

WORKSHOP ON GPU PROGRAMMING FOR MOLECULAR MODELING – URBANA, AUGUST 2-4 2013

GENERAL EVALUATION FORM

Rate the items below using the following scale:

1-Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Unsure, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly agree

I. OUTCOME	Scale				
1. The workshop broadened my understanding of concepts and principles in the field of GPU programming for molecular modeling.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The workshop improved my ability to carry out original research in the field of GPU programming for molecular modeling	1	2	3	4	5
3. The workshop improved significantly my computational skills.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The workshop taught me techniques directly applicable to my career.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The material presented in the workshop was relevant to my research/development goals.	1	2	3	4	5

II. LECTURES	Scale				
1. The instructors' knowledge of the subjects was good.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The instructors explained the material well.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The instructors provided real-world examples.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The lectures were coordinated between instructors.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Lectures incorporated recent developments in the field.	1	2	3	4	5
6. The range of lectures captured the overall essentials of the field.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The level of the lectures was appropriate.	1	2	3	4	5
8. The underlying rationale of the techniques presented was clear.	1	2	3	4	5
9. The instructors stimulated my intellectual curiosity.	1	2	3	4	5

III. PARTICIPANT PRESENTATIONS, GROUP DISCUSSION, PROJECT LABORATORY	Scale				
1. Participant project presentations were a useful part of the workshop.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The group discussion of participant projects was beneficial.	1	2	3	4	5

1-Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Unsure, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly agree

III. PARTICIPANT PROJECT PRESENTATIONS & GROUP DISCUSSION, continued	Scale				
3. The programming project laboratory session (on Sunday) was beneficial.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I received valuable input on my project from other workshop participants.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I received valuable input on my project from workshop instructors.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Instructors were well-prepared to answer questions.	1	2	3	4	5
7. There was enough instructional staff to help the participants.	1	2	3	4	5

IV. ENVIRONMENT & TECHNICAL RESOURCES	Scale				
1. The lecture room was conducive to learning.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The projection system was sufficient for the lectures.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The Internet connection provided was sufficient for workshop tasks.	1	2	3	4	5

V. COMMUNICATION & DISSEMINATION	Scale				
1. Instructors were readily available for Q&A outside the lecture periods.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The workshop web site was informative about the event.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Emails about the workshop were helpful.	1	2	3	4	5

VI. OVERALL SATISFACTION	Scale				
1. The workshop was well organized.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The balance between lectures and discussion/laboratory sessions was optimal.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I was able to make significant progress on a GPU version of my code during the workshop.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The workshop addressed my research/development needs.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Overall, the workshop met my expectations.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I would recommend this workshop to others.	1	2	3	4	5

VII. COMMENTS – IMPROVING THE WORKSHOP

1. What suggestions do you have for improving the workshop?

VII. COMMENTS – SUGGESTIONS FOR SIMILAR WORKSHOPS

2. What suggestions/ideas do you have for similar workshops?

VII. COMMENTS, OTHER COMMENTS

3. What topics were most valuable / least valuable to you? What topics do you think should be covered in future workshops?

4. Other comments?

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM