FEBS Questionnaire Summary Form - FEBS Number ALC Name Organiz Title FEBS Event: Number of Student Participants 47 Number of Applicants: Number of Senior Investigators 37 Number of Tutors 2 Number of Accepted Participants: 10 Number of Lecturers/Speakers 20 Total Number Participants 104 Total Number Questionnaires Returned 54 51,9 % of Participants Question 1: Organisation of the program. Number of Answers 49 5 Question 2: Quality of scientific training and interaction with speakers Number of Answers 35 16 2 Question 3: Quality of lecturers & talks - was the scientific subject adequately covered and state-Number of Answers 35 18 Question 4: Was there adequate discussion after presentations, or sessions or during practical work?	04
Number of Student Participants 47 Number of Applicants: Number of Senior Investigators 37 Number of Tutors 2 Number of Accepted Participants: 10 Number of Lecturers/Speakers 20 Total Number Participants 104 Total Number Questionnaires Returned 54 51,9 % of Participants Excellent Good Adequate Poor Unsatist Question 1: Organisation of the program. Number of Answers 49 5 Question 2: Quality of scientific training and interaction with speakers Number of Answers 35 16 2 Question 3: Quality of lecturers & talks - was the scientific subject adequately covered and state- Number of Answers 35 18 Question 4: Was there adequate discussion	
Number of Senior Investigators Number of Tutors Number of Lecturers/Speakers Total Number Participants Total Number Questionnaires Returned Excellent Good Adequate Poor Unsatist Question 1: Organisation of the program. Number of Answers Question 2: Quality of scientific training and interaction with speakers Number of Answers 35 16 2 Question 3: Quality of lecturers & talks - was the scientific subject adequately covered and state- Number of Answers 35 18 Question 4: Was there adequate discussion	
Number of Tutors Number of Lecturers/Speakers Total Number Participants Total Number Questionnaires Returned Excellent Good Adequate Poor Unsatist Question 1: Organisation of the program. Number of Answers Question 2: Quality of scientific training and interaction with speakers Number of Answers Question 3: Quality of lecturers & talks - was the scientific subject adequately covered and state- Number of Answers Question 4: Was there adequate discussion	
Number of Lecturers/Speakers Total Number Participants Total Number Questionnaires Returned Excellent Good Adequate Poor Unsatist Question 1: Organisation of the program. Number of Answers Question 2: Quality of scientific training and interaction with speakers Number of Answers 35 16 2 Question 3: Quality of lecturers & talks - was the scientific subject adequately covered and state- Number of Answers Question 4: Was there adequate discussion	
Total Number Participants Total Number Questionnaires Returned Excellent Good Adequate Poor Unsatist Question 1: Organisation of the program. Number of Answers Question 2: Quality of scientific training and interaction with speakers Number of Answers 35 16 2 Question 3: Quality of lecturers & talks - was the scientific subject adequately covered and state- Number of Answers 35 18 Question 4: Was there adequate discussion	factory Sum % of Tota
Total Number Questionnaires Returned Excellent Good Adequate Poor Unsatist Question 1: Organisation of the program. Number of Answers 49 5 Question 2: Quality of scientific training and interaction with speakers Number of Answers 35 16 2 Question 3: Quality of lecturers & talks - was the scientific subject adequately covered and state- Number of Answers 35 18 Question 4: Was there adequate discussion	factory Sum % of Tota
Excellent Good Adequate Poor Unsatisf Question 1: Organisation of the program. Number of Answers 49 5 Question 2: Quality of scientific training and interaction with speakers Number of Answers 35 16 2 Question 3: Quality of lecturers & talks - was the scientific subject adequately covered and state- Number of Answers 35 18 Question 4: Was there adequate discussion	factory Sum % of Tota
Question 1: Organisation of the program. Number of Answers Question 2: Quality of scientific training and interaction with speakers Number of Answers 35 16 2 Question 3: Quality of lecturers & talks - was the scientific subject adequately covered and state- Number of Answers 35 18 Question 4: Was there adequate discussion	factory Sum % of Tota
Number of Answers Question 2: Quality of scientific training and interaction with speakers Number of Answers 35 16 2 Question 3: Quality of lecturers & talks - was the scientific subject adequately covered and state- Number of Answers 35 18 Question 4: Was there adequate discussion	
Question 2: Quality of scientific training and interaction with speakers Number of Answers 35 16 2 Question 3: Quality of lecturers & talks - was the scientific subject adequately covered and state- Number of Answers 35 18 Question 4: Was there adequate discussion	
Number of Answers Question 3: Quality of lecturers & talks - was the scientific subject adequately covered and state- Number of Answers Question 4: Was there adequate discussion	<i>54</i> 51,9
Question 3: Quality of lecturers & talks - was the scientific subject adequately covered and state- Number of Answers 35 18 Question 4: Was there adequate discussion	53 51,0
Number of Answers 35 18 Question 4: Was there adequate discussion	
•	<i>5</i> 3 51,0
after presentations, or sessions or during practical work?	
•	
Number of Answers 32 18 4	<i>54</i> 51,9
Question 5: Balance between training (tutorials & poster sessions) and scientific lecturers: (Only for courses with hands-on practical work)	
Number of Answers 25 20 3	<i>48</i> 46,2
Question 6: Did the course fulfill your expectations?	10 10,2
Number of Answers 33 17	50 48,1
Question 7: Was there #Yes % of 7	Total #No % of Tota
sufficient information available about the cours 49 47	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
any problems with transportation?	
any problems with the course language?	
enough time for informal discussions with other particips 49 47 enough time for discussion after poster sessior 52 50	
opportunity for informal discussion with lecture 51 49	
possibility to meet others in your field?	
chance to obtain overview of the fields?	
chance to receive help with current work? 47 45	,2 5 4,8
	0 / 17 /
Question 9: Duration of the course Number of Answers Right Too Long Too Short\(\)hould Box 50	Sum % of Tota 52 50,0
Transfer of Allowers	02 00,0
Question 10: Location and accommodation of the course:	
Excellent Good Adequate Poor Unsatist	factory Sum % of Tota
Number of Answers 43 9 1	53 51,0
Question 11: Quality of facilities (lecture hall, slide projection, other visual aids, audio, acustics):	
Number of Answers 41 12 1	54 51,9
Question 12: Give your overall evaluation of the E\Excellent Good Adequate Poor Unsatist	factory Sum % of Tota
Number of Grades 46 7	53 51,0
Evaluation Grades in % of Total Participants 44,2 6,7 0,0 0,0 0,0	0 51,0 51,0
Il Answers to Questions by their Numbers <u>Excellent Good Adequate Poor No Cor</u>	nment Sum
Quest 1 49 5 0 0 0	
Quest 2 35 16 2 0 0	
Quest 3 35 18 0 0 0	
Quest 4 32 18 4 0 0	
Quest 5 25 20 3 0 0 Quest 6 33 17 0 0 0	30
Quest 6 33 17 0 0 0	
Quest 6 33 17 0 0 0 Quest 7 Yes No No	
Quest 6 33 17 0 0 0	
Quest 6 33 17 0 0 0 Quest 7 Yes No No Quest 8 not applicable Quest 9 not applicable Quest 10 43 9 1	53
Quest 6 33 17 0 0 0 Quest 7 Yes No No Quest 8 not applicable Quest 10 43 9 1 Quest 11 41 12 1	54
Quest 6 33 17 0 0 0 Quest 7 Yes No No Quest 8 not applicable Quest 9 not applicable Quest 10 43 9 1	54 53

