

## HANDS-ON WORKSHOP ON COMPUTATIONAL BIOPHYSICS – URBANA, OCTOBER 22-26, 2012

**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 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. EVENING LECTURE SESSIONS  | Scale |   |   |   |   |
|---|-------|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The content of the evening lectures was relevant to my work.                         | 1     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. The evening sessions were long enough.   | 1     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. The presentations by TCBG staff and scientists were a good addition to the workshop. | 1     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Presentations by workshop participants were a good addition to the workshop.         | 1     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Overall, the evening sessions were beneficial to the workshop.                       | 1     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| V. 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 Hampton Inn provided sufficient accommodations (answer if applicable to you).        | 1     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| VI. 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 |
| 4. The organizational emails before the Workshop were helpful.             | 1     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| VII. 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!**