

FIRST INFOBIOMED TRAINING CHALLENGE Satisfaction survey

Total sample size: **10**

QUESTIONNAIRE

User profile

1) Age: **27,9 years** (*SD 2,77*)

2) Gender: Female **60%** Male **40%**

3) Scientific specialty:

Biology, immunology, computer engineering, mathematical modelling, epidemiology, pharmacy, medicinal chemistry, bioinformatics, immunogenetics, medicine, biomedical sciences.

4) Experience in research: **3,55 years** (*SD 2,84*)

5) No. of training events (courses, seminars, summer schools,...) attended :

4,11 (*SD 4,59*)

6) Please indicate your motivation/s for participating in the Training Challenge (tick all the relevant):

Innovative training experience	90%
Cross-discipline approach	90%
Event location	30%
Expenses covered	40%
Establish new contacts	60%
Pharmainformatics topic	30%
Other, please specify	0%

A. Event organisation

A.1. Global quality of the event organisation (1 to 5 scale - very poor to excellent):

4,20 (*SD 0,42*)

A.2. Please rate the infrastructure provided by the organisation (1 to 5 scale - very poor to excellent):

3,60 (*SD 1,26*)

Comments on infrastructure
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better access to internet connection - More computers and internet connections are needed - The only problem was the very early departure of the airplane from Holland. Maybe night before would be better. - An internet connection for each competitor would be a great improvement.

A.3. Please rate the venue where the Challenge takes place (Viladrau) (1 to 5 scale - very poor to excellent):

4,70 (*SD 0,67*)

Comments on training venue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nice place. Quiet. Fresh air. - Beautiful and quiet - Perfect! - A very beautiful area, but there is nothing to do outside of the challenge, which makes you feel very confined and isn't very good for people stress levels as days go by. Also too much food...

A.4. Please rate the venue where the opening/closing sessions take place (Barcelona) (1 to 5 scale – very poor to excellent):

4,60 (*SD 0,52*)

Comments on the opening/closing venue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very good setting - It's Barcelona! But the participants saw very little of it and got hardly a chance to go out and relax together after the challenge was over.

A.5. Please rate the appropriateness of the materials and information support provided by the organisation (1 to 5 scale – very poor to excellent):

3,90 (*SD 0,88*)

Comments on materials and information provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some objectives should be stated earlier (the presentation criteria too). - Better outline of training challenge would be helpful. - I think we all felt we didn't know exactly what was expected of us during the Challenge ("what are we supposed to do" was a common question at the beginning). This lead to confusion and also a lot of stress. I think it would be better to provide more information on what is expected -a talk by the tutors, for example.

B. Event characteristics

B.1. In your opinion, the schedule of the Training Challenge is (1 to 5 scale – highly inadequate to highly adequate):

4,10 (*SD 0,74*)

Comments on event schedule
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Working hours are relaxing, except Thursday. - Not much of schedule (other than breakfast, lunch or dinner) was in evidence. The meetings with the tutors were the only other events outside our work. The tutors were helpful, but there was too many meetings.

B.2. Do you think that the Training Challenge duration is (1 to 5 scale – too short to too long):

2,90 (*SD 0,32*)

Comments on event duration
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The right length. - It should not be longer because it is quite exhausting! - Might be 1 or 2 days longer. - Longer would be nice, since there's lots of time pressure in one week. This depends on the goals. Too long for just reading papers and too short for any real science. Also too long to be kept in a place where there is hardly anything to do outside of work.

B.3. Please, rate the following aspects of the methodology of the Training Challenge:

- Focus on team work (1 to 5 scale – ineffective to effective):
4,20 (*SD 0,79*)
- Cross-disciplinary approach (1 to 5 scale – ineffective to effective):
4,60 (*SD 0,52*)
- Competition of 2 teams (1 to 5 scale – ineffective to effective):
2,20 (*SD 0,92*)
- Number of participants (1 to 5 scale – ineffective to effective):
4,70 (*SD 0,48*)
- Number of tutors (1 to 5 scale – ineffective to effective):
4,70 (*SD 0,48*)

Comments on event methodology
- Very good. - Comments on methodology: I think that competition aspect works counter-productive. - The focus on team work is a great idea and we all learnt how to work as a team. However, I think for everyone to enjoy the team-work and for it to be interdisciplinary you need a problem that everyone can contribute to (i.e. use their own expertise) otherwise people think they aren't really doing anything and can lose interest. Our problem didn't suit the makeup for our group in this way. We had a diverse makeup but some people felt it wouldn't have mattered what their exact background was. The competition part was pointless. We have enough competition outside of the Training Challenge, we don't need it to teach us as well.

