Presenter: Nasir, Tufan

Seminar Date: 2014-04-22

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
6.76	6.86	6.91	6.89		6.66			5.88	6.2	6		5.25	6.2	0	0	0	E (45.86)

Presentation Style											
# Question	Α	A-	B+	В	B-	C+	C	Mean			
1 Moderate Pace	16	1	2	0	0	0	0	6.74			
2 Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	13	5	1	0	0	0	0	6.63			
3 Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	16	2	1	0	0	0	0	6.79			
4 Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.89			

Presentation Style Comments

Material was at a good level

You were professional and confident. The only thing I would change is to speak louder.

Nice work presenting at a level congruent with the knowledge of the audience. Good pace and excellent keeping eye contact with us. Appeared well prepared.

The pace was a little slow but overall the flow was good.

Great job presenting extremely difficult material!

the presentation flow was great

At times, it was difficult to hear because Tufan was a bit soft spoken.

Tufan was very professional during his presentation. It was clear that he prepared and practiced a lot for his seminar because he didn't rely too much on his notes.

Slow pace, went way over time.

I was extremely impressed with how professional and confident he was in this presentation. He presented the material at an appropriate level for the audience too. He went at a perfect pace I think.

You seemed very confident in your presentation. I would recommend to speak up a a little and don't rely on your slides quite as much.

The seminarian had good eye contract throughout.

He needed to talk louder and make more eye contact. It seemed like he relied on the slides to much.

It was very difficult to hear which, for me, was distracting.

Speak up it makes it seem like you lack confidence even when you are the expert in the room.

Good pace throughout the entire presentation and relied minimally on his notes

Try not to look at screen/slides so much. Pace was a little bit slow

Good pacing. Adequate eye contact. Little distracting mannerisms. Maybe talk a little bit louder.

maintained eye contact during presentation under moderate pace

Ir	nstructional Materials									
#	Question	Α	A-	B+	В	B-	C+	С	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	15	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.74
2	Slides and handout are devoid of spelling and grammatical errors	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.89
3	Provided orientation to charts/graphs/pictures/diagrams (if applicable)	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.89
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.89

Instructional Materials Comments

References were all at the bottom of the slides. Provided orientation to tables.

The handout followed a slightly different flow than the presentation

The handout was somewhat text-dense, especially in the background and overall conclusions sections. I really liked the use of pictures and diagrams, including charts within the study information.

On some of the slides it was hard to see but that was probably due to the room change. Try to have things more on the top half of the slides instead of the bottom half of the slides (slides with the title of your studies).

Slides were very clean and easy to read. I didn't see any errors

There were many acronyms but the presenter took the time to say what they meant

Nice clean slides. Handout could have been "broken up" a bit into more of an outline format.

His slides and handout were very clear and easy to read. His handout contained a lot of great information, and he did a good job summarizing that information on his slides.

Slides were clean and easy to read /

His slides and handout were so clear and helpful. I liked how he included really nice pictures and images of how the drug works, penetration of different radiation types, how his studies were designed, and results of his studies.

I really liked your slides and handout. They were professional and easy to view.

The slides and handout were easy to follow.

Slides were put together really well and the handout was clean.

Handouts and slides were clear.

I couldn't find the handout prior to your presentation, it seems it was hidden in a box somewhere.

His instruction materials were very well put together and easy to read

Handout was in a different order than the slides and was difficult to follow along with. Make sure when you are presenting charts or graphs to orient the audience and define any abbreviations present.

Slides and handout were easy to read. Minor errors on handout that weren't too noticeable. Good orientation to pictures.

slides and handout were clear and easy to follow along during his presentation, references were all rpovided

Overall Presentation Content									
# Question	Α	A-	B+	В	B-	C+	С	Mean	
1 Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	
2 Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.84	
3 Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.89	
4 Appropriate background information was provided	17	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.89	
5 Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	6.89	

Overall Presentation Content Comments

Interest in the topic was clearly mentioned

You defined the controversy very well

Met all of these points very well. Great job explaining the background info. Cancer and its treatments can be complex but it was explained succinctly.

Overall good flow. Try to talk a little louder or use a microphone next time.

Presentation flowed well - it was obvious this is a topic you are very interested in (kudos to you!)

The controversy was well defined

Presentation was well organized and had a smooth flow. The background had just the right amount of material.

Tufan provided the audience with good background information.

Good background

I was very impressed with the background information he provided. I didn't know anything about his topic before he started his talk and afterwards I felt like I had a good understanding of the controversy, the drug, how it works, and how to implement the seminar into pharmacy practice. I think this indicates that he did an excellent job on this seminar. He definitely provided appropriate background.

Content was appropriate and I felt that you covered a necessary amount of background material.

The presentation content was clear and well organized.

The background information was very good, and well put together.

I feel like title and objectives were a bit misleading. I think it would have been better to establish the regimen that you were discussing a little more firmly. It took me to almost the end of the seminar to realize that all Yttrium, Ibitumoman, Tiuxetan therapies also started with rituximab and that the combined regimen was as a whole the stand-alone therapy. I think that should have been discussed up

front more.

good background

Provided a clear background into a very complicated topic. His pictures were also very helpful

Maybe a little bit too much in the background but overall did a good job presenting the controversy and your interest.

