

# Presenter: Allen, Paul

Seminar Date: 2013-12-03

## 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
6.82	6.94	6.9	6.94	6.83	6.95	6.94	6.75	6.63	6.8	6.58	6.25	7	6.6	0	0	0	E (47.16)

Presentation Style									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	15	6	0	0	0	0	0	6.71
2	Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	18	2	1	0	0	0	0	6.81
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	19	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.9
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	19	1	1	0	0	0	0	6.86

## Presentation Style Comments

Good eye contact. Pace could be faster for the background. You didn't rely on notes which was good

Overall good flow, you could have maybe cutback on the background info.

The material he presented was great and really useful for students. He had thorough eye contact with the audience and relied less on the notes.

He was well composed throughout, the only flaw I saw with the presentation style was that he spent a good amount of time behind the podium.

Pace was good, but it went a bit long

Good flow and interaction

Pace was moderate and easily to follow. At times, too much elaboration of certain points was provided.

Paul seemed very comfortable while he was presenting and didn't have any distracting mannerisms.

I liked your presenting style, it sounded very natural.

A little slow with the pace and at the beginning looked back a lot at the slides and had back to the audience a couple of times.

It was a little slow at times but he was very professional throughout

Seminarian was very professional and presented at a great pace throughout.

More eye contact and relying less on your notes would have made you seem more confident in the material

Pace was a little slow. Paul did an excellent job of handling a very distracting classroom though.

Paul did a wonderful job pacing his presentation. His voice inflections and tone kept our attention and provided appropriate emphasis throughout.

You kept good eye contact with audience and minimal note usage

Very good pace with no distracting mannerisms

Very professional speaker, went at a smooth pace, and information presented was well presented and appropriate for audience

Very poised and confident. You are a great public speaker

Good pace. Maybe slightly slow, but that didn't distract the audience. Minimal reliance on notes. Material was presented at an appropriate level for the audience.

Paul's presentation style is natural and in great control of pace. He has maintained eye contact and always directed his audience attention to the topic.

## Instructional Materials

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Slides and handout are devoid of spelling and grammatical errors	18	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.86
3	Provided orientation to charts/graphs/pictures/diagrams (if applicable)	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.95

## Instructional Materials Comments

Everything was easy to read

Good visuals when used.

He used primary literature and his graphs and charts were useful in understanding the concept.

I thought he did a good job in these factors. There were a few instances where the slides were more detailed than the handout and given that the handout is something to hold on to to reference I would have preferred it the other way around. However, this is a personal preference so not something I would hold against him.

Slides and handouts were clear

The handout was complete and well prepared

Materials were clear and straightforward.

I noticed a few errors on his handout, but overall, his handout and his slides were clear and easy to read.

Slides and handout were easy to follow. Great job here

Had a mistype between the slides and the handout with study 1 results.

He could have had a few more charts and pictures to make it more accessible to the audience

The handout was well organized and easy to follow.

The slides and handouts lined up perfectly. I liked that you told us where we could find the tables from the slides in our handouts.

Parallel structure is important and while it wasn't a huge deal, the phrase "intention-to-screen" was listed two different ways. You need to just pick a way to phrase it and stick with it.

The slides were well organized and succinct, and the handout reflected the important content of the presentation.

handout was extensive but easy to follow

Handout was very easy to follow along with his presentation and helped to clarify things

Slides were clean and devoid of errors

Slides and handout were clear and easy to follow

Slides and handout were easy to follow. Great orientation to graphs and pictures. Everything was well cited.

Slides are very easy to follow; handout gives more detailed information about certain points that slides have no space to cover. This made audience more likely/easily to follow along with his presentation.

## Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	19	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.9
2	Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	6.9
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	19	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.9
4	Appropriate background information was provided	17	4	0	0	0	0	0	6.81
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95

## Overall Presentation Content Comments

The objectives were met

Good job at not being distracted by people coming in and out.

It was a well organized presentation. I believe a little more information on the background could have been helpful in understanding the subject better.

He clearly laid out the controversy, which is something that I had personally contemplated when learning about prostate screening, I really liked how he addressed it and answered some of my internal questions from the past.

Background was a bit long, but great presentation

organized and articulated arguments for controversy and slides

Include more information about the morbidity associated with biopsy based on false positive PSA result; or morbidity associated with localized prostate cancer treatment for treatment of low-stage (low-mortality) prostate cancer. This would help by highlighting why PSA screening (and subsequent over-detection) of low-grade prostate cancer is controversial.

