

Presenter: Ahlstrom, David

Seminar Date: 2014-03-20

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
6.83	6.81	6.98	6.87	6.88	7	6.95	7	7	6.7	6.1	6.75	7	6.5	0	0	0	E (47.23)

Presentation Style									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	8	7	1	0	0	0	0	6.44
2	Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.94
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.94
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Presentation Style Comments

You talked fast, but it didn't bother me. I enjoyed the fast pace.

Pace was pretty fast, but you had good eye contact and your body language was very energetic.

He minimally relied on his notes, went at a moderate pace, and presented the info and background at an appropriate level.

Great volume, pace, and eye contact. Very engaging

I felt like you rushed through and spoke very fast

Only comment here was that he moved a little fast so it was hard to look at the handout and slides at the same time.

Very professional and confident

You were extremely enthusiastic which made focusing during the second seminar much easier. Also, the pace was quick but that is how I like it!

It seemed the presentation was a little rushed

Some complained about the pace, it was very fast but I was not bothered by it. You were very excited and it kept the audience engaged. / I think you did a great job.

Pace was a little too fast, but there were many studies to be presented

He got a little overenthusiastic.

I know comments were made about your pace in the immediate critiques following your presentation. I agree that it did seem a little rushed, partly because you had such high energy. I enjoyed seeing you so passionate about what you were presenting.

Good pace- a little fast but pace stayed consistent throughout. Spoke clearly but sometimes it seemed a bit robotic, as if he over-practiced the presentation. Great eye contact with audience and was very professional.

Great eye contact with audience. Very enthusiastic. Pace was a little fast for us to be able to look in your handout and follow your slides at the same time.

Pace was a little rushed and towards the end started looking a lot at the screen rather than the audience

Instructional Materials

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	12	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.75
2	Slides and handout are devoid of spelling and grammatical errors	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.63
3	Provided orientation to charts/graphs/pictures/diagrams (if applicable)	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.94
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.94

Instructional Materials Comments

Slides were very clear and not wordy. Would have enjoyed seeing bullet points in the handout though.

Slides were great and easy to read. The charts were very helpful for the presentation.

I liked that his handout was in paragraph form and his handout was well organized. He provided excellent explanations of tables and cited appropriate references.

I think the most graphically represented seminar to date. Well done discussing all the pictures

Your handout was chunky

Handout wasn't in JAMA style and the handout was a little hard to read.

The handout was a little wordy and a few bullet points would have been nice to see, but that is just preference

There were few spelling errors and I really enjoyed your handout and slides overall.

The handout seemed to need a little more info.

slides were well prepared, clear and easy to follow. The handout was a little too "paragraph form" for my taste but was still well done.

A few typos were found in the hand out, but I liked your summary slides

I found 1 or 2 grammatical errors, but the handout was blessedly short.

I thought your slides looked clean and crisp

Slides were clear and easy to read. Handout would have been easier to read if it was in a bulleted format, rather than paragraphs. I liked how he was able to fit each study on one page, so it was easy to read.

Just a few typos in handout. Bulleted points in handout may have made the handout easier to follow during your presentation.

VERY minor spelling errors noted in handout

Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.94
4	Appropriate background information was provided	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.94

Overall Presentation Content Comments

Controversy was clearly stated. Background was appropriate, you didn't have much of it, but i didn't think we needed much.

Overall your content was good. I'm impressed you were able to talk about four studies in such a short amount of time.

He defined the controversy well and presented the background information succinctly. The presentation had appropriate flow.

Well defined objectives and you came back to them frequently throughout the presentation.

I think you presented well

I absolutely loved the introduction by included his father. Very cool.

Great introduction of the topic and summary of current guidelines

It was really nice to have you devote more time to the studies than on the background information, especially on a topic where we are all up-to-speed on the basic. Great job filtering the content.

I liked how you included a personal touch with the case and interest in topic.

Great introduction. The use of your dad throughout was great. It illustrated your interest in the topic and tied all the points together at the end. /

Great background given, not too in depth to allow for more time on the studies

His flow was very smooth, despite his great enthusiasm.

I liked how you set up by showing what the guidelines recommend, and then analyzed the primary literature yourself to make an overall "best" recommendation.

Great interest and I liked how he used the example of his father and returned to it at the end. Topic was very applicable to current times. Background was short but he was able to focus on the very important info and leave more time for his studies, which was good because we all know a lot about HTN.

Great introduction--succinct, yet sufficient for the seminar. Controversy was set up well with guideline differences.

