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	6.66	6.88	5.38	5.88	6.2	6	5.63	5.25	6.2	0	0	0	E (45.86)

Presentation Style

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
2	Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	5
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4.5
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6

Presentation Style Comments

Tufan stood behind the podium and maintained moderate eye contact with the audience, alternating with reading off the screen. He should have used the microphone because he voice was too soft to hear, causing me to move up to the front of the room. He also mumbled when he looked at the screen.

Tufan showed good pace throughout his presetation; there were not any significant pauses that disrupted the flow of information. His eye contact was generally pretty good. He tended to start discussing each slide with his eyes toward audience, but towards the end of his discussion of individual slides, his gaze returned toward the slide. and away from the audience. Although I think Tufan spent much time putting together the slides and presentation, I think his gaze towards the slides reflects not enough practice time with actual presentation delivery. On many of the slides, but not all of them, Tufan used disfluency/filler terms, mostly "uhms" This is common of many presenters, but also may reflect less experience with public speaking and presentation practice. Tufan presented material at a level that was appropriate to the audience. The therapy is very complex and involves numerous technologies. I think Tufan did a good job explaining these at a level appropriate to the audience.

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)	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	4.5
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5

Instructional Materials Comments

Tufan's handout and slides were in good shape. I didn't notice any spelling or typographical errors. External references were very thoroughly cited on each slide. Kaplan Meier plots were the only data plots, but Tufan didn't orient the audience to them.

Tufan did a good job with his instructional materials. There are many different styles for handouts. I think his handout was extremely detailed, but I think it would have helped to have more outlnining and bullets to break up the long blocks of text. His tabular format for the literature analysis was very well done. Easy to read headings. The slides were generally very well done. An earlier version of his slides used an orange, red yellow background that was difficult to follow. His choice of colors for the final version was much better and easier to read. Again, I think it is related to not enough practice with actual delivery of the presentation, but an opportunity for improvement could be in the orientation to charts and graphics embedded on the slides. Taking a moment to introduce the title/subject of the chart, then identifying the content and unit measurement of the vertical and horizontal axes is extremely helpful to the audience and to the flow of information being presented.

Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
2	Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
4	Appropriate background information was provided	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6

Overall Presentation Content Comments

Turfan gave a thorough introduction and background to lymphoma and current treatment modalities. He also did a good job of positioning radioimmunotherapy to radiation and chemotherapy. Objectives were well framed. The controversy was also well framed, though Tufan should have revisited it at the end as part of his conclusions. The presentation was well organized, though Tufan got ahead of himself on one occasion.

Tufan did very well overall on the presentation content. At the beginning, I would like to have heard about his interest in the subject and how this came to his attention. Tufan did put in a stand-alone slide to introduce the controversy for the presentation. I think two critical elements to the controversy could have been better stated. These are the idea that the disease is indolent/insidious and this been a major influence as to why there are not more aggressive treatments/therapies for the disease. Another element is that the primary studies to be review are phase II trials and thus difficult to draw too many statistical inferences into direct patient care decisions.

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	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.5
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5.5
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Tufan did a good job of explaining his selection of studies, though personally I would have presented more information about the RCT to contrast with the weakness of the other two studies. In particular, no statistical analyses were presented for the primary endpoint or safety results for either of the phase II studies. Although this was probably due to the lack of this information in the studies themselves, it does beg the question of why these studies were selected.

Tufan generally did a good job with his presentation of clinical data. In view that the trials were phase II, this introduced addiional limitations in the value of the studies. On the Illedge study, he described the issues involved with bimodal distribution and the Clopper-Pearson "exact" confidence intervals. I think he used this defintion and statistical test in a very good fashion to analyze the study.

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5.5
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4.5

Conclusions Comments

Tufan's more definite conclusions stemmed from the RCT. He rightly backed off from concluding anything definite from the Phase II studies. Specific recommendations for pharmacy practice seemed supportable. There wasn't a slide for the pharmacist's role, though Tufan described verbally.

Tufan did a good job with his conclusions based on the studies. Also, he did verbally mention implications to pharmacy practice and role of pharmacist. I think he conclusions were ok. Some opportunities for improvement would be getting more out in front on this issue. We could certainly draw the conclusion that, in view of this being an indolent illness, there is not much role baased on phase II trials to use this agent. We should really have a phase III trial that has a better methodolgy for getting at benefit to risk ratios.. Also, the idea of implications to pharmacy practice and role of pharmacist, was presented as an "afterthought" I think he could have had a slide as well as some bullets in the handout that more completely indicated the impact to pharmacy.

Question Answer Session

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	4.5

Question Answer Session Comments

Good Q/A session, though Tufan didn't overtly encourage audience interaction.

Tufan handled the questions pretty well. It seemed like there were some really important elements that did not come out until the final question and answer session. Tufan handled them pretty well, but this may be another opportunity for improvement in seminar. Also, Tufan could have benefited from one or two pauses during the seminar to check if the audience had any questions.

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	1	0	1	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

Very thorough knowledge of lymphoma, its treatment options, and RIT.

Turan demonstrated good knowledge of the subject and demonstrated acceptable critical thought. He was responsive to the audience questions. I did not feel that he made statements or drew opinions that were beyond the scope of his knowledge.

Overall Comments

Interesting seminar.

Overall, Tufan did a good job with his seminar. Opportunities for improvement are primarily based on preparing content and leaving enough time for substantial practice in delivery of the seminar. Tufan appears to be a generally soft spoken person. In any future professional presentations, he should increase his voice level, or use a microphone.