Evaluation Form - RESULTS

Second Split Workshop in Atmospheric Physics and Oceanography

May 22-30, 2010, Croatia

Your evaluation form is anonymous. Please, answer the following questions using the scale from 1 to 5.
(1 = poor, 2 = satisfactorily, 3 = good, 4 = very good, 5 = excellent)

	Rating	Mean
A. Program		
1. Overall quality	5,5,5,5,5,5,4,3,5,5,5,5	4.75
2. Obtaining new ideas and research methods	3,5,5,4,4,5,5,5,2,4,5,4,5	4.30
3. Was the workshop program ambitious?	4,5,5,5,5,4,5,4,4,4,5,4,5	4.53
4. Was the workshop interesting?	4,5,5,3,5,5,5,4,3,5,4,5,5	4.46
5. Workshop organization	4,5,5,3,5,5,5,5,5,5,5,5,5	4.76
6. Exchange experiences with colleagues	4,5,5,3,5,5,5,5,3,5,5,4,5	4.53
B. Lectures		
7. Advisor selection	5,5,5,4,5,5,5,5,5,4,4,5,5	4.76
8. Expertise of advisor	5,5,5,5,5,5,5,5,5,4,5,4,5	4.84
9. Expertise of other speakers	4,4,5,4,5,4,5,4,5,4,5,4,5	4.46
10. Willingness to answer questions	4,5,5,4,5,5,5,5,5,5,5,5,5	4.84
11. Interesting fields	4,5,5,4,5,5,5,4,4,4,3,5,5	4.46
C. Workshop manager (Željka Fuchs)		
12. Adequacy and expertise	4,5,5,3,5,5,5,5,5,4,4,5,5	4.61
13. Organization quality	4,5,5,3,5,5,5,5,5,5,5,5,5	4.76

D. Other	**Rating**	**Mean**
14. Did the workshop fulfilled your expectations?	4,5,5,5,5,5,5,5,3,4,5,5	4.69
15. Your suggestions for improvement	/	**Overall mean**
1. More large-scale midlatitude dynamics, both in meteorology and oceanography. 2. It became clear that student presentations were far more interesting when they actually worked on a project as opposed to just talking about somebody else's paper, so this kind of work should be encouraged. 3. Many of the students did not participate in discussions following presentations. I think this is both beneficial and problematic, in that, when students were not speaking, advisors often engaged in interesting and informative discussions on the topic at hand; however, many students missed an opportunity to make a meaningful statement about the topic to the rest of the group. I think it might be difficult to improve student involvement, however, because students are all focusing on specific topics that are quite unique. For this reason, they probably don't have much to add to a discussion on other topics due to unfamiliarity. One possible way is to distribute abstracts before each session. Another idea is to ask advisors to select 2 or 3 other topics from the list of talks and then to suggest to his/her student(s) to read a little about them in preparation for the presentations. In this way, the advisors can present a broader view of a particular topic by 1) requiring a research project or literature review; 2) by suggesting the student become familiar with related issues on similar topics. In this way, the discussions will become enriched with greater awareness of the topic. Another idea that comes to mind is to make part of each day a period of discussion in smaller breakout groups. The most valuable resource at the conference, I think, is the accumulated knowledge and experience of the advisors. Advisors could form small discussion groups based on a broad topic, such as climate, remote sensing, tropical convection, etc. Then, students could be assigned, or join by choice these groups in order to explore the topic in detail .Lastly, I think a project completion deadline would be helpful, perhaps a week before the start of the conference. Overall, the workshop was a great learning experience for me, and I have even formed a working relationship with my workshop advisor, someone I had not met before the workshop began. I enjoyed meeting other students and was even inspired to increase my knowledge of meteorology, as several of the other students at the workshop had a superior knowledge of midlatitude atmospheric processes than me. Thank you again for the opportunity! 4. Make it 2 weeks long. Add a poster session in which every student can present his/her own work. 5. The workshop was perfect! 6. The workshop was great. I met a lot of great scientists and learned a lot from them. Thank you organizers!! 7. We already discussed about this on Brac: it would be		**4.32**

good to prepare oneself in advance of the workshop, if veryone had to hand in an abstract about his talk. Reading all the other's papers like it was done once, is way too ambitious, as everyone is so much involved in its own thesis and research. One thing I would like to mention: I was unsatisfied in which way one was treated. On the one hand one pretended to have an informal environment, but on the other hand, one was treated like school kids who have to be educated and have to be threatened, that if they don't ask a question, they will fail. I haven't experienced this since I left school over a decade ago. Also Ph.D students are adults and some of them are around 30 years old. It is a matter of being in research only for 2 or 3 years, that you often don't have such an overview over a variety of topics, so that questions simply do not pop up that quickly. I guess being in research for decades in which you have the value of a lot of experience, changes the situation. 8. Compulsory to send in and read a short abstract ~2 weeks before course. Topics that are somewhat related to your own research would be good since the amount of work that needs to be put in is quite large in relation to the point credits. Thank you for a wonderful week! 9. Assign the tasks a few months in advance 10. This was my first time on such workshop so I was very impressed. I liked it very much and hope to participate again. Thank you for that experience! 11. twice per year at least !		

Thank you for your time!