

# Presenter: Wong, Raymond

Seminar Date: 2013-11-05

## 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
6.94	6.94	6.95	6.94	6.94	6.95	6.94	6.75	6.75	6.7	6.92	6.88	7	7	0	0	0	E (47.92)

Presentation Style									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	19	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.86
2	Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95

## Presentation Style Comments

You looked very confident presenting

Great job staying engaged with the audience. Good pace, and excellent job presenting the material with minimal reliance on the powerpoint.

Great confidence throughout the presentation. Also, good pace and good job at keeping it interesting.

Great job presenting the material. Coagulation can get very complex and it's easy to get mixed up in explanations, but you did an excellent job

The presentation was prepared and rehearsed in a detail, good job

great pace and professionalism

Presentation flow was good and distractions were minimized. Work on more natural delivery.

Ray was very professional and did a great job presenting.

Great knowledge of the topic. Great pace

Good constant pace but could have gone a bit quicker when getting to the point instead of going a round about way to the point.

Raymond did a very good job presenting, and asked thought provoking questions to keep the audience engaged. There were occasionally too long of pauses

He spoke a little slow at times and could have managed the time a little bit better. He was never too fast though.

The seminarian was great at making eye contact with the audience and didn't rely on notes.

You sounded much more natural and relaxed this time than you did in your seminar last semester, and you didn't sacrifice content to do so.

It seemed very rehearsed, the pace at times could have been quicker.

Really interactive and professional.

Very impressive presentation style. Pace was great and material was presented at the appropriate level.

Very clear presentation

Good pace and tone during the entire presentation

Great pace and professionalism

Very poised and seemed extremely well-prepared. Barely looked at his slides and didn't need any note. The pace was good and the material was presented at a good level for us.

very good pace

## Instructional Materials

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
2	Slides and handout are devoid of spelling and grammatical errors	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
3	Provided orientation to charts/graphs/pictures/diagrams (if applicable)	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.91
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.95

## Instructional Materials Comments

You provided orientation to all of your material. It would have been nice to see a table format  
everything on instructional materials was well done

Great job at orienting us to the graphs and putting things in plain language.

Slides and handout looked great! Slides were very clear and well organized

Diagrams were included as supplemental information and helped the interaction with audience  
good pictures/diagrams!

Include more visuals in the slides to keep presentation interesting.

Ray's slides and handout were clear and easy to understand,

Great font, good pictures to illustrate point across

Great handout very easy to follow.

His handout was very thorough and his slides were easy to read.

He could have included more pictures and oriented us to them better. I really liked how he picked up on the graph that displayed measures with units that were different.

The handout was easy to follow.

The writing on your slides is clear, but some charts were a little hard to read because the writing was small. This was less important because you explained that charts well.

Slides and handout were excellent. There was just enough information to understand everything.

Slides were great. Material was handled well.

Ray oriented the audience to the diagrams and graphs very well. This helped improve my understanding.

great slides

Slides were very clear and easy to understand for the target audience

Slides were easy to read and handout had just the right amount of information

The handout and slides were very neat and well organized. They were easy to read and follow.

great

## Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	18	4	0	0	0	0	0	6.82
2	Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
4	Appropriate background information was provided	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

## Overall Presentation Content Comments

Good flow

Sometimes transitions can be difficult to manage, but in this seminar the transitions were smooth. Nice work.

It would have been nice to know why you were interested in pediatrics and not just adults.

The overall organization was fantastic. I noticed not all of your objectives were measurable

The controversy was not clear very well until the actual controversy slide, after that it was good great background!

Content was well organized and led smoothly to Raymond's conclusion.

Ray provided the audience with good background information.

I liked the way you both seminar papers before diving into them. I kept me interested and able to better follow your presentation

Good presentation it was very easy to follow and you did a good job of involving the audience.

He did a great job framing the topic of his presentation. The flow was very good, with a few places that were punctuated by pauses

He could have gone into more detail about how he chose his topic and what interested him most in it.

The seminarian had a great flow throughout the presentation.

You were very clear in what you presented throughout the presentation.

The topic was interesting. I was wondering as well why pediatrics was selected.

I would like to have known more about why you focused on cardiac surgery in pediatric patients.

Very smooth transitions and objectives are very useful for understanding.

Interesting topic, explain why chose for pediatrics especially

Provided very good background information on CHD

Flow was great and appropriate background information was provided

Great!

yes

## Presentation of Clinical Data

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Presented concise objectives, methodology and treatment for each study	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Outcome measures were stated and described, and appropriateness was explained	20	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.91
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	19	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	6.9
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	19	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	6.9
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.95

## Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Great statistical analysis and explaining the tests used with appropriateness

I especially like the analysis of the study strengths and limitations, and importantly was the extra effort taken to explain why the study authors used certain methods/tactics.