Clearly discussed the interest and controversy. Enough background information was given.

presentation was arranged nicely, objectives were stated at the beginning

P	Presentation of Clinical Data									
#	Question	Α	A-	B+	В	B-	C+	С	NA	Mean
1	Presented concise objectives, methodology and treatment for each study	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.89
2	Outcome measures were stated and described, and appropriateness was explained	16	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.79
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.84

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Appreciated that you mentioned when it was difficult to compare things accross studies.

You provided a detailed and thoughtful analysis of the study strengths and weaknesses

nice work on these points

I liked how you stated what phase trial it was.

Great job with data analysis. You provided insight and explanations as to why certain things were on the handout and presentation

The presentation of the data from the trials contained enough information without going too far

Tufan provided additional insights about several of the study findings that showed a depth and understanding of the subject matter.

He did a good job identifying strengths and weaknesses of his studies.

I know that only phase II studies were available and you did a good job presenting the studies, but it would have been nice to have the topic on something more relevant since you kept having to say well we can't compare or draw any conclusions since it is only phase II information. So not that clinically revelant.

He provided a detailed an thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations and key trial results were well represented with appropriate statistical analysis.

You presented the clinical data well.

The seminarian presented the data well.

Data was discussed really well and was done in a teaching manner.

I think it would have been helpful to discuss response rates seen in current regimens to better establish how this compares.

good studies

He provided a thorough analysis of his clinical data from the studies he provided, despite them being only in phase 2

Presented the data as well as you could with the studies available.

Great analysis of the studies. Adequate discussion of the strengths and limitations.

key trial results and outcomes were clearly presented

C	Conclusions										
#	Question	Α	A-	B+	В	B-	C+	С	Mean		
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	6.84		
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	14	5	0	0	0	0	0	6.74		
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	15	3	0	0	1	0	0	6.63		
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	13	4	0	1	1	0	0	6.42		

Conclusions Comments

Clinical importance was discussed.

I would have liked to see a stronger clinical importance of the studies

Considering these were only phase two trials I didn't expect to receive a definitive treatment recommendation for use in clinical practice, but is was good to see what the potential treatments may be and what we might expect in the future. I liked your pharmacist role considerations, especially the importance of cost. This could be a serious issue for many/most patients since this potential treatment is very expensive.

Overall, good conclusion. The conclusion was a little wordy in the handout and could have been cut down. Also, next time it would be nice to include a slide with the role of the pharmacist instead of just talking about the role.

Hard to make a recommendation on this topic, but you did the best with the evidence you had.

The conclusions were evidence based

Although Tufan could have emphasized that rituximab was a part of the "monotherapy" regiment in the studies, his conclusions followed the studies presented in his seminar.

He did a good job identifying responsibilities of the pharmacist pertaining to his topic.

Did not really discuss clinical importance because they were phase II studies and said that nothing could be compared. There were no specific recommendations for pharmacy practice, but did include a brief recommendation of what other sort of research should be done. Pharmacist role was not included in the slides or handout but brefiely mentioned it at the end of the presentation.

I was impressed with his conclusions. He not only discussed his conclusions in terms of the studies but he also mentioned potential uses and benefits of treatment with Yttrium Ibritumomab Tiuxetan in the future and opportunities for studying it in the future. His conclusions were the most well-thought out conclusions I have seen in a seminar presentation. I can tell that he went above and beyond as he analyzed the studies and put his presentation together.

I would have liked to see a slide on the pharmacist's role instead of you just speaking about it. Also, it

would have been good to address the cost issue in your conclusions since that was the crux of your controversy.

The seminarian was able to conclude with the limited amount of information.

Overall conclusion was supported by the data.

Role was mentioned, but it wasn't especially specific.

I agreed with your conclusions

Provided good conclusions based on the available data

Some conclusions seemed like a large jump from the data you presented. The drug was not being used as monotherapy in either study and had no group to compare either with. Since rituximab is already approved for non-hodgkin's it's hard to say that your drug and not the rituximab was causing positive outcomes with no comparisons available. I realize that it is a new drug so those types of studies aren't available, just be careful with conclusions based off of phase II trials. Great job presenting a very complicated topic in a way we could understand though.

Conclusions were supported by the data presented. Good discussion of the pharmacists' role.

final conclusions were supported, no pharmacy roles was discussed in the presentation

Question Answer Session								
# Question	Α	A-	B+	В	B-	C+	С	Mean
1 Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
2 Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	11	5	2	1	0	0	0	6.37

Question Answer Session Comments

Fielded questions well.

You succinctly and thoroughly answered all questions

Really good job answering the questions fielded. I would have preferred to see a couple of brief stopping points within the presentation though instead of waiting until the end because it's more difficult to remember questions all the way until the end on challenging topics. That is just a personal preference.

Good job at answering questions and thinking on your feet.

Great job answering the questions that were asked of you.

