



EVALUATION WRITE IT RIGHT OKTOBER 2008

	<i>score 1 - 5</i>
The course met my expectations	4,2
I will be able to apply the knowledge	4,4
Course will help me to do my job better	4,2
Instructor were knowledgeable	4,6
Quality of instruction was good	4,3
Instructors could relate to my situation/question	4,0
Class participation and interaction	4,0
Good course material	4,0
Please rate the course overall	4,4
The course was well organised by FOM	4,1

1. Which of the course items was most useful to you?

1. poster piece, technical English 3, writing manuscript and getting objective advise from instructors, fogometer
2. Lectures technical English
3. Lectures "get your message across"
4. The lectures on technical English were the most useful
5. They were all useful in a different way
6. Rewriting own draft, instructions on getting the message across/analyzing paper for the message
7. -
8. Reviewing other people's articles. The review of my article
9. Technical writing part (given by Prof. Lowe)
10. Technical English
11. To re-write my manuscript/print out the 5 most important sentences in a paper and use the style later on
12. Exercises
13. It was really nice and instructive that our manuscripts were read with such interest. Tnx for the comments!
14. Corrected manuscript, feedback, structure of papers
15. Writing a piece and the instructors comments on them
16. Personal evaluation from teachers
17. Technical English
18. Encouragement that even as non-native English speakers we can write good articles (provided we follow *their tips*)
19. Correction on my paper
20. Tricks to write a good paper
21. How to write scientific English
22. The tips of article structure
23. Exercise, including comments
24. First showing examples then bringing in practice
25. The personal tips we got about our manuscripts, and the pitfalls they say in them

2. Which of the course items was least useful?

1. technical English 1/2, spoons
2. -
3. spoons exercise
4. The lectures on post presentation was not structured
5. -
6. I think all seem useful, perhaps the poster informant is less relevant@ this stage.
7. We only got a reader with exercises
8. unfair determination of best drawing/writing on first day
9. -

10. none
11. how to make graphics- it was good information, but it took too long
12. some presentations
13. -
14. poster focus
15. cherrie exercise
16. -
17. graphics
18. -
19. -
20. making your paper clear and well organized
21. -
22. none
23. ?
24. -
25. -

3. What item(s) did you miss in the course?

1. more information about how to build up a manuscripts, like more in depth than just abstract, intro, results and discussion
2. -
3. -
4. -
5. -
6. -
7. a short of summery of all tips
8. more discussions, interactions, more analyseis of individual mistakes
9. -
10. -
11. information about correcting sentences in a better way
12. -
13. -
14. -
15. -
16. A bit more on paper construction (so the order of things)
17. No items
18. -
19. a written handbook
20. nothing missed
21. -
22. None
23. -
24. -
- 25.

4. How do you evaluate the duration of the course? Is two consecutive days a suitable format?

1. Yes, but I feel the information density of the first day could be higher. This was a lot better the 2nd day.
2. Yes
3. yes
4. yes! The two days should not be separated
5. maybe
6. yes
7. very good
8. could be one more day and therefore less lecture style but more discussions
9. yes
10. yes, perfect
11. everything can be *condensed* in one day
12. could be quiker
13. yes
14. yes
15. Yes, its plenty even 1 1/2 could do

16. In the way it is given, its is oke. Another way might be with a week between were you can rewrite
17. Two consecutive days is good. However the material could have fitted in one day
18. -
19. tiring, coming form far, commuting two consecutive days is too much
20. Yes, I think so
21. yes, perfect
22. The duration is fine. It can be better if arranged in two weeks
23. Is ok
24. Yes, although information density at day 1 was not very high
25. yes, as they dit it, it definitely is

5. Would you recommend this course to fellow students?

1. yes
2. yes
3. yes
4. yes!
5. yes
6. yes, surely
7. yes certainly
8. yes
9. yes
10. absolutely, in first/second year of PhD
11. yes, I already did!
12. yes
13. y
14. yes
15. yes
16. absolutely
17. maybe
18. yes
19. -
20. yes
21. yes
22. yes
23. yes
24. YES
25. yes

6. Do you have any further remarks?

1. I found the 2nd day more useful, there was more usable information there. Especially more information could have been given on the first day. I liked the poster part. This was quite new info.
2. Perhaps, the information density can be slightly higher sometimes, it went a bit too slow (this was also caused by distracting questions of participants)
3. The information given in the lectures is not in the reader, nor anywhere else - It would be nice if it were.
4. Some instructions were a bit chemistry-style oriented, which does not necessarily fit the physics journals.
5. Maybe it would be good to have some extra time in between course days. So that you can practice what you have learned... come back and learn more.
6. -
7. Course should be offered in beginning of second year of PhD
8. Proper food or at least a soup for lunch would be better. Smaller group, 15 people at maximum
9. Smaller groups would be better. It would be useful if we had some version of the presentations professors gave in a paper form, like a reminder
10. -
11. It was a great course. However, condensed in one day or having it in 2 days, but with more informations, will be very useful
12. The website could be more clear!
13. The 10 commandments do not really cover the content of the course. Even though the material in the syllabus is nice, perhaps something more of a "samenvatting" of the course content can be included
14. To FOM: please send time in email, not only by mail.

15. -
16. This is way better as a (8 afternoon) course from James Bosman institute, which was not so good. If possible make it possible to type you're new manuscript, I can not read these handwritings.
17. The information density was low. A lot of time was wasted talking about nothing. One could learn so much more.
18. Bigger tea cups. Hot water.
19. -
20. -
21. The organizing part form FOM could be improved (an agenda should be sent in advance)
22. Some basic introductions of softwares for graphics.
23. Some kind of handout of the lectures?
24. -
25. -

Conclusies

1. De evaluaties (alle deelnemers hebben er eentje ingevuld) zijn uitstekend met een 4,4 (schaal 1-5) als gemiddelde overall score voor de training. O.a. de trainers en de toepasbaarheid van de opgedane kennis worden zeer positief beoordeeld. Vrijwel alle deelnemers zouden andere promovendi aanraden de training te volgen.
2. Het schrijven/herschrijven van een eigen artikel en het krijgen van feedback daarop en de lectures "Technical English" zijn de 2 favoriete onderwerpen. Deze onderwerpen dus absoluut in de cursus houden.
3. Er zijn geen onderwerpen die er in negatieve zin uitspringen en geschrapt zouden moeten worden. Ook kunnen de deelnemers nauwelijks punten noemen die ze gemist hebben.
4. De cursusopzet in 2 achtereenvolgende dagen werkt goed en hoeft niet aangepast.
5. Een aantal deelnemers geven aan dat de 'information density' op de eerste dag laag was en dat de training korter zou kunnen, bijvoorbeeld in 1,5 dag. Een alternatief zou kunnen zijn om extra onderwerpen toevoegen.
6. Sommige deelnemers missen iets van een naslagwerk (of handout of samenvatting o.i.d.)
7. Mensen ontvangen graag per email een extra reminder voor datum, tijd en locatie. Ook ontvangen zij graag vooraf een programma. Dit kan gelijktijdig met `dj asd;ff dsjf asd;dfj`
8. Training jaarlijks opnemen in oio-trainingspakket. Maximum aantal deelnemers 25 in verband met grootte van de zaal. Meestal valt er dan toch nog eentje af.