Great job at explaining the studies and what things are relevant. Also, by explaining why certain things were good or bad and in very clear language.

Great job with your analysis!! You really went in to detail on WHY the statistical analysis used was appropriate or not. It was actually a great drug lit review!

Seminarian pointed the issues with the studies very effectively

great explanation of articles

More depth in assessing paper strengths and limitations.

Ray did a very good job evaluating his studies and explaining the strengths and limitations.

Great talk on the limitations of the study

Great job with presenting the data and amazing job hitting on the stats and why each test was or was not appropriate.

He had a strong understanding of the clinical data and explained the information clearly.

His analysis of study strengths and limitations was excellent.

The seminarian covered all his objectives.

Your bias analysis was very complete and thoughtful. It included important things that I probably would have missed in my own reading (like title bias).

Everything was explained thoroughly, one of the best so far!

More power discussion would be helpful. The discussion of bias was great.

Was able to present the data in an interesting way that came across as more of a story instead of just listing the facts. This helps me remember the studies so I can recall them later when needed.

very clear explanation of studies. Studies were a little weak but from what you explained I understood they were the best out there.

I thought it was good that he pointed out potential biases of authors based on just the titles of the study and how it could affect the results

Great analysis of clinical data. Student was able to go outside the author's conclusions and critique the studies.

Did a great job describing the statistical analyses used and explained why they were (or weren't) appropriate for that particular study. He even suggested a better method than what the authors had used, very impressive.

yes



## Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	19	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.86
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95

## Conclusions Comments

It was a hard topic to see why the pharmacist is relevant as they are not usually the ones to determine which medications surgeons will use

I think that the conclusions drawn were well supported, and more importantly the seminarian was able to explain what and why the conclusions were valid or not.

Great job at explaining what the role of the pharmacist is and what to do with the information that was just presented.

Very clear recommendations. Your conclusions were direct and clear.

Excellent analysis of bias

great job

Conclusions were derived from the data presented.

His conclusions were appropriate and were supported by good data.

Great conclusion. Good summary of both studies.

Great job with making your own conclusions and critically analyzing the authors conclusions.

He was very specific and direct with his recommendations.

Provided specific recommendations for us to follow which was nice. He could have discussed the clinical importance and application of the studies more.

The seminarian's conclusion was supported by the data presented.

I liked how your conclusions were strong and not wishy-washy at all.

The conclusion was great, and I liked how you had little quizzes, and specific recommendations what a pharmacist should do.

Kept conclusions appropriate to the level of evidence.

Conclusions are within the available evidence. I liked the thorough pharmacist's role with different scenarios where the treatment may be appropriate.

From how you presented your studies I was able to make the same conclusions as you. Great Job able to provide strong conclusions based on the data presented to him in the studies.

Conclusions were well thought out and supported.

I thought the conclusion was excellent and you supported it well with data and explanation.

yes

Question Answer Session									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	20	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.91
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

### Question Answer Session Comments

Great job of answering the tough audience questions

Great job answering questions with well thought out answers. I also like the idea of asking the audience a question, especially when they did not have one. I think that was a great way to engage the audience.

Great job at giving the audience opportunities to ask questions and then asking the audience questions to get them thinking and to keep their attention.

Great audience interaction. Loved how you quizzed us and had us participate!

Seminarian used quizzes and questions to the audience. Good clarifications in the methods for the studies

good job with mini quizzes!

Nice job handling questions.

He did a good job answering audience questions.

Able to think on his feet quickly.

Good job answering questions and involving the audience.

Raymond did a great job encouraging audience interaction.

He seemed to dodge questions at the end of his presentation by not providing much time for the audience to formulate questions. He also tended to answer questions in a round about way. However, he did provide opportunities for the audience to ask questions at other points during his seminar.

The seminarian did a great job answer questions and encouraging patient interaction.

You handled questions well, especially the ones from Dr. Granger about heparin that did seem to totally relate to your presentation.

Lots of opportunities to ask questions.

The interaction throughout the presentation was great, but questions could have been answered more thoroughly.

Encouraged questions throughout and was able to answer questions well.

Excellent answers to questions, even the hard ones from Granger

was able to thoughtfully answer most of the questions with little or no difficulty

Great job answering and encouraging questions.

Great job answering questions.

good jobs

## 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	19	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.86
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	20	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.91
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

## Overall Knowledge Base Comments

Great knowledge base

I believe that the overall knowledge base was solid and well studied. Seminarian appeared to be well prepared.

Great job at thinking on your feet and answering the questions thoughtfully.

Obvious that you knew the information inside and out (even if you didn't know exactly how protamine was made - which was not what you were presenting on)

Raymond acknowledged the clinical implications of the studies

good job explaining and theorizing

Raymond appeared to be well versed in the topic.