I was satisfied with the answer to my questions

I felt that Tufan's pace was moderate enough to allow the audience to ask questions. Questions were handled well.

Tufan did a great job answering questions. It was clear that he is very knowledgeable about his topic.

Answered questions well. It would have been nice to have more opportunities for questions or times when you got the audience to participate.

He answered audience questions very well and confidently. He provided very understandable and good responses.

I thought you handled the questions well and with poise.

The seminarian could have allowed more time for questions throughout the presentation.

You really shined in this section.

Didn't provide many opportunities for questions.

Would be better to give question opportunities throughout or warn us

He was able to answer very complicated questions for such a difficult topic

Provide more times for questions throughout the presentation. If you don't have enough time, find some less important information that you can cut out to provide time for questions.

Answered all questions well. Maybe more interaction with audience.

encouraged audience to ask questions at end of seminar

C	Overall Knowledge Base										
#	Question	Α	A-	B+	В	B-	C+	С	Mean		
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	7		
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.84		
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	6.79		
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.84		
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95		

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

Good job distinguishing between clinical and statistical significance.

You seemed very knowledgeable

I could tell your knowledge base was good by the way questions were answered with confidence and without hesitation.

Throughout the presentation your background knowledge showed through.

It was obvious your overall knowledge of this topic went beyond your presentation.

The presenter had a good knowledge of the topic

Tufan had a good understanding of the material, as demonstrated by his selective emphasis of important points and relevant insights about those points.

He did a good job thinking on his feet.

Strong overall knowledge base in a complex disease state

He definitely looked BEYOND the author's conclusions to offer insight into the overall study results. He discussed conclusions in the context of previous research which was something I haven't seen a lot of students do in the past. He demonstrated knowledge of the subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar with the way that he answered audience questions. I could tell that he was very comfortable with the material and well prepared.

I felt like your conclusions were identical to the authors, it would be good to try to expand a little and offer some unique insight.

The seminarian demonstrated knowledge of the topic.

Overall knowledge was when you were able to think on your feet and answered all the questions.

Comparison to current therapies was lacking. Also, didn't add much beyond authors conclusions.

Good knowledge

His ability to answer a variety of difficult questions clearly showed that he had a very good overall knowledge base

Obviously very knowledgeable on the topic and was able to answer questions that were not directly from his studies. (had a broad range of knowledge)

Has a clear knowledge base of the topic, as evident by answering the questions and the extra information provided to the audience.

overall knowledge was great, able to go beyond the basic and talked about some clinical implications

Provide one comment on what you liked about this seminar

Pace was good.

I liked that you chose a new drug that we will see in the future

Moved through the material at a brisk pace but so much so that it was too hard to follow. Also really like the extra pictures and graphs used in the handout.

Overall the slides were clean and I liked the graphics in the slides and handout.

Great job overall! You did a very difficult topic which is awesome!

I think it was a good exposure to a type of treatment that we don't get to have as much exposure

Well organized and thoughtful seminar.

I like the information Tufan included in his handout. He did a great job making his handout clean. He also did a good job only presenting the key information in his slides/presentation.

I liked how you didn't let it get overally complicated given that it was cancer.

I liked how well prepared he was, how detailed everything was, and how confident and clear he was throughout his presentation.

You did well conveying a topic that most of us know very little about

The seminarian did a great job with presenting the information.

I liked that the handout and the slides were well put together.

You explained everything at an appropriate level and clearly knew a lot about the subject.

Interesting topic

I liked the graphs and pictures that he provided to aid with understanding

You introduced me to a drug that I had never heard of before and didn't even know such a type of drug existed. Was very interesting.

I liked how the presenter was able to provide the pertinent information about a topic that many of us are not familiar with.

interesting topic

Provide one comment on what could be improved about this seminar

Maybe instead of putting up all the inclusion exclusion criteria in a table, just put all of them in your handout, and only put the interesting ones on the slides.

The only thing is to speak louder otherwise it was great

Again, I think a question slide of two within the presentation would have broken up the monotony.

Have the handout follow along with your slides to make it easier for the audience to follow along.

Speak a little bit louder...it was very difficult to hear. Maybe even wear a microphone next time.

Maybe a cost-effectiveness study could wrap up things well

Talk louder and improve your vocal delivery/tonality. At times, your voice was soft and difficult to hear.

No suggestion for improvement.

Choose a topic where their are better studies. Have a topic that has studies we can actually take something away from and not just Phase II trials.

He could have included more jokes in his seminar or smiled more.

Make sure your conclusions address the concern/controversy.

The seminarian could have allowed more time to ask questions.

I would decrease the amount of wording in the handout. maybe use bullet points. You also need to speak a little louder for people in the back.

Mostly just establish the purpose of the seminar and it's impact in therapy a little more clearly.

Speak up I could hardly hear

Maybe have his handout follow a bit more closely with his presentation. That way the audience could read as well as listen to what he was saying

Try to cut down less pertinent info in the background so you have more time to spend on studies/questions and don't go over the time limit.

Maybe allow more time for questions or state at the beginning that you will be holding all questions until the end.

speak a bit louder

General Comments

