

Presenter: Turner, Kyle

Seminar Date: 2013-10-24

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
6.95	6.88	6.95	6.94	6.95	6.98	6.97	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	0	0	0	E (48.21)

Presentation Style									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	18	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.9
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95

Presentation Style Comments

Thought it was great.

He was able to grab our attention and inform us about the topic quickly.

Excellent job with presentation. The flow was just right and he engaged the audience with questions.

Presented the material in a way that kept the audience engaged

n/a

I thought you presented at a great pace, and you kept the audience listening

Great pace and a good background of the disease state was given. I felt comfortable with the information being presented when prior to this lecture had no experience with the disease/drugs.

Very professional. He maintained great eye contact with the audience and was very confident throughout the presentation

Great pace!

Good pace throughout

Great job knowing your slides well enough to maintain good audience eye contact.

He did a good job on his presentation.

Was easy to listen to and follow

Really confident, well-spoken

He was confident and engaging. I had no trouble paying attention.

Your presentation style was very engaging. Thank you, sir.

Kyle is nicely comfortable in front of an audience.

Great flow and pace. Very professional!

Good moderate pace. Some reliance on notes, but able to still maintain eye contact with audience. There were a few "um" that occasionally took away from the presentation. Would have appreciated a bit more information regarding atrial fibrillation and the importance of anticoagulant therapy there to help set the background for the presentation.

Great confidence.

Instructional Materials

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	16	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.75
2	Slides and handout are devoid of spelling and grammatical errors	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
3	Provided orientation to charts/graphs/pictures/diagrams (if applicable)	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.9
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	18	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.9

Instructional Materials Comments

No complaints

He was well organized.

He clearly oriented the audience to the charts/tables.

Did particularly well orienting us to the various graphs and charts that were used, it really facilitated understanding of the study results

Good job orienting audience to all the graphics

Your handout was very clear, but maybe a bit long

Gave great orientation to all graphs which was very helpful to those like me who were near the back of the room.

Great slides! Awesome Information in handout and appendix

Some slides seemed busy due to inclusion of long paragraphs and use of full sentences. Otherwise, everything was great.

Slides were very easy to read and well put together

Minimal typos throughout. Great job orienting us to graphs and charts.

Had many graphs and explained them well.

Really good at orienting you to what was on the handout and on his slides.

Good presentation, some slides were rather lengthy

There was some seeming discrepancies on the results section of one of the studies that I didn't hear any explanation for.

The materials looked excellent. However, there were a lot of P1s that attended your seminar, and I was unable to obtain a copy of the supplemental handout. Maybe we can announce that upperclassmen

have priority when it comes to the handouts.

It's a bummer when the graphs don't expand well but what can you do? They were fine enough to get the general idea and clearer ones were in the handout.

Great slides- easy to read and not too wordy

Great job orienting the graphs. There were a few blurry pictures in the presentation. Maybe next time make your own tables and diagrams. The handout order was not the same as on the slides.

good job orienting us to charts.

Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	18	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.9
4	Appropriate background information was provided	18	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.9
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Overall Presentation Content Comments

I thought the content was great, and background and the problem were well explained.

He was well organized.

Overall, great background information, but it would have been nice to have a little more information about afib and why it is important to treat it, pathophysiology, etc.

Interesting topic and felt that the case was really effective at getting the purpose of your seminar across

Interesting topic, good job

Your presentation flowed very well

I thought the definition of the controversy was great and even at the end left us with a great thought about where to start thinking about the issue

I really liked the intro to the topic starting out with a case. It got the audience engaged and interested from the beginning.

Background on the topic was very thorough

Really liked how you used the patient case

I thought you introduced the idea well, developed your controversy, and provided adequate background information.

I liked that he had a personal interest in his topic.

Really well done.

Excellent level of background to catch us up, if we were unclear on the topic

Great Job!

I enjoyed hearing about your interest in the topic. When I learned it was a cardiology-related topic, I knew it would be amazing (given that I already knew of your love for cardiology given your previous

seminar from P3 year).

All were done well

Very well organized and interesting topic. Only suggestion: a tiny bit more background in a-fib

Good flow. Would have appreciate more background on the disease state (atrial fibrillation).

Content was good for time allotted.

Presentation of Clinical Data										
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Presented concise objectives, methodology and treatment for each study	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
2	Outcome measures were stated and described, and appropriateness was explained	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	19	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	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.8
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Clinical data all seemed in order, the graphs were well explained too. /

He was very entertaining yet still professional.

Good explanations of studies.

Presented the studies in a clear way and felt the analyses were spot on

n/a

I got the impression that you really understood your material

Evaluation of the pros and cons was very nicely done

Great description of the studies and assessment of the strengths and weaknesses.

Good job on explaining the studies used and their relevance

Appropriate explanation of studies

Great overall presentation of the studies. My only comment is that you had concern about one of your studies not achieving power, even though they did find a statistically significant difference. Because they detected that significance, they inherently were powered enough. Something in their calculation was off that made them predict the need for a larger sample size for that outcome. Otherwise, you were fantastic.

Did well

Perfectly done.

Good analysis of the data, made it easy to understand

Though there were weaknesses in the trials, they were discussed, and put into context.

The clinical data were separated and presented in a manner that enabled me to easily follow along with what the presenter was saying.

Great presentation! Awesome calculation of number needed to harm! I forgot how to do that.

Studies were well analyzed and easy to understand through his explanations.

Great analysis of the studies, appreciate your ability to differentiate your conclusions from the authors'.

good analysis of studies

Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	18	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.9
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
4	Discussed the role of the pharmacist and/or impact to the profession of pharmacy in regards to the use of the treatment	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95

Conclusions Comments

Use of a case to discuss relavency was great and made the conclusions very understandable. I think I might do it in my future seminars.

Well though out conclusion.

Great conclusions. He described the role of the pharmacist well.

Definitely made the topic relevant to pharmacists and our role

Good job

I liked how you recommended when you would use double vs. triple therapy

I liked how you said you may not have a say in what happens but you could have an opinion if asked.

Great conclusion. Loved the case to tie it all together. The pharmacist role was emphasized and clinical importance was discussed in detail.

Met all the necessary criteria. Great conclusion

Very good overall conclusions

Very relevant conclusions that were well defined and applicable to clinical practice.

Very detailed about our role as pharmacists

At the end you proposed a really important question and I wish that an answer based on the research done to date (at least by you) would have been given. / Really good job, enjoyed the presentation a lot.

Great job defining the role of the pharmacist

I thought the seminarian's final conclusion could have been more firm, but I understand why he would be conservative.

While I did think that your conclusions were supported by the data, I do feel that most clinicians will be unlikely to start the majority of their patients on triple therapy, as they tend to err on the side of

conservatism with liability in mind.

I would disagree with you and say double therapy should be the standard with the thought that triple therapy may be necessary in certain patients. I've decided to be conservative lately. Really well done.

Conclusions were based on the evidence. Love how he ended with a final thought.

Great job emphasizing the clinical importance of the study.

good discussion of the grey area that remains with all the data.

Question Answer Session									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Question Answer Session Comments

Didn't have any questions.

I like that he was able to confidently answer each question presented to him.

He answered questions with ease and demonstrated thorough knowledge of the studies.

Fielded questions successfully and had a great dynamic with the audience

For better or worse the presentation left little room for many questions

Great job with the Q & A. You had a lot of questions

Clearly understood what was going on in the trials as all questions were answered very well. I thought he handled Dr. Oderda's question very well.

Great job answering questions!

Kyle seemed very prepared and did a good job answering questions

Good job answering questions

You had great answers to the questions.

Answered question thoughtful and well

.

Answered questions thoroughly and without hesitation

N/A

Used the Q&A session as an opportunity to clarify a less-clear "weakness" of one study that was addressed in the presentation...perfect use of the opportunity.

Great question/answer period!

Q and A was well done. It was clear he knew his subject.

Able to answer questions well and could speculate the answer when the answer was not exactly known.

Great answers.

Overall Knowledge Base									
#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	20	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	20	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	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.95

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

Knowledge base seemed pretty extensive

He was able to share his view of the guidelines

He demonstrated thorough knowledge of his topic while addressing questions.

Apparent he knew that material well, and definitely came up with his own conclusions about the studies
n/a

You obviously understood your topic

I thought he clearly demonstrated thinking on his feet because of how he answered the questions.

