Presenter: Efimova, Ekaterina

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
6.96	6.9	6.96	6.88	6.93	6.94	6.92	6.63	6.88	6.7	6.2	6.63	6	6.7	0	0	0	E (46.86)

Presentation Style

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Moderate Pace	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Thorough eye contact/ minimal reliance on notes	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
3	Displayed professionalism/ poise/ confidence/ lacked distracting mannerisms	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	6.88
4	Material presented at the appropriate level for the audience	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.94

Presentation Style Comments

Great pace and eye contact.

Very well put together!

The pace and eye contact were great. The material was complicated but you explained it pretty well.

Was very professional throughout the seminar, kept a good pace, and really impressed with her lack of needing notes.

Good volume and near constant eye contact. Very engaging

You held yourself very professionally

I thought the pacing was excellent. The background was also a great 30,000 foot view of CLL and was much appreciated.

Very professional and confident with minimal reliance on notes.

I thought you were fantastic at maintaining eye contact with the audience and looking minimally at your slides.

Did a good job of professionalism and was at an appropriate level for audience

Great presentation style and pace. It was easy to follow along and understand what you were trying to discuss. /

Very confident and well-rehearsed

When she made a small mistake, it derailed her confidence for a bit, but for the most part, she was very confident.

The background provided was appropriate and allowed me to follow the presentation.

Spoke a bit fast, but had a lot of info to go through. A few ums and uhs here and there, and a few moments of stumbling on words, but always recovered. Overall, she spoke clearly and had great eye contact.

Great pace. Good eye contact. Did not read off slides.

Seemed a little nervous. Work on calming nerves and avoiding the "ums"

Instructional Materials

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Slides and handout were clear/easy to read	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.82
2	Slides and handout are devoid of spelling and grammatical errors	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.94
3	Provided orientation to charts/graphs/pictures/diagrams (if applicable)	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.82
4	Cites appropriate references/correct referencing style and emphasizes primary literature	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Instructional Materials Comments

A little more description of the only graphic you had in your slides would have been helpful. I thought the handout would be better with bullet points.

I thought your slides were perfect, not bulky.

Slides were easy to read and without any grammatical/spelling errors.

I liked the handout having paragraphs, contrary to what was said in class, and it was well organized and devoid of errors. Cited appropriate references.

I liked the med chem stuff, good background on MOA etc.

The handout was a bit chunky

Oriented us all to the graphs appropriately. Everything was clear.

Great appendix with lots of information! Would have liked to see more graphical representation of results in the slides, but that is just personal preference

I actually like when handouts have paragraph formatting so that I can use it as a good in-depth reference later on. Good job!

Provided a good explanations of the charts she used.

Slides and handout were prepared well. More bullet points in the handout may have been helpful. / Very good job orientating the audience to charts and graphs. / Citations throughout appeared appropriate

Did not orient regarding graph on epidemiology slide

I love how clear and to the point her handout was.

Everything looked very nice. I did think some of the text was a little bit too small on some of the slides; it would likely be too small for someone with mildly impaired vision sitting toward the rear of the room.

Slides and handout were easy to read. A few slides were wordy. Provided great orientation to graphs

and charts.

Clear slides. Would have liked bulleted points in handout instead of paragraph form. Good orientation to diagrams--really appreciated diagram of mechanism of action of the medications discussed. Few typos in handout.

Really point out what the graphs say especially on complex ones

Overall Presentation Content

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Introduction, interest in topic, and outline/objectives described	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Defines purpose/controversy of seminar topic clearly	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.94
3	Objectives clear and useful for self assessment	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
4	Appropriate background information was provided	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.94
5	Well organized presentations and smooth transitions (appropriate 'flow')	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.94

Overall Presentation Content Comments

Thought you did great establishing the controversy and letting us know what your interest was.

Present anytime, you are great at it.

Great interest in the topic. I liked how you referred to your interest throughout the presentation.

Objectives were clear and helpful, interest in topic memorable, and the appropriate background info was provided.

