

Presenter: Isham, Michael

Seminar Date: 2014-04-17

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
6.75	6.67	6.77	6.83	6.77	6.93	6.77	6.38	6.5	6.9	6.82	6.88	6.75	6.9	0	0	0	E (47.52)

Presentation Style									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.93
2	Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	13	1	1	0	0	0	0	6.8
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	11	3	0	0	0	0	1	6.4
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.87

Presentation Style Comments

Very confident and maintained a great pace. I saw no nervousness even though you were late. Great job in controlling your nerves.

Good presentation style and great pace.

He presented at a moderate pace, was professional, and the material was presented at an appropriate level. He spoke a bit too quietly to hear.

Try not to turn your back on the audience

Pace was excellent and took the time to explain things as they appeared in his presentation

Very professional with minimal reliance on notes.

Seemed to rely heavily on looking at the slides

Your style and pace was good.

You were confident in your presentation style and it was apparent you had practiced it thoroughly

Good presentation style overall, only minimally distracting mannerisms.

Very nice presentation, very professional

Good eye contact. Used "so" as a transition a lot, which is a weak way to transition (estimated about

10-15 times prior to getting to studies, and 5 times after that). Also, said "we know that..." a lot, which is also not good to say in a presentation where some of the audience may not know that. Better to just state the info rather than giving it that lead in.

Good pace and eye contact with audience. Felt like the material presented was appropriate for the audience, but was missing an emphasis on defining the controversy.

Well paced and confident in your presentation

Good pace and eye contact.

Instructional Materials

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	12	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.73
2	Slides and handout are devoid of spelling and grammatical errors	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.87
3	Provided orientation to charts/graphs/pictures/diagrams (if applicable)	7	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	6.27
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.8

Instructional Materials Comments

I thought the handout was well put together and flowed very well with your presentation.

Slides were good and easy to read. Good font size. In both the slides and handout, the citations were not correctly placed at the end of the sentences. The numbers are supposed to be after the punctuation.

The slides and handout were easy to read, though I wished his handout contained more information that was in his slides. He provided orientation to graphs.

Orient audience to graphs before pointing out data on the graphs

Great to the point handout. Only room for improvement would be to cut the one slide with multiple graphs on it up into multiple slides or just focus on one aspect of it.

It would have been helpful if your handout went along a little bit more with the handout for the background section. I felt like I had to flip around a lot during the presentation, but it had a lot of great information. I liked how you used graphs to show the results. Great job explaining them.

Several of the slides were very busy and crowded with graphs. Didn't orientate to the graphs very well.

There were a lot of graphs and this can be a good thing but you did really give enough good info to know what the graphs were saying. Pointing out the scale, units etc is really important.

The slide with the all the graphs was a bit confusing because there were so many, but all the other instructional materials were good. I liked the bullet points on the handout.

The slides were easy to read and looked nice, easy to follow.

Good materials, nice handout with good background.

Handout and slides were clear. Two slides had a huge amount of graphs, but only a few were pointed out. It would've been better to just include the ones discussed.

Clean slides and handout. Few punctuation errors regarding citations (citations come after punctuation). A few slides where it would have been helpful to have had more orientation to the graphs.

Graph slide was busy. Consider bulletin points as well to break up large amounts of text

Noticed a few typos

Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.93
2	Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	6.73
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	12	2	1	0	0	0	0	6.73
4	Appropriate background information was provided	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	6.67
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.8

Overall Presentation Content Comments

Your presentation answering many questions that I had concerning the new guidelines, great job.

The controversy could have been more clear if you would have compared the old guidelines to the new ones, but otherwise well done.

He explained his interest in the topic well, defined the controversy, and appropriate background was provided. He had smooth transitions.

I would have liked to see more background on the old guidelines to help solidify the controversy. Also I don't think the third and fourth objectives was really addressed adequately in the seminar.

Controversy set up could have been improved. What about the new guidelines is different from the old ones?

I liked how you used a case to present the controversy of the topic. I think it would have been interesting to give more background on the new guidelines vs the old guidelines, but I realize time is sometimes a constraint with the background info

Could have provided more background between the old guideline and the new guideline

Presentation of the content was fine. A little more background on the controversy would have been nice.

Good topic, I had actually just talked about the new guidelines with a co-worker a few hours prior to your seminar.

Overall content was appropriate, nothing huge missing, and nothing unnecessarily added.

I was happy to see this wrap-up especially since we get so many patients on multiple therapies and no one is actively pulling these other drugs off.