Paul provided the audience with good background information, however, his background section during his lecture was a bit long. He probably could have cut down on the background information and saved a bit more time for the question and answer section.

I did learn a lot here and in addition to my cancer module from therapeutic. Very thorough and it shows your interest in the topic.

Could have shortened up the background a bit to make the presentation shorter since it went a bit long. Interesting topic though with current controversy about PSA testing.

I liked how he had a specific picture to identify an objective slide.

The background was a little long, but needed for understanding of the topic.

I liked that the testosterone structure was used to tell us you were covering an objective.

Too much focus was put on background information. It could have been further simplified without taking away from the overall presentation.

Paul explained thoroughly his interest in the topic and provided an excellent background on the use of PSA and the controversy regarding the topic.

I liked how there were multiple controversies included into one.

Overall presentation was very smooth and flowed well together in an organized manner

Good background information, maybe a little too much but seminarian knew material very well

Very smooth presentation

Clearly defined interest and controversy. Objectives were clear and the appropriate background information was provided.

I like very much about the great transitions he gave before each section; even the objectives, he patiently explained to the audience what he would like to achieve at the end of the presentation.

## Presentation of Clinical Data

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Presented concise objectives, methodology and treatment for each study	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Outcome measures were stated and described, and appropriateness was explained	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	6.95
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	19	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.9
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6.81

## Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Your statistical analysis was good and you provided your own interpretation of the data

It would have been nice to know the cost of the test to compare to other tests and treatments.

He presented the outcomes and key trial results really well. In the handouts he stated study length as strength and limitation for both of his studies and I believe more clarification could have been more helpful in understanding limitations and strengths.

One aspect I really liked was when he discussed the limitations and the amount of contamination. I had initially thought that the "contamination" would have been due to another factor so I am glad he spent the time to thoroughly explain when he could have easily just stated that contamination was an issue and left it at that.

Presented data clearly and in detail

The values and measurements well explained

You quickly dismissed the conclusion of the second study (that showed no benefit of PSA screening). More time should have been spend on this foundational part of your seminar.

Paul did a good job explaining strengths and limitations of his studies.

Did a great job here in explaining the data and giving your own input on whether to recommended screening.

Could have gone into more detail about why statistical test was appropriate or not and would have liked more pictures/charts/graphs included in the presentation.

I liked how he included strengths and weaknesses on the same slides.

The seminar covered all the objectives.

The studies were easy to understand because of the way you explained each detail. The data was presented very well in the handout as well. It was clear and concise.

Studies were well presented.

Paul addressed each of the statistical measures concisely in his presentation and brought up important strengths and limitations that were key to his conclusions.

good explanation of risks and inclusion discussion

Studies were analyzed very well and he was able to explain the strengths and weaknesses of each

Student was able to differentiate between the two studies based on inclusion criteria and statistical analysis

Maybe just explain why the statistical tests used were or were not appropriate

Great discussion of the studies. Presenter had a thorough discussion of his analysis. Presenter thoughtfully listed the strengths and limitations of the studies.

All strengths and limitations of two articles are well presented; primary and secondary outcomes are appropriate.



## Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	6.76
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	19	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.9
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	19	1	1	0	0	0	0	6.86
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	17	4	0	0	0	0	0	6.81

## Conclusions Comments

I liked that you let the audience decide what to conclude from the data

Good job at hitting the pharmacist role.

He had specific recommendations for the pharmacists and he pointed out the important things we need to know and be familiar with as pharmacists. His conclusions were supported well by data he presented in the seminar.

He did provide rationale for his conclusion. This is a tough spot given that there is so much controversy on this topic. But when questioned further on his conclusion he was able to back up his position and also relay the message on a personal level that I thought would be a great approach when speaking with patients.

Great recommendations.

I think it needed a little more emphasis on a specific position. At the same time you let the audience make their own opinion of the evidence

I had a hard time accepting your conclusion that PSA was beneficial when two large well-designed studies on the subject had two different conclusions.

He did a good job drawing appropriate conclusions from the evidence in his studies.

Your conclusion here were great. Also I like to mention I like the way you answered question.