The objective were not very measurable. May consider something like "apply correct goals to elderly patients in clinical practice"

Presentation of Clinical Data

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Presented concise objectives, methodology and treatment for each study	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Outcome measures were stated and described, and appropriateness was explained	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.88
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	9	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.44
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	6.93
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Strengths and limitations I thought were covered well. Highlighted the key results of each trial well.

Great job with the data from these studies. It would have been helpful to explain why the two studies did not meet power, but you got to that in the Q&A.

Did a great job explaining the studies. It was impressive how well he explained all 4 studies and kept them straight. It appeared he needed to explain the power issue more simply as many people still didn't understand.

I think you understand, but perhaps didn't articulate well the implications of power. You talked about needing more events for some of the studies to detect power and that the studies could do so by increasing n. With an $n > 3000$ though the better way to detect events wouldn't be to increase n further. You touched on the studies excluding all but the healthiest people, I think it would have made the presentation stronger to hit that point home.

I think if anything you presented too much info on your studies

I was impressed with how well he quickly moved through 4 studies. Very impressive.

The power discussion was a little confusing and it would have been helpful to clarify why power was not met or how it was not met during the discussion, however, it was addressed during question and answer section

Good analysis. Your power comments were confusing until that was clarified later. Great job comparing the trials and helping us to see the big picture.

It would have been clearer to provide more tangible data on the power other than say it did not meet power.

You had ALOT of studies with different information, methods, outcomes, and conclusions but you kept

them all straight throughout the whole seminar and it was clear you knew the studies really well.

The discussion on power was very confusing

He was able to move through the data quickly, but it felt very complete.

I thought you were able to assess appropriately the importance of power. Just make sure to state why the study didn't meet power if it didn't (e.g. didn't have enough participants/events)

Very thorough study analyses, especially when tackling 4 studies! Great study comparisons as well, with the couple graphs/charts. The only area of improvement was the power- he didn't fully explain if the studies were powered or not.

Good job analyzing and talking about all your studies. The way that power was defined during your presentation was a little confusing, but was clarified during the question and answer session.

The power discussion was hard to understand based on how it was presented. Try to think critically about why power fell short and what that means for clinical practice. Use a "power" statement (eg, 80% power to detect a 10% difference in stroke....)

Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.81
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.94
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.81
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.94

Conclusions Comments

Your conclusions seemed practical and supported by the data provided.

Good recommendations based on the data. You explained the role of the pharmacist well.

He discussed the role of the pharmacist well and drew conclusions supported by the data. Explained the importance of the studies thoroughly.

The "how low can you go" conclusion may not have been completely supported, but it was a catchy comment.

Good conclusions based on data

I thought the conclusion was very appropriate and liked how he used clinical judgement to make it

Really liked the summary table. Great application with the study at the end of the presentation

I liked how you came to original conclusions regarding what we should recommend, and it was completely synthesized using the data from the trials.

I would have been better to provide a specific recommendation other than just keep going lower.

I agreed with you conclusion overall. Be careful with recommendation like, "How low can you go". I feel like I understood what you were trying to say but remember people in general love hyperbole and will hear recommendations like that and attack them.

Again, due to the power discussion, it was unclear if the conclusions were pertinent

His conclusions were very confident.

I'm not sure I agree with the game plan of treating to a blood pressure as low as possible....sometimes we don't know how low is too low until a patient is on the floor. However, I did like your thoughtful analysis from which you made your conclusions.

Conclusions based on evidence and were valid. Could have talked a bit more about clinical significance during the seminar, but it did come out at the end. Great bringing in back to the initial patient case.

Great conclusions. Very applicable topic. Was a little lost regarding where isolated systolic hypertension and treatment falls. ISH was focused on in the background, but then no specific recommendation was made in the conclusion.

Not sure your conclusion exactly matched the evidence/.

Question Answer Session

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Question Answer Session Comments

I thought you answered questions very well. You clearly knew more about the studies than what you had already told us.

You handled the questions really well. Great job!

Answered questions well and was very welcoming of them.

Some pretty tough questions. You answered them well and coherently.

Good with q and a

Great job answering questions. Definitely knew his stuff.

Great job answering questions

Great job answering questions.

He answered all question very appropriate and knew his information.

Great job handing questions. You need to be careful to listen to the full question and ensure you understand what is being asked before you answer. For example, you had a question about the clinical relevance of continually increasing the number of subjects just to meet power. Your answer was great but you didn't address the clinical importance. / Overall great job

Good job answering the questions, you were very comfortable and confident

This is really where his preparation shined through.

Gave ample opportunity for the audience to pose questions.

Good Q&A- was able to answer every question very well.

Great job answering questions. Could tell that you really knew your studies.