Intro was sufficient, but could have had more info on the new guidelines. It would've helped with flow and with strengthening the controversy by spelling out how the guidelines changed, instead of assuming we know. I seriously had a hard time seeing how this was a controversy. It didn't help that there was neither a controversy slide nor section in the handout, spelling out the "controversy." Flow was hindered from the jump from background to studies. Also, mispronounced "fibrates" the ENTIRE

seminar. Know how to correctly pronounce something if you're going to mention it! The last objective was not even addressed in this seminar.

Great introduction. Felt like the controversy needed to be address a little better and set up. Had an extra objective on handout--statin intolerant patients. Transitions in presentation was generally smooth and logical.

Consider more background on the change in guidelines and why it is controversial

Good flow of 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	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.93
2	Outcome measures were stated and described, and appropriateness was explained	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.8
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.87
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.8
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	11	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	6.71
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.87

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Your trials were large and applicable to your subject. I really liked how you explained the trials and the end points they used.

Great job explaining the important points from each study.

Explained the trials clearly and effectively, spoke about the strengths and weaknesses, and addressed power.

All well done here, but the slide you had all those graphs you only really used 2-3 of them. If possible try to just utilize them in the slides

I thought a big strength was how Mike talked about strengths and limitations as they appeared in the study, not just at the end on one slide. I think that is a tough thing to do but Mike was able to pull it off very well.

Great job presenting the studies

provided good details about the study objectives.

I don't recall if you discussed the time frame of these studies and the importance of it especially in CVD outcomes. The studies were pretty short.

The studies were large and complex, you did a good job at boiling down the data. The strengths and limitations were well detailed.

I thought you provided a thoughtful analysis of the strengths and limitations of the studies. Well done.

Interesting studies but complete. I am glad you chose all the ancillary agents to discuss because a whole seminar on just one would be not as useful!

Studies were analyzed pretty well. I like how he discussed the strengths and weaknesses as he went through the studies, so we understood them when he listed them later. It would've been nice to see how he decided on these specific studies, out of the many multitudes of studies in this topic.

Able to address each aspect of the study and analyze the study to determine the utility of the study in supporting or not supporting the objectives of the seminar.

No mention of dropouts and power not defined in all the studies

Good job presenting large complicated studies in a manageable manner.

Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	12	1	2	0	0	0	0	6.67
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	12	2	1	0	0	0	0	6.73
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.8
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.87

Conclusions Comments

I also agree with your conclusion.

Conclusions were clear, direct, and supported by the information presented.

His conclusions were supported by the data, the clinical importance was discussed, and provided specific recommendations.

You at one point mentioned the analysis was for CV mortality, but the studies studied all CV events. These other events can cause serious morbidity and are a valid endpoint due to that. Also you either extrapolated the conclusion or the authors explicitly made the conclusions of no adjunctive therapy being viable, but they only studied one drug. I don't think the studies are able to make that broad determination.

The role of education was thoroughly explained. Could have gone further and explained how to introduce this idea to new physicians or what to do when a patient presents a script for fenofibrate or niacin.

Some of the conclusions presented were not supported by the two studies presented, but I liked the fact that he talked about some of the studies done with other medications. I liked the application using the case.

Could have included more details about the clinical impact of the seminar

Conclusions were good and supported by the data presented.

I liked the case to help solidify what you explained in the presentation. Good conclusions based on the evidence.

Clinical applications was excellent, this is a hot topic that was very relevant.

Excellent topic and conclusions were in line with what I was aware of.

Conclusions were based on the evidence he looked at. Recommendation was not specific.

Conclusions were appropriate--appreciated the additional summary of the studies available and their

conclusions. Clinical importance addressed.

You made some conclusions at the end that were not even mentioned in your presentation. Try to either find evidence for all conclusions or only make those for which you offer evidence.

Conclusions matched available data.

Question Answer Session

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.93
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.93

Question Answer Session Comments

Only had 2 questions, but I could see you really knew your material.

Not many questions, but you handled them well.

Encouraged questions and answered them well.

Encouraged interaction throughout and answered questions adequately.

Could tell he knew a lot and wanted more questions, meaning he presented well and was well-prepared.

Great job answering questions

Encourage audience participation.

Good job on the Q&A

Not too many questions, but from the ones you got, you did a good job.

Nice job fielding questions in the Q&A session; your previous research prepared you to appropriately answer questions.

Great handling of the quesitons. Sorry I didn't have one!

