

NAMD Workshop Evaluation
Day 1, Wednesday, April 17, 2002

Check your location.

- _____ Boston University
- _____ NCSA, Champaign
- _____ North Dakota State University
- _____ Ohio Supercomputing
- _____ Pittsburgh Supercomputing

1. Please rate the following presentations:

	<u>Not</u> <u>Useful</u>	<u>Somewhat</u> <u>Useful</u>	<u>Unsure</u>	<u>Useful</u>	<u>Very</u> <u>Useful</u>
a. NCSA Resources	1	2	3	4	5
b. Intro to Molecular Dynamics Simulations	1	2	3	4	5
c. What Can We Learn from MD Simulations	1	2	3	4	5
d. Case Study 1	1	2	3	4	5
e. Case Study 2	1	2	3	4	5
f. Case Study 3	1	2	3	4	5
g. Overview of Hardware/Software	1	2	3	4	5
h. Questions & Answers	1	2	3	4	5
i. The workshop overall	1	2	3	4	5

Comments _____

2. Please rate the following:

	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Unsure</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>
a. Presenter was clearly visible.	1	1	3	4	5
b. Materials were clearly visible.	1	2	3	4	5
c. Participants at other sites were clearly visible.	1	2	3	4	5
d. Quality of audio was satisfactory.	1	2	3	4	5
e. Quality of video was satisfactory.	1	2	3	4	5
f. Use of technology (i.e., participation from multiple sites) enhanced the workshop experience.	1	2	3	4	5

Please provide any comments or suggestions about the workshop content, presentation, or experience so far.

Thank you for your feedback.

NAMD Workshop Evaluation Day 2, Thursday, April 18, 2002

Check your location.

- Boston University
- NCSA, Champaign
- North Dakota State University
- Ohio Supercomputing
- Pittsburgh Supercomputing

1. Please rate the following presentations:

	<u>Not</u> <u>Useful</u>	<u>Somewhat</u> <u>Useful</u>	<u>Unsure</u>	<u>Useful</u>	<u>Very</u> <u>Useful</u>
a. Configuring & Running NAMD Simulations	1	1	3	4	5
b. Building Molecular Structures	1	2	3	4	5
c. Assembling Molecular Systems	1	2	3	4	5
d. Integrating Equations of Motion	1	2	3	4	5
e. Accelerating Processes via Steered MD	1	2	3	4	5
f. Analysis of MD Trajectories	1	2	3	4	5
g. Efficient Evaluation of Forces	1	2	3	4	5
h. NAMD Serial & Parallel Performance	1	2	3	4	5
h. Discussion, Questions & Answers	1	2	3	4	5
i. The workshop overall	1	2	3	4	5

Comments _____

3. Please rate the following:

	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Unsure</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>
a. Quality of audio is satisfactory	1	2	3	4	5
b. Presenter was clearly visible.	1	2	3	4	5
c. Access Grid materials were clearly visible.	1	2	3	4	5
d. Participants at other sites were clearly visible.	1	2	3	4	5
e. Quality of video is satisfactory.	1	2	3	4	5
f. Use of technology (i.e., participation from multiple sites) enhanced workshop experience.	1	2	3	4	5

3. Please rate the workshop:

a. The workshop is well organized.	1	2	3	4	5
b. Satisfied my research needs	1	2	3	4	5
c. Addressed expected research needs	1	2	3	4	5
d. Web-based NAMD materials met my needs	1	2	3	4	5

Comments _____

What suggestions do you have for improving the workshop?

What suggestions do you have for similar workshops?