Great knowledge of the subject

Very prepared and knowledgeable

I could tell that you knew your stuff and you were very well prepared

Based on the questions you were asked and your presentation, I could tell that you know this area very well. Great job!

Several questions answered that were a little off topic

Very prepared.

Definitely knew more than what was presented, as evidenced by the Q and A session

He was well prepared

It was evident that the seminarian knew much more than was addressed in the formal presentation.

Good job looking at the level of recommendation!

Great knowledge base and he clearly was able to think on his feet.

Good placing the conclusions in the context of current guidelines (triple vs. double therapy as the standard).

good knowledge of subject.

Provide one comment on what you liked about this seminar

As mentioned earlier, I liked that he used a case based example to reinforce what the conclusions were.

He was very personable.

He was clearly prepared and his seminar went very well. Great flow throughout and great explanation of the studies.

His presentation style flowed well, the material he presented was concise and he was effective in explaining his topic and the controversy.

Good subject, well researched.

I think you presented very clearly

I felt he was very prepared and explained everything well enough to everyone that I was never lost by what he was talking about. I feel like I could adequately explain to people what the papers were about pretty accurately after leaving.

I really enjoyed the patient case that he started with and ended with. I think it emphasized the clinical significance of the topic and got the audience engaged.

Topic background was great

Very interesting topic and something that would be applicable

I really liked your topic and how you approached your conclusions.

He did a well job in his presentation. He knew his subject very well, present good and had good slides to show his findings.

Well prepared, flowed well and could follow and understand everything being presented from beginning to end.

You were very natural at speaking and relaxed throughout

I liked the overall flow and mood; Kyle was confident and did great at keeping the audience's attention. He was also great at keeping his explanations concise yet thorough.

That it is actually clinically relevant.

Awesome topic! Very timely and appropriate.

Great presentation style- good flow and pace, great eye contact, no hesitations or pauses. Overall a fantastic presentation.

Appreciated your patient case. Good job summarizing the balance needed between risks and benefits of anticoagulation therapy.

I liked the topic and your presentation of the topic.

Provide one comment on what could be improved about this seminar

Having researched this topic a little already, an analysis of whether or not the increased risk of bleeding was associated with higher mortality rates would have been good. I remember from I had found that even with triple therapy, mortality rates from bleeds was no different than in dual therapy even though the rate of bleeding events was higher. You might have stated that though, I confess I drifted off at one point.

Nothing comes to mind.

Maybe include more background about afib, including pathophys.

The presentation and topic were great as is; would have been interesting to look at the other, newer anticoagulants too.

I wouldn't mind a little more info on the physiology of the disorder

The handout could have been trimmed down

I feel like more time could be spent on the Afib disease state just to be clear on exactly what that is.

I thought he did a great job and I don't have any recommendations.

I would avoid using full sentences on the slides.

Couldn't think of anything to big, nice job

Just a better understanding of power in clinical trials.

He really never made a conclusion to his controversy. He did explain the risks well with both choices, but didn't seem to answer the controversy. He said it should be determined on each case.

See prev. comment about an answer to the concluding question proposed.

None, at this time

There were a couple of discrepancies within the studies that were never explained.

Just ensuring that all your classmates received a handout.

Hmmm...add color to your slides...grasping at straws really on this one.

Just a bit more background on a fib to remind the P4s and help the p3s understand.

Avoid the use of too many "ums."

I would have liked a little more info on the new oral anticoagulants realizing that it may have been difficult with the time limits.

General Comments

Great job overall. I felt it was a very applicable.

Good job.

Great job Kyle!

Great presentation, well done, and I was very interested in the subject matter.

Overall great job. It would be hard to beat this presentation in my opinion.

Great job. I really enjoyed the seminar!

Awesome job Kyle!

Great job on your seminar!

Good job!

See prev. comments

N/A

Your wife makes excellent pumpkin chocolate chip cookies! I thank you both!

I'm keeping your seminar to reference later! Great job!

Excellent job Kyle! The seminar was truly great. You are a very confident presenter and that will get you far in our profession.

Great job overall. Could really tell that you put in a lot of work for the seminar. Great topic that emphasizes the importance of weighing the benefits and risks.

Great Job.