Handled Q&A well.

Answered questions with poise.

Answered the questions well and helped clarify your points

Answered both questions well.

Overall Knowledge Base

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.8
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.8
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	11	3	1	0	0	0	0	6.67
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	6.73
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.87

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

I believe you thoroughly knew your material, I really liked how you included several other studies and gave brief synopsis of them. Great job.

You demonstrated your knowledge as you explained the studies in great detail. You went into a lot of the pros/cons as well.

It was obvious he was very knowledgeable about the subject and able to think on his feet.

The commentary on internal/external validity was good. However the line in the handout "results in men not clinically significant as it also produced an increase in risk for women" I don't think was accurate. It may not be clinically significant for other reasons, but there are other drugs that tend to work better in one gender.

I thought the discussion of wanting monotherapy trials looking at CV outcomes was described very well.

Great knowledge base. I really liked how you included other trials looking at other medications

Didn't offer any insight into the trial results other than what was offered by the authors

You could easily discuss the studies and it was clear you had studied them.

Clearly you knew more than what was presented. You deal with the guidelines everyday in your workplace setting.

Excellent knowledge base; it was evident you spent sufficient time researching and becoming familiar with the topic.

Overall knowledge base was very evident and useful in determining therapy course.

He did know his information and was able to think on his feet.

Great overall knowledge base. Would have appreciated a little more insight into the studies and specifically how they did or did not relate to your patient case or more of a take home point from each offered. Great job with summarizing additional studies available.

You knew more than you said but we didn't get the full knowledge from you during your presentation

Could tell you knew more then could be presented in the time frame allowed.

Provide one comment on what you liked about this seminar

I liked the topic, it was a really controversy at my pharmacy.

Very good pace.

I enjoyed learning about this topic and seeing the results of these studies, and hearing specific recommendations.

The pace was good and you seemed to really have genuine interest in the topic

The best part about this seminar was how Mike was able to talk about strengths and limitations of studies as they presented instead of all at the end. This was unique amongst this semesters seminars.

Very interesting subject. I liked the case that you included to emphasize the clinical importance and the role of the pharmacist

Covering a subject about new guidelines recently published

Good strong solid recommendations supported by the data.

I liked the applicability of the information presented in your seminar. It affects nearly all adults!

I loved the topic in general--very new and relevant, and needed/needs to be addressed.

Timeliness of the topic.

Study evaluations were well done.

Good audience interaction and case.

You were very confident while you presented which is good

Hot topic. New guidelines are significantly different than last guidelines.

Provide one comment on what could be improved about this seminar

be on time

Consider adjusting how you cite in text to have the numbers after the punctuation.

He spoke too quietly and his handout had much less information than the presentation.

Define what ASCVD is before using it in the seminar

More background on the old guidelines and how they differ from the new guidelines. Statistics on how many people receive these alternative meds would have been nice as well if they were available.

Provide more background on old guidelines vs new guidelines.

Could have given better guidance to the graphs and less busy slides.

Showing up on time is always important.

Punctuality would have engaged more of the audience.

It was evident you spent time preparing this; I can't think of anything more at the time that would improve the seminar.

Hmmmmmm....not sure. It was excellent.

Make sure that your controversy is clear. It is a bad thing that I was asking myself at the end "and the controversy is what now?"

Would have appreciated a better set up of the controversy--some of what was missing was addressed in the handout, but would have been helpful to have had that information presented.

This was a broad topic and I felt like there was more to cover that we didn't. Consider focusing on one drug and presenting more data

A little comparison between old and new guidelines would be helpful.

General Comments

great job, really, you did a good job

Great job overall!

Great presentation on an interesting topic.

Overall great job. I was very impressed by Mike's poise and confidence up there. I could tell he was well-prepared and spent a great deal of time working on the project.

Great job!

It seems that there was no focus for the presentation. There was many discussions that were discussing lipid treatment and not really focused on fenofibrate³ and Niacin with statins. Just skimmed the surface of the subject.

No additional comments.

N/A

Nice job overall. Congrats on finishing seminar.

Thank you!

Work on transitions and making sure you know how to properly pronounce drug names that you mention frequently in the seminar. Don't assume your audience knows enough about your topic to exclude an important section in your background (i.e. What the new guidelines say).

Great job overall. Good topic, very relevant. Could tell that you put in a lot of work.

Make sure you start on time because it taints the rest of the presentation. Something to think about for next time.

Good job on your presentation.