

Presenter: Zang, Bin

Seminar Date: 2014-04-15

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
6.89	6.66	6.87	6.93	6.91	6.63	6.97	6.75	6.63	6.7	6.33	6.63	6.25	6.9	0	0	0	E (47.02)

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Presentation Style Comments

Good job of targetting background to audience level.

Excellent background to help the audience understand antibody therapy

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Instructional Materials Comments

Slides were really well done and readable. The handout had the slides printed in the back which everyone appreciated. Bin referred the audience to the handout appropriately. There probably should have been more references included on slides, but really critical ones were there.

No additional comments

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	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')	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Overall Presentation Content Comments

Well done overall. Lots of good things. The controversy was presented early and clearly. Many things highlighted in the background were essential for understanding the studies. Probably should have included Rituximab in the title. The Objectives were mis-worded. The objectives are the objectives for the audience. The should all be able to read "at the end of this seminar you should be able to ..." Also they all should be measurable or testable. So things like "review" or "evaluate" are not correct for objectives whereas "describe" and "list" are.

No additional comments

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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)	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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

Bin did a good job of highlighting key results. Provided an good analysis strengths and limitations.

The exclusion criteria were not completely clear and would have benefited from additional explantion

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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

Conclusions from studies were well justified. Overall firm conclusion for the inclusion of the anti-CD20 therapies was appreciated.

No additional comments

Question Answer Session									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	0	2	0	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

Answered the questions very well. Just got a little carried away at the end and went a little long. Really showed himself to be an expert in the area.

Most answers were good, but some could have been more concise

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	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

Overall knowledge base was impressive. Really was able to discuss different aspects of the material.

Apparent depth in knowledge.

Overall Comments

Excellent job

Excellent presentation that was well prepared.