Question 14: How did you learn about the FEBS Event?						
Source of Information	Posters	Neb/E-mai	Advert.	Word-of-Mouth	Other	
Number of Answers	1	35	6	12	2	

Positive comments:

Organisation of the programme/quality of the lectures:

- Really good mix of molecular signalling mechanism and clinical physiological relevance.
- The sessions were topically homogenous
- Extremely well organized, diverse presentations, good amount of time for interaction and sharing
- The chosen topics were very appropriate and the presentations themes well allocated.
- Pleasantly surprised with all the arrangements here. Everything is very organized.
- Every lecture gave a piece to the whole picture of the session.
- 10 min talk + 5 min discussion was good
- The coffee breaks were excellent for more independent discussion.

Comments location/food/quality of the facilities

- Dead city, but nice lecture room and restaurant.
- Perfect! Ideally!
- Somehow mixed spartan, but clean accommodations
- Superb food!
- Most beautiful place.
- I would certainly come back.

Additional comments:

- A wonderful meeting
- Thanks very much for a great time
- Thank you! Good luck! It was unforgettable!!
- All was perfect organized
- Very excellent organization and location. Great occasion for learning and I appreciated the informal atmosphere.
- I would like to thank FEBS for this great opportunity.
- Very good, friendly, open atmosphere!
- Perfect meeting
- I deeply appreciate the organizing of this conference
- It is a great opportunity for a student to present their work with the same talk format (time...) as researchers.
- Superb event, size just right!
- Good luck and thanks a lot for invitation.
- Organization was excellent. The order of the presentations was carefully planned, one presentation lead to another. Was brilliant especially if this was not your particular research area.
- I thought the event was excellent.

Negative comments:

Organisation of the programme/quality of the lectures:

- I missed a key note lecture.
- Some more basic lectures or tutorials would be nice.
- More clinical presentations.
- Allow discussion groups on controversial topics.
- Would provide more informal discussion time, also during sessions.
- To be included longer lectures (6 participants)
- Shorter breaks in between oral presentations, 45 min was too long.
- Shift some talks to posters.
- Finish sooner in the evening.
- Put methods and commercials to sessions parallel to discussion groups.
- Some presenters did not present their work understandable language, speed;
- Occasionally a speaker did not speak clearly or the details were too much/too confusing. The heavy metal lecture was awful.

Comments location/food/quality of the facilities

- Could have been more comfortable.
- Dead city, but nice lecture room and restaurant.
- Perfect! Ideally!
- Superb food.
- Internet should work.
- No dumplings smile.
- Other location:

Improvements:

- More free time to prepare, relax etc.
- Payment system: include credit cards
- Better organization of dinner time (was too long) + more meal, being sufficient for adult person;
- Single rooms, buffet lunch, more space for poster session
- Let more of the young investigators know about funding opportunities/travel awards.