C. Event development

C.1. Please, rate the following aspects regarding the Challenge **tutors**

- Relevance of their expertise (1 to 5 scale – very irrelevant to very relevant):

4,10 (*SD 0,57*)

- Helpfulness (1 to 5 scale – very unhelpful to very helpful):

4,80 (SD 0,42)

- Availability (1 to 5 scale – highly unavailable to highly available):

4,60 (SD 0,70)

Comments on tutors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nice group. Learned a lot. Laughed a lot. - It was great to have them there and also great they were of a similar age and very approachable. Their exact expertise didn't come into play very much but the fact they were not under so much pressure and hence they were not so stressed helped us to keep our perspective (well, it helped me anyway :-). However, 3-4 is enough - otherwise we would be swamped by meetings and always feel like someone is watching us (it makes it much harder to work together when you're being observed).

C.2. Please, rate the following aspects regarding the Challenge **experts**

- Relevance of their expertise (1 to 5 scale – very irrelevant to very relevant):

3,38 (SD 1,41)

- Helpfulness (1 to 5 scale – very unhelpful to very helpful):

3,75 (SD 1,58)

- Availability (1 to 5 scale – highly unavailable to highly available):

3,63 (SD 1,51)

Comments on experts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comments on experts: it would be useful to have more experts in different fields. - I didn't notice real difference between tutors and experts. - The experts were also very helpful but their expertise wasn't so relevant so they ended up being much like tutors. It would have been better to have them explain who they were and what their expertise was (though very briefly). Also the amount of experts should be kept low because at one stage we just had a continuous stream of people sitting watching us and asking questions at what we were doing.

C.3. Please rate the Training Challenge dynamics (flexibility, encouragement, degree of participation, openness, etc.) (1 to 5 scale – very poor to excellent):

4,30 (*SD 0,82*)

Comments on event dynamics

- Dynamics within the group was excellent. The team worked well together. - Very interesting! Some researchers really do not know how competitive they are! (or at least they prefer not to know). I could feel this through the whole challenge - even at the final presentation. But that's how life is! - Flexibility was high as was the encouragement and openness. However the degree of participation was let down by the group composition and the problem. Most of us came hoping to use some of the tools and expertise we had to do scientific research (as would be the case in real collaboration) but ended up just reading papers, etc. which was disappointing. We all wanted to show the others what we were doing and how it could help but in the end we couldn't.

D. Event impact

D.1. Regarding the impact of the Training Challenge, please, rate the following aspects:

- General usefulness of the Training Challenge (1 to 5 scale – useless to extremely useful):

4,50 (*SD 0,53*)

- Impact on your future career (1 to 5 scale – very low to very high):

3,60 (*SD 1,26*)

- Impact on the way you perform research (1 to 5 scale – very low to very high):

3,70 (*SD 1,16*)

Comments on impact

-Very useful and I learned a lot. - I learned a lot about group dynamics but also about other points of view and possibilities to generate information. - I liked the challenge because you get to meet people from different backgrounds and see how they think and problem solve and also it enabled me to learn about areas of science I knew nothing about.

E.4. Please, rate your overall satisfaction with the Training Challenge (1 to 5 scale – very dissatisfied to very satisfied):

4,50 (SD 0,53)

E.5. The best about the Training Challenge is...

- The opportunity to meet scientists of different expertise.
- Integration with people from different backgrounds.
- Multi approached team work.
- Meeting new people. Good team work. Learning new skills.
- Meeting people. Valuing interaction. Viladrau. Laughs.
- Learn to work in a collaborative team.
- Interaction, getting to know new people, learn new ideas.
- The possibility to ask anything you want and that way learn about other research fields.
- Discovering and learning about new areas of science. Seeing various approaches to problem solving.

E.6. The worst about the Training Challenge is...

- The fact that at the end there will be "winners" and "losers". It is research, not a TV game.
- A little too short.
- Competition between both teams.
- It had to end.
- It wears you out on the last day.
- The short time range for doing things.
- Competition.
- Stress because of the competition.
- Not enough real problems to tackle for everybody in the time given (and I don't think reading papers qualifies). The presentation at the end is pointless.

E.7. Things that should change in future editions of the Training Challenge:

- Every day (2nd, 3rd & 4th) a different expertise should visit the groups for 3-4 hours. It is not necessary for him to stay overnight.
- No competition, just a challenge.
- I don't think it needs changes.
- Experts should be properly introduced. More internet connections (reduces frustration!).
- Put less stress on competitive part. Improve team work focus.
- Drop the competition.
- No competition. More concrete information on the final goal beforehand.
- More focused case studies that can immediately involve all the participants scientifically. The presentation at the end is not necessary. Those who are interested can read the project proposal written by the groups afterwards.

E.8. Other suggestions for improvement

- Just keep it the same.
- Perhaps a slightly better definition of the challenge and some more time.

E.9. Additional comments

- Excellent location!
- This was a very worthwhile experience that I really enjoyed.
- I enjoyed it very much! Lots of fun & learning combined. Thanks to organizers and tutors!
- Thank you. I will never forget this experience.