PhD Symposium WS 08 / 09 General Questionair
**General questions**

1.1) At the symposium you...

- gave a presentation: 40.7%
- presented a poster: 32.2%
- were an expert: 11.9%
- were in the audience: 20.3%

1.2) Was the symposium interesting for you?

- very much: 33%
- very much: 38%
- quite much: 29%
- quite much: 0%
- not at all: 0%

1.3) - speakers

- to short: 9%
- to short: 19%
- quite long: 70%
- quite long: 2%
- to long: 0%

1.4) - posters

- to short: 9%
- to short: 11%
- quite long: 61%
- quite long: 18%
- to long: 0%

1.5) - breaks

- to short: 0%
- to short: 12%
- quite long: 73%
- quite long: 15%
- to long: 0%

1.6) Was the symposium helpful for you?

- very much: 15%
- quite much: 37%
- quite much: 31%
- quite much: 15%
- not at all: 2%

1.7) Please rate the catering arrangements

- very good: 68%
- quite good: 23%
- quite good: 8%
- quite good: 2%
- very bad: 0%

1.8) Please rate the symposium facilities

- very good: 31%
- quite good: 44%
- quite good: 19%
- quite good: 6%
- very bad: 0%
1.9) How would you rate the symposium handouts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=51
av.=1.65
dev.=0.74

1.10) How would you rate the symposium overall?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=55
av.=1.85
dev.=0.7

1.11) Did you know before that the Karlsruhe House of Young Scientist (KHYS) supports professional events organized by doctoral candidates / postdocs (e.g. summer/winter schools)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Know</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=54

1.12) Would you recommend the symposium?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommend</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=55

1.13) Are you of the opinion that the Karlsruhe House of Young Scientist (KHYS) should offer the symposium regularly?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=53

1.14) If yes, at what intervals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every two years</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=55

1.15) How did you learn about the symposium?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poster</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyer</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHYS-Homepage</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By friends, colleagues</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIT Intern-Newsletter</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My professor forwarded an info-mail</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institute office forwarded an info-mail</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHYS-mail</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation by my professor/advisor</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=59

Comments

2.1) What were the best things about the symposium?

[Handwritten comments: “Networking between Uni. & Forschungszentrum.”]
The feedback:

Connections between University and PKV.

The best thing is that the PhD Symposium was organized.

The feedback of the experts:

Professional feedback.

Technical support for speakers.

Organization:

- possibility to hear the presentations
- get to know what other people are doing.

The training of presentation skills.

Few words, much beer.

The variety of subjects (oral presentations and posters).

Communication between PhD students.

The Symposium itself was very great! Contact to other PhD students, contact to other fields (technics + social sciences together).

Practice: English.

Knowledge in new research fields.

Networking.
Networking
I hope the feedback will be helpful as well.

- Networking

Comment & commentary on abstract was helpful.
Long breaks to meet other PhD students.

Interaction with other students.

Meeting other young scientists will be possibility to exchange own field.

Informal and atmosphere

Dass junge Wissenschaftler die Programme bekommen wollen,
das Präsentieren ihrer Arbeit in einer realistischen
Umgebung zu sehen

Interdisciplinary presentations

Possibility to practice communication skills, feedback from experts on own way to write abstracts and to have presentations (evaluation of the presentation)

To achieve feedback about the presentation technique.

Exchange between PhD students.

Interaction with other PhD students.

The training effect, constructive atmosphere

To gain presenting
To get to know other disciplines
the interacting with the colleagues, learning good ways to do good presentations and poster presentation prepared by experts.

- experience for PhD-students feedback

- Get information about what is going on in the KIT e.g., student association. Talk to other PhD students.

To get an insight into other students work.

2) What aspects, if any, would you change in future?

- zu jedem vortrag / namensschilder sollte die fakultät genannt werden.

- weniger Strandbad Programm

- Better support by PhD.

- Die Themen sollten besser angeordnet abgestimmt sein

- the time for speakers was very short.

- a session with general advice for the oral presentations and for the poster preparation for speakers.
maybe try the computer in advance.

- there haven't been any experts on the several subjects I thought some
  people of the committee would ask the presentation
  for the presentation of speakers.

**Opening Speech**

- too many interruptions

- needs both for feedback
  personnel

- 2-day event with thematic focus

More participants.

**Separation of dramatically different topics**

Direct feedback from the experts to the "talkers"

more time for speakers (20 min or minimum)

Early registration only for people presenting papers.
I think presentations are more helpful and interesting than papers.

- too early registration hours for prepare coffee earlier
- technical support
- experts from my field of research

I always felt the people next to me present very well. I was sometimes
walking on. I felt somehow less comfortable.

A bit more time