HANDS-ON WORKSHOP IN COMPUTATIONAL BIOPHYSICS – SAN DIEGO, JULY 12-16 2010

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 Computational and Theoretical Biophysics.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The Workshop improved my ability to carry out original research in the field of Theoretical and Computational Biophysics.	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.	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
10. The daily noon Q&A period was beneficial.	1	2	3	4	5

III. HANDS-ON SESSIONS	Scale				
1. The hands-on sessions were important for the learning process in the Workshop.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The concrete examples in the hands-on tutorials increased my understanding of the lectures.	1	2	3	4	5

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

III. HANDS-ON, continued	Scale				
3. The hands-on sessions were long enough.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The hands-on sessions were coordinated with the lectures.	1	2	3	4	5
5. TAs were well-prepared to answer questions.	1	2	3	4	5
6. There were sufficient instructions to proceed with the hands-on assignments.	1	2	3	4	5
7. There were enough TAs / instructional staff to help the participants.	1	2	3	4	5
8. The tutorial options accommodated the differing interests of participants.	1	2	3	4	5
9. The tutorial options accommodated the differing expertise levels of participants.	1	2	3	4	5

IV. ENVIRONMENT & TECHNICAL RESOURCES	Scale				
1. The software used in the Workshop ran well on my (circle one: Windows/Mac/Linux) laptop.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The lecture room was conducive to learning.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The projection system was sufficient for the lectures.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The Hilton La Jolla provided sufficient accommodations (hotel guests only).	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. The emails about setting up laptops for 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 hands-on sessions was optimal.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The Workshop addressed my research needs.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Overall, the Workshop met my expectations.	1	2	3	4	5
5. 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 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