TCBG & NSF HANDS-ON WORKSHOP IN COMPUTATIONAL BIOPHYSICS – SAN FRANCISCO

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 instructors were prepared for the lectures.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The lectures were coordinated between instructors.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Lectures incorporated recent developments in the field.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The range of lectures captured the overall essentials of the field.	1	2	3	4	5
8. The level of the lectures was appropriate.	1	2	3	4	5
9. The underlying rationale of the techniques presented was clear.	1	2	3	4	5
10. We were exposed to a well representative range of techniques.	1	2	3	4	5
11. The instructors stimulated my intellectual curiosity.	1	2	3	4	5

III. HANDS-ON	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

IV. ENVIRONMENT & TECHNICAL RESOURCES	Scale				
1. The Apple Powerbook G4s were adequate for the exercises.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The Apple Powerbook G4s ran smoothly.	1	2	3	4	5
3. It was easy to learn how to use the Apple Powerbook G4s.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The software used in the Workshop ran well on the Apple Powerbook G4s.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The lecture rooms were conducive to learning.	1	2	3	4	5
6. The projection system was sufficient for the lectures.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The Club Quarters-San Francisco hotel provided sufficient accommodations.	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 daily noon Q&A period was beneficial.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The Workshop web site was informative before the Workshop started.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The Workshop web site was informative during the Workshop period.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The online information was up-to-date.	1	2	3	4	5
6. The online material was organized.	1	2	3	4	5
7. There was sufficient information about social activities during the Workshop.	1	2	3	4	5

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

VI. GENERAL ORGANIZATION	Scale				
1. The number of participants was reasonable.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The cost of the Workshop was reasonable.	1	2	3	4	5
3. There was enough TAs and support staff to help the participants.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The social activities enhanced the Workshop experience.	1	2	3	4	5

VII. OVERALL SATISFACTION	Scale				
1. Overall technical support was good.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Overall general support was good.	1	2	3	4	5
3. The Workshop was well organized.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The balance between lectures and hands-on sessions was optimal.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The Workshop addressed my research needs.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Overall, the Workshop met my expectations.	1	2	3	4	5

VIII. COMMENTS
1. What suggestions do you have for improving the Workshop?

VIII. COMMENTS, continued

2.   What suggestions do you have for similar workshops?