I really liked the conclusion comparison slide, which allowed us to see where you agreed and differed with the authors and showed that you came up with your own conclusions.

He could have included a little more support for why he recommends testing. His argument in support of testing was about the "importance of a life." This is true but I think he could have supported it more with objective evidence.

The seminarian made a great conclusion, and left the audience with an option to make their own conclusions.

I liked that you developed your own conclusion, it had more detail and was more patient oriented when compared to the authors' conclusion.

I wasn't entirely clear about his recommendations for pharmacists. They could have been more clear.

I really appreciated that Paul stressed the importance of pharmacist's educating patients so they can then contribute their wishes in the care provided.

I would like more on what a pharmacist could do.

His conclusion and our role as pharmacists was very clear and provided a detailed response on what we should do in the event a patient asks us about it

Conclusions were well thought out and were based on seminarian did a good job drawing his own conclusions based on the evidence of the two studies.

I thought your conclusions were well thought out and you did a good job of explaining why you did or didn't agree with the author's conclusions.

Conclusions were based on the available data. Presenter provided recommendations on clinical practice.

All the above areas are covered and conclusions restate the presentation objectives.

Question Answer Session									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95

### Question Answer Session Comments

You showed your knowledge when answering the audience questions

Great at answering questions and forming your own conclusions.

I liked how he answered the audience questions and he had a really good knowledge on the subject which helped him answer the questions presented by the audience.

He did receive some rather difficult questions from students and faculty, but he held his own well and displayed his knowledge on the subject and was able to think on the spot when others may have been blown aback by such questions that required thorough contemplation in a very small amount of time.

Excellent job with questions!!! You did great and you were confident

Bullet-proof when answering questions, good job

Questions were handled well.

Paul did a good job answering questions.

You did an excellent job here

Great question and answer section, you were well prepared for questions.

He did an EXCELLENT job answering audience questions appropriately. I especially liked the diagram he drew on the whiteboard to explain a bias question.

Answered the questions thoroughly with pictures.

Each question was answered with confidence and that showed that you were well prepared and had done your work.

Handled questions well.

Paul confidently answered each question posed by the audience.

Great job keeping the audience involved with all the outside distractions of people in and out.

Answered some very hard questions with ease and clearly knew a lot on his topic

Seminarian did a great job answering questions.

Answered questions very well. it was very helpful how you used the white board when explaining some of your answers to get your point across more clearly.

Presenter thoroughly answered all questions asked.

At the end of each section, Paul encourages audience to ask question; he further provides the clear answers.

## Overall Knowledge Base

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	19	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.9
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	18	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.86
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

## Overall Knowledge Base Comments

You made your conclusions based on the data and had a good knowledge base

You researched and knew the subject well.

His knowledge on the subject was great and that was noticeable from the answers he was providing to different questions. He knew a lot about the clinical and statistical significance.

My previous answer would have been possibly more fitting here. However, when questions were posed he showed not only good knowledge on the subject at hand, but was also able to think on the spot before answering when posed difficult questions. This truly displayed his background knowledge.

Great job thinking on your feet!

Paul demonstrated proficiency in the topic knowledge when answering questions

Paul knew the subject material.

He seemed prepared and knowledgeable about his topic because he was able to answer questions from the audience.

From how you answered questions in class, I can tell you have a thorough understanding of the subject.

Strong overall knowledge base and were able to come up with your own conclusions and recommendations from the studies which was great.

He demonstrated thorough knowledge beyond the subject through his response to questions.

The seminarian demonstrated knowledge by answer the questions beyond the presentation.

You were asked many questions and answered them thoroughly. Even when you did not know the answer I felt like you were able to think on your feet and theorize. Again, I think this was due to your

knowledge of the material and the research you put into it.

More comparison to current recommendations would have been great.

Paul demonstrated great knowledge of the topic with his responses to questions and background info in the presentation.

You showed you were very knowledgeable in the subject

He was able to answer a lot of difficult questions, demonstrating a very strong overall knowledge base

Student knew subject in great detail

You were able to answer every question asked, even when it was not directly related to your topic. Very knowledgeable in the entire area of the prostate cancer in general. You were also able to give supporting information for your answers and conclusion.

Clear demonstration of knowledge. Clearly related the information to pharmaceutical/clinical practice.

I extremely like that Paul is able to think on his feet and discusses some controversial topics with audience and faculty members.