Great flow, a lot of information was covered but it was done so in a concise manner.

I liked your background info

Giving the background on the approval by the FDA was great and helped define the controversy.

I felt like the controversy was a little unclear, but great background information to orient that audience

Objectives were great. I appreciate your personal connection to the topic. It was also nice to have you include the approval history, NCCN guidelines, and site of action in the background.

She was well organized on her presentation and had a good interest in topic.

Introductory material was covered very well and in-depth. Your interest in the topic was compelling and interesting. Your controversy was clear and how you wanted to address it was explained. Organization and flow were good.

Nice touch adding information regarding interest in topic

Everything was great, besides the slight interruption when she got nervous and tripped over her words a bit.

As aforementioned, the background information was appropriate and useful.

Great interest in topic. Objectives well defined and background was very good. Controversy was clearly outlined. Could have defined what ORR was (i.e. what is a response), but otherwise was great.

Great set up of the controversy. Appreciated your ability to define the questions that you wanted to answer through your seminar. Would have appreciated definition of ORR within the context of the studies and CLL as well as what would constitute clinical significance.

Great intro story, very captivating

Presentation of Clinical Data

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	NA	Mean
1	Presented concise objectives, methodology and treatment for each study	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Outcome measures were stated and described, and appropriateness was explained	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.88
3	Presented key trial results with corresponding statistical analysis	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.82
4	Student is able to determine if sample size and power is appropriate (if applicable)	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	6.93
5	Withdrawals and dropouts are accounted for (if applicable)	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	6.87
6	Provided a detailed & thoughtful analysis of study strengths and limitations	14	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.76

Presentation of Clinical Data Comments

Good analysis of the strengths and weaknesses. I think a slide with them listed seperately would have been helpful, but you did mention them.

Talk about knowing your stuff... Oh wait, you did!

You had some challenging studies that did not appear to be in the typical intervention vs control format, but you did a good job explaining the important points from the studies.

Did a great job explaining the studies and discussed their appropriateness. Hit on key points.

I think it's difficult to give the study an honest assessment as efficacy compared to existing treatments wasn't the aim of the study. The goal of the study was to determine proper dosing of the drug. You handled the studies well, but I don't think it was an easy road to take.

Obviously more data would be nice, but you did great with what was available

Only constructive comment here would be to explain what the power was referring to. What was the comparison?

Great description of the trials, would have liked more emphasis on the trial with ibrutinib since that was the focus of the seminar

I would liked to have seen more about the appropriateness and definitions of the various outcomes that were measured in the studies. Also, you had strengths and limitations in the handout, but they were missing from the slides/presentation.

She had a difficult job demonstrating about her topic with limited data. It would have been good to have dived deeper into her trial of interest.

Analysis of the studies was really good. The conclusions drawn from the studies seemed a little muddy.

The strengths and weaknesses were addressed throughout the presentation of the study, not just at the end. Really good. Addressing sample size throughout was important but having a more evidence based sample size cut off would have been helpful.

Address what clinical significance is while presenting data

She was able to really bring home the relevance of the results.

I thought you did a fine job with the way you presented the data. I can imagine with such different studies that it was difficult to meld together, and I thought you did that successfully.

Thorough analyses and I liked how she selected the studies, since there were so few in this area. She could have focused more on her main ibrutinib study moreso than the other two, but otherwise it was very good.

Liked how you pointed out strengths and weakness as they came up in your study discussion. Felt that more was needed regarding the p53 mutation in the first two studies and if that affected results.

You said that the drug was "superior" at one point. I think this was just a slip since your handout/slides didn't say it, Be careful since the data didn't show that it was superior. Not a huge deal but something to think about

Conclusions

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Conclusions are supported by data presented in the seminar	14	2	1	0	0	0	0	6.76
2	Clinical importance and application of the study is discussed	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.94
3	Provided specific recommendations for clinical pharmacy practice	17	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	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Conclusions Comments

I thought your description of the pharmacist's role was well done.