Handled your questions well with composure

Overall Knowledge Base

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.94
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.81
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	16	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	16	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	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

I felt you had a definite understanding beyond the facts presented in the seminar.

Your knowledge base was evident by how you handled the Q&A. Great job!

He was able to explain where the guidelines come from and why they're different very well, but there was confusion about statistical significance versus clinical significance that needed to be explained even more clearly.

You had a good understanding of quite the large amount of data, essentially 4 studies. You were able to talk about the specifics of a study without having to use notes

You clearly were familiar with the topic

I thought he was able to theorize well on how to increase power.

Great knowledge of all of the studies presented. It would have been helpful to hear a conclusion about the clinical significance of the studies since they had such a huge number of patients in the studies and there didn't seem to be a benefit in the last two trials, I would say that is clinically significant

You really knew the trials super well. It allowed you to easily answer questions about them and bring ideas from all of them together at the end.

He knew his information very well and was able to give information on several different trials.

It was obvious you knew your stuff. Good job

It was apparent you knew the data very well and were comfortable speaking of the trials without needing to reference your notes

He knew his stuff, and obviously prepared well.

All your answers and conclusions were very thoughtful. Well done.

Very clear that he had a solid knowledge base on the topic. He was able to make his own conclusions based on the evidence. Was clearly able to think on his feet to answer questions.

Great overall knowledge base. Would have liked you to elaborate more on clinical significance and what a difference of 10 mmHg of blood pressure means clinically for the patient.

You knew a lot about your studies. Good job

Provide one comment on what you liked about this seminar

Great job putting it all together when analyzing four studies.

I liked the table that summarized the guidelines. I think I will use that in practice.

He was smiling through his whole presentation and went through the studies expertly without looking at notes even though there were 4 of them.

High energy and enthusiasm for the topic

Interesting topic

I liked how he introduced and ended the topic with the discussion of his father as a case example. Very creative and cool.

I really liked the comparison of all of the guidelines and how the studies fit into the guidelines. I also really liked the case study at the end to apply all of the data presented

It was very practical and useful in clinical practice.

I liked how he was able to provide a summary of the trials to wrap up all the different parameters and results.

You were very energetic and knew your stuff backwards and forward.

You are an excellent public speaker and very confident in your deliver

His enthusiasm, though a little much at times, sparked my interest in the topic.

I like seminars that question treatment guidelines. Too many times practitioners forget to employ clinical judgment and simply follow the guideline blindly.

Solid knowledge base and great study analyses and comparisons.

Very enthusiastic. Great eye contact. Very applicable and great topic. Good summary table of studies.

Great first seminar. Nothing huge to work on but a few minor fixes to makes next year's even better

Provide one comment on what could be improved about this seminar

Since a lot of the studies were only done in japan I thought that a comparison of people in japan to the US would be nice to give an idea of external validity

I would try to work on the pace. Otherwise it was great.

The explanation of the lack of power in the 2 trials and why we couldn't draw conclusions from them needed to be explained better.

It was really good. The only thing I really didn't like was the "how low can you go" comment

Slower speaking

The handout was not in JAMA style and was a little tough to read.

Discuss the clinical significance of the studies along with the statistical significance

Try to be more clear when describing power and how the met/did not meet it.

Could of explained the power of the trials a little better

Be careful about drawing conclusions like "how low can you go"

Slow it down a bit, I got lost a few times because you moved on very quickly

I felt a little lost when it came to his power talk; I would have liked more orientation there.

Provide more information about how you would treat specific patients. For example: // "In a patient with multiple other risk factors or concurrent disease states, such as a patient with increasingly progressive renal impairment secondary to hypertension, I would employ the 'treat to as low as possible' mentality since benefits gained from tight control will justify risk of hypotensive episodes." // or: // "In an otherwise healthy elderly patient (not other chronic disease states, no obesity, no significant family history), I would treat to a goal of <150/90 since benefit gained may not warrant the additional risk associated with hypotensive episodes that could result from the 'treat to a pressure as low as tolerable' game plan."

Explain power better and work on not speaking so robotically.

Define power in context of what was required to meet power. Emphasis on the type of patient your recommendation was not clear until the question and answer session ("fairly healthy")

Work on your pace - not rushed or nervous and stats analysis

General Comments

Great job!

Great presentation and loved his positive attitude.

I thought he did a great job tackling such a huge topic.

Great job! Very interesting topic and thorough analysis of many studies

Fantastic job!

Good Job.

No additional comments.

N/A

Nothing at this time.

Congratulations on a job well done.

Great job! Interesting and pertinent topic.

Great job overall. Great topic and you definitely knew your material.