He did a good job thinking on his feet and he wasn't afraid to refer to audience members if he was unsure about a question.

Great knowledge of the topic

Great overall knowledge base and had done a lot of research on the topic. He was also able to look beyond the author's conclusions and critically evaluate those conclusions and state what could have been done to improve the studies.

Raymond is very bright and can figure things out quickly while thinking on his feet.

He theorized when he was unsure of the answer. Hard questions were posed to him as well. He could have distinguished between clinical and statistical significance more and determined whether the primary outcomes were really that clinically relevant.

The seminarian was very knowledgeable about his topic.

You made good use of other references and guidelines in your discussion.

I thought you were able to answer the questions very well, even the ones where the professor tried to stump you.

More knowledge of coagulation cascade would have been helpful.

It was clear that Ray knew a great deal about the topic and had researched it thoroughly.

You were an expert of this topic

student was able to explain clinical relevance and why the topic was important to our future practice

Student thought outside the author's conclusions and was able to apply them to clinical practice

Obviously knew a great deal on the subject. Easily answered questions. Also came up with own well thought out conclusions rather than just repeating the author's conclusions.

yes

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

I liked the seminar a lot

Very easy to follow along and digest the information as it was presented.

Great presentation style, probably one of the best I have seen so far. I like how you presented the material and made it easy to follow along and clear language.

Great job overall, you were confident, made eye contact, took your time.

These studies were very difficult to work with but the presentation was still clear

great review of clotting factors!

Good organization and smooth flow.

I like that Ray asked the audience questions. It kept the audience's attention.

I liked the way you introduced both studies before diving into it in later discussions

Really great job with presenting the data along with the statistical information and critically evaluating the studies and stating how the studies could have been improved.

I liked how he was able to analyze the information well, and he was very good at explaining things throughout the presentation.

I liked how he asked the audience questions throughout his presentation to get the audience involved.

The seminar did a great job of making the presentation flow smoothly.

I liked how you asked the class to participate and answer questions.

I thought your explanations of the statistical information and the limitations of the study were very detailed. I liked that you explained why certain things were a limitation.

Pace and interaction were great.

Very interesting topic that was presented in a way that was understandable and clear.

This was one of the clearest seminars that I have ever heard. It maintained my interest and was understandable.

I liked that he kept the audience engaged with the little mini-quizzes.

Great style and analysis of presentation

Good amount of text on the slides that was easy to read and follow. Also did a good job coming up with suggestions for the therapeutic use of your topic.

very good presentation with full preparation

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

There isn't anything I would change

Maybe include more visual aides/pictures.

Wouldn't change anything.

Can't really think of anything

a little more silence for the question time

this is picky but when showing the charts/graphs, you could either summarize or breakdown the paragraph that explains it

More images and visuals throughout slides.

Sometimes his explanations were a bit long and probably could have been a little shorter.

N/A

Could have been a bit more brief and get to the point quicker than taking a bit of a round about way to the main point.

He would benefit from being slightly more succinct in his presentation.

He could have gone a little faster. He seemed to drag on a bit at times.

The seminarian can explain a little bit more on his interest of researching about pediatric patients.

When asking the audience questions I think you should try to give them more time to answer (someone eventually will). Since that can be time consuming, maybe you wouldn't want every question you pose to be in that format, but it would be nice if some were.

I think at times the pace could have been picked up, which would have made the presentation a little bit smoother.

Anticipate questions and make sure you have a very strong knowledge base.

It would have been nice if more data was available so we could draw a stronger conclusion for clinical practice.



You could design your own experiments and publish on this topic so there are stronger studies out there.

Give a more concrete explanation as to what the pharmacists' role is with this drug

Nothing at this time

Nothing, it was great.

n/a

## General Comments

Good job

Best seminar so far this semester!!!

Great job at asking us questions and involving the audience in your thought process.

Great job! Congrats!

Great job!

great job overall!

Choose a more global topic next time. The drug that you examined is not used widely and may not be relevant to all pharmacists and populations.

Great job Ray! You did a good job evaluating your studies and presenting your information to the audience!

Great Job!

Overall great job and I was very impressed with your statistical analysis.

I think Raymond did an excellent job and definitely looked confident up there.

He did an excellent job and knew the material well and beyond just the topic of his seminar.

Overall, the seminarian was very knowledgeable and kept the audience engaged.

Great job! I'm really impressed with how much you've improved since last time (I didn't know if that was even possible, but apparently it is.)

Overall, great presentation. Your knowledge and confidence definitely showed through in this presentation.

Overall well done.

Best seminar ever

overall very good presentation on an interesting topic

Great seminar!

Good job!

good topic and great presentation