Loved the ace in the sleeve and the cart before the horse analogy.

Great discussion on the role of the pharmacist. They play a big role in helping other providers select optimal treatments for patients.

Discussed the role of the pharmacist effectively. Didn't explain why she thought the results were clinically significant until the question and answer session.

Again, back to previous comment, it's hard to necessarily draw conclusions about the study as we're not directly comparing the drug with other treatments. It was good that you acknowledged that in the presentation and you handled criticism of the point well.

I would have liked a little more info on what pharmacy will realistically do with this info

I thought the discussion of the pharmacist's role was great, and when it came up in a question from the faculty I thought you handled it very well.

Since the studies were different with different populations, I don't necessarily think you can state ibrutinib is "superior" or non-superior. Great summary table of studies. Great discussion of the role of the pharmacist

Your conclusions were pretty good in general. However, based on these studies you cannot claim any superiority or accurate comparison. When these studies are all we have, of course you have to make some assumptions. Just be careful about how you word the conclusions when the data is so minimal.

I liked how she formulated her own opinions that might be different from the authors conclusions.

I think your conclusion about the FDA putting the cart before the horse was right on. The evidence behind their recommendation is lacking. / One issue with your conclusions is that it is not appropriate to make comparisons across the different trails that you presented. Overall great job.

There was one question regarding how pharmacists can help make decisions, maybe emphasize what other things pharmacists can do, e.g. make adjustments based on patient specific parameters, etc.

Her conclusions were well thought out, and delivered confidently.

I agree with your conclusion that the FDA may have "put the cart before the horse". It would have been easy to just agree with the FDA in your conclusions. I'm glad you put some thought into it.

Conclusions were well explained and based on the evidence. I like how she made specific recommendations based on different patients. Great information on future studies.

Great conclusion--specific recommendation made for what patients you would be willing to use ibrutinib in.

Superiority comment goes here

Question Answer Session

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Succinctly, yet thoroughly answered audience questions	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.94
2	Encouraged questions and interaction with the audience	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.94

Question Answer Session Comments

i thought you did a great job answering some difficult questions.

Man, Dr. Bae really tried to trip you up, but you did great!

You got some detailed questions, which you handled well. Great job!

Answered questions extremely well and was open to questions.

Some difficult questions, you obviously had a good understanding of the drug to answer them as well as you did.

Awesome with q and a

I thought all of your responses to questions were great.

Great job answering questions!

Good job handling the volley of questions that you were asked!

She did a good job answering tough questions with difficult answers

You got many difficult questions. Remember to keep your composure even if you don't know the answer. Its ok not to know.

Question and answer was OK, could be a little more prepared

She was very patient when answering questions.

You were unable to succinctly answer questions due to the duration of the multiple inquiries, but I thought your answers were appropriate.

Good Q&A, especially with all of the difficult questions from one of her faculty graders.

Great job answering questions. Kept calm throughout the session and used your knowledge of the subject well.

Try to find other ways to engage the audience since this is a topic a lot of people won't know much about

Overall Knowledge Base

#	Question	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	Mean
1	Demonstrated knowledge of subject beyond the facts presented in the seminar	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
2	Student is able to distinguish the difference between clinical and statistical significance	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.82
3	Student is able to look beyond the author's conclusions and offer insight into the overall study results	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	6.82
4	Student is able to discuss conclusions in the context of previous research and in comparison to current practice/therapy	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	6.94
5	Student is able to think on his/her feet. May theorize if not sure of answer, but identifies answer as such	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Overall Knowledge Base Comments

Great job discussing the contexts of your main study amongst the data from the others.

I guess this makes you the expert on the subject now huh!

You seemed comfortable in the Q&A session, which showed that you understood the material. Well done.

Able to look beyond the author's and guidelines' conclusions and draw her own conclusions based on the evidence. Definitely discussed her conclusions in the context of current therapy, and obvious she had a good knowledge based.

