Presenter: Cardoza, Christopher

Seminar Date: 2013-11-13

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	6.86	6.94	6.92	6.91	6.97	6.96	6.25	6.25	6.2	6.58	6.5	6.75	6.3	0	0	0	E (46.73)

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

Presentation Style Comments

Fairly quick pace, slow down. You were looking behind you throughout presentation, position podium computer in a way that you can see it and the audience without having to look behind you.

Provided a good introduction and overview of the topic and the rationale for the interest in the topic. / / The pace was a bit fast.

Instructional Materials

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Instructional Materials Comments

I like that you came back to your objectives throughout the presentation - this was helpful and made sure everyone was following you. Consider using abbreviated citations on slides ie. Cardoza et al. JAMA 2005: 14(3): 135-139. That's enough to pull a study you are interested in but won't junk up your slides with lots of words. I would also work on standardizing how information is presented on each slide, somewhat inconsistent. Some overuse of pointer during presentation was distracting - if cats were in the audience would be going crazy :)

Provided good "hints" in "red" as to what the audience should keep in mind in evaluating the information. / / Great comparison of Breo vs Advair on the slide - easy to evaluate the difference.

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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
4	Appropriate background information was provided	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6

Overall Presentation Content Comments

Perhaps a bit much background information - you ran over on time and I think this was part of the issue. Keep working on slow transitions, take a pause between slides and think about how you can smoothly go from one topic to the next ahead of time. Using your objectives to help summarize periodically can help with this.

Exccellent job in describing the purpose and controversy and provded great background information. There were a lot of internal summaries and good transitions. Also did a good job in involving the audience. Would have liked to see an objective that the presenter was going to evaluate clinical study information regarding Breo.

Presentation of Clinical Data

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Great discussion of studies strengths and limitations, helpful for interpreting the studies. Don't forget to help us interpret doses - not everyone may be familiar with medium dose vs. high dose - so help spell that out for us so we can interpret studies better.

The student did a great job of analyzing power and looking at the shortcomings of the first study by Oliver et al. Also did a nice job of highlighting confounding and external validity issues with the first study. Very nice job of evaluating the second study and looking at confounding issues and comparing the products used.

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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

Would have liked to see some discussion of what to do in different practice settings. Might have been nice to provide specific recs for what you would tell a provider about prescribing this drug for asthma (ie. like some mention of negatives like insurance unlikely to cover, minimal clinical evidence supporting, no FDA approval,etc.).

Good job in overall conclusions as far as loosking FF alone and FF/VI 100/25 and looking at how the product should be used in practice. However, the presenter also stated that more studies should assess patient satisfaction/adherence and financial constraints in the use of the product. Really nice job in outlining role of pharmacist in asthma management.

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Question Answer Session Comments

Good confidence with answering questions at the end. Would have liked a little more information about why they did not seek approval for asthma yet and why they did not start by approving an inhaler with just the ICS component first?

One of the best parts of this presentation was audience involvement and "giving hints" to the audience as to what to look for as the studies were being presented and evaluated. The student did allow great interaction with the audience but it made it hard to stay within the time constraints. /

Overall Knowledge Base

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

Good understanding of current asthma therapy - would have liked more information about potential role in the future in asthma care.

Excellent knowledge of the subject and demonstrated that in the evaluation of studies and also in answering questions. Was very good at "thinking on his feet."

Overall Comments

Overall, good job Chris! I would encourage you to make suggested changes to your presentation now and this could make a nice presentation for a job or residency interview if needed in the near future. Watch the time carefully as you did run over a bit.

Very good seminar - I feel like I learned a lot! Thank you for this seminar presentation.