## Provide one comment on what you liked about this seminar

I liked that everything was well-written and easy to read

It was an interesting and applicable topic that we could put to use right away.

I liked the pharmacist role he presented during the seminar and what was necessary for us to know as pharmacists in the future to aid the patients. He did an amazing job analyzing the studies.

He did a great job of fielding difficult questions. One thing I liked more though was that he explained some aspects that may have been glossed over in other presentations, such as the limitation of contamination and what it truly was, that really added to what the audience would learn from the presentation.

Great job overall, you knew your data and were very confident

I liked that the topic was a diagnostics topic that is from general interest

Interesting and controversial topic with big implications.

I really like that Paul selected a topic that tied in with his topic from last semester. Good idea!

You are a natural presenter

I liked how you made your own conclusions and had a clear recommendation in regards to PSA screening.

I thought he was very well prepared and an excellent public speaker.

The seminarian was very comfortable with the topic and presentation. This enhance the flow of the entire seminar.

Your confidence and understanding of the material could be seen throughout the entire presentation. The way you approached and answered each question was done in a professional manner.

We were all very distracted and he didn't miss a beat and kept the audience's attention the best he could.

I really liked the poised and confident manner of the presenter.

Great job keeping your composure with all the distractions in the room most people would get flustered.

It was a very interesting topic with a clear and easy-to-read handout

Very professional presentation style

You did a great job keeping eye contact with the audience and being confident in your presentation and

conclusions. You gave a good explanation for your own conclusions and looked at the study's strengths and weaknesses to come to the conclusions. Did not just agree with and copy the author's conclusions.

Great job answering questions. There was no hesitation and the presenter displayed a high level of confidence.

The best of all, Paul arranges the presentation in a great way that every one can follow with him and learn something new from his presentation.

## **Provide one comment on what could be improved about this seminar**

Just shorten the background section a little

Less time spent on background information.

Having a little more background information in the future presentations is the area that can be improved.

The main area for improvement would be to have more of a presence in front of the audience, easier said than done, but I felt he knew his material and the presentation could have benefitted from him being out directly in front of the audience more rather than behind the podium at times.

Speed up a little on background information

More diagrams

I didn't fully buy into your conclusion about PSA being beneficial. However, THIS IS a controversial topic.

His seminar was a little too long. It probably could have been cut down a little bit to fit the appropriate time frame.

Great job , perhaps more tables.

Could have included some more pictures/charts/graphs to break up some of the text.

He could have sped it up at times.

There were not a lot of room for improvement except for more visuals to keep the audience engaged.

More eye contact would have been better and less background for the sake of time would have helped as well.

Relevant and MOST important background information would have been great.

Maybe a few more visuals in the slides, but excellently done!

Come prepared with papers



Maybe cut down on the length of time spent on giving us background information

Involve the audience a little more

Talk about statistical tests used and if they were appropriate or not.

Maybe take less time discussing the background, as it took the majority of the presenter's seminar time.

He may consider to study another article rather than to choose the 2nd study with "contaminated" result.

## General Comments

Congratulations on your last seminar!

Overall good job.

He had a great knowledge on the subject and he even addressed the downsides of consequences of PSA which may lead to potential misdiagnosis. Overall, great presentation!

He did a very good job. I was impressed with his knowledge base and how he took the time to explain what he was presenting and the details of the presentation/studies.

Great job!

Great job

Well put together and organized.

Good job Paul!

Great job

Overall great seminar and you demonstrated that you had a strong knowledge base especially during your question and answer section.

Overall, I think Paul did an excellent job and his seminar was really interesting. Well done!

Overall, the seminarian did a great job and demonstrated knowledge of the topic.

Overall, amazing job! I really liked this subject matter and I thought it was presented at a level that everyone could understand and comprehend.

Overall, a well done presentation.

Great job preparing and executing your seminar! Perfect pace, tone and pauses for questions.

I enjoyed the PSA topic

Overall very good topic and presentation that was very informative for something that we likely will be asked about in the future

Great job overall!

great job!

Overall, a great presentation. I have learned a lot.

PSA screening in early detection of prostate cancer is a controversial topic; Paul chooses this challenge, analyse two articles and provides his understanding about it. At the end, I know that I have learned something new (such as KLK3 gene, etc) from his presentation, I really enjoy it.