You obviously had a great deal of knowledge about the subject and were able to answer questions well, but I think concrete conclusions may be be difficult to draw based upon the data.

It was very clear you knew your stuff

Definitely able to think on your feet. Theorizing on the answer was great to the question about why you chose 100 as the cutoff.

Great knowledge of the subject. Would have liked explanation of clinical significance and why you thought it was clinically significant during presentation, but it was discussed in q/a

Overall you seem to know the topic very well. I wished to see you go beyond the author's conclusions a little more and have more original thoughts. However, that did come out a little more at the end of the presentation.

She formulated her own ideas about what options might be best for the treatment of patients.

Evident that you did your research and knew the information well. Good job

Good understanding of different treatment options and what patient goals may be

She prepared very well, and it showed.

I thought the simple fact that you considered the patient's goals of treatment in your recommendations demonstrated that you could look past the conclusions made in the clinical treatment guidelines and formulate your own opinions for treatment. Nice job.

It was clear that she knew her information- she had solid background knowledge of the topic. She was able to critically evaluate the literature and come up with conclusions different than the authors. She was able to think on her feet.

Great overall knowledge base. Would have appreciated a definition of clinical significance within your seminar.

I liked how you encorporated the future research into the presentation

Provide one comment on what you liked about this seminar

I thought it was a difficult topic to take on since there was really only one study supporting the use of ibrutinib. Great job pulling out a clinical application of the studies analyzed.

Great pace.

You made a complicated topic pretty easy to follow and understand.

Her presentation style was impressive, maintaining eye contact with the audience and had great flow to her presentation.

A lot of energy and confidence

I liked your poise and presentation style

I thought you had the perfect amount of background material in your handout. It was easy to get caught back up on what CLL is.

Great analysis of the data that is available. It was a hard topic and you had a great knowledge base. I like how you chose to do this topic even when the data is not that clear and the studies are limited because that is similar to real life situations.

You did a great job distilling down a difficult topic for us to grasp.

She was able to formulate guidelines based on the evidence and what is best for the patients

Very in-depth and detailed explanations were provided.

I liked the putting the cart before the horse analogy. Good way to introduce the controversy.

I loved how direct and confident her conclusions were.

I liked that you took on the task of investigating how to best treat a disease by looking at multiple drugs (that is, studies with very different interventions).

Solid knowledge base and good eye contact.

Good eye contact with audience. Great job making specific recommendations regarding what you found from your studies.

Very polished. With a little fine-tuning your P4 seminar will rock

Provide one comment on what could be improved about this seminar

As mentioned earlier a seperate slide of strengths and weaknesses would have been nice.

Be inside Dr. Bae's head before you start.

Some information about what a "response" is would have been helpful for the audience to understand the outcomes from the studies.

She could have discussed why she found results to be clinically significant during her seminar rather than after.

It is difficult to try to compare drugs when they are not directly being compared

The handout could have been edited

Understanding what the P values were comparing to would have been nice.

Discuss the definition of clinical significance during presentation

Make sure your conclusions are original and match the data appropriately.

She could have provided more information of the difference between her efficacy trial versus comparative trials.

Be careful about making comparisons across trials that are very heterogenous

Focus on clinical and statistical significance. Anticipate questions from the audience.

When you make a mistake, let it go, and don't fret about it.

Increase the font on some of the slides

Work on trying not to say um or uh and speak a little slower.

Define terms in background section--ORR, clinical significance.

Work to calm your nerves (maybe through more practice)

General Comments

I think you did really good, great presentation style and excitement for your topic.

Great job!

Great presentation and explained the topic very well!

I was very impressed on how well she covered the topic in such a short amount of time. Great job. I'm

excited to see if the "Cart before the horse" becomes the "Ace up the sleeve"

Great job!

Great job overall!

Good Job!

No additional comments. See above.

N/A

Nothing else, thank you.

Congrats on a job well done.

Great job!

Great job overall. Could tell that you put in a lot of work.