α | A- | B+ | В | B- | C+ | С | Mean |
| 1 Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described        | 2 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 7    |
| 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                          | 2 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 7    |
| 5 Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow') | 1 | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 6    |

### **Overall Presentation Content Comments**

The overall presentation content was mostly appropriate. It may just have been me, but I struggled to fully understand the controversy and its place in the presentation. I think a little more description would have been helpful.

good outline of the issues in using finasteride relative to PC

| Presentation of Clinical Data |  |   |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |      |  |  |
|-------------------------------|--|---|----|----|---|----|----|---|----|------|--|--|
| #                             | Question   | Α | A- | B+ | В | B- | C+ | С | 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)                           | 1 | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 6.5  |  |  |
| 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**

The presentation of the clinical data was mostly appropriate. An area for improvement in this section would be to better state how the study leads back to the controversy and a better explanation of your thoughts on it.

this was a difficult area to discuss, as guidelines for use of finasteride are not clear, and most men will have potentially detectable PC by the time they die - sorting out how to ID the high grade cancers is critical

| C | conclusions   |   |    |    |   |    |    |   |      |
|---|---|---|----|----|---|----|----|---|------|
| # | Question  | Α | A- | B+ | В | B- | C+ | С | 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   | 1 | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 6    |
| 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**

I was still very confused on the applicability of the recommendation. It seems that all men should be on finasteride after the age of 40 years. Part of this confusion is my ignorance related to the disease state, but I would suggest a stronger introduction in future presentations to make sure your audience is able to follow.

good

| Q | uestion Answer Session                                 |   |    |    |   |    |    |   |      |
|---|--|---|----|----|---|----|----|---|------|
| # | Question   | Α | A- | B+ | В | B- | C+ | С | Mean |
| 1 | Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions | 1 | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 6    |
| 2 | Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience | 1 | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 6.5  |

#### **Question Answer Session Comments**

I think you knew the appropriate answer for each question, but just be careful not to ramble while answer. Don't "think out loud." Repeat the question, formulate your response, and then give a succinct answer.

you did a good god trying to answer audience questions. The high grade cancers are the ones we need to figure out how to detect better - the discussion about sampling prostate post-finasteride were difficult to answer, yet you did a good job acknowledging when you were at your knowledge limits

| Overall Knowledge Base |  |   |   |   |   |    |    |   |      |  |  |  |  |
|------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|------|--|--|--|--|
| #                      | Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar  Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance  Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results  Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research |   |   |   |   | B- | C+ | С | Mean |  |  |  |  |
| 1                      |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 7    |  |  |  |  |
| 2                      | -  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 7    |  |  |  |  |
| 3                      |  | 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**

Very knowledgable regarding the subject matter and it was evident that much research and time had been done to prepare for this presentation.

very good discussion of study vs clinical relevance

# **Overall Comments**

| Overall, | well | done | seminar. | Very | professional | and | appropriate |  |
|----------|------|------|----------|------|--------------|-----|-------------|--|
|          |      |      |          |      |              |     |             |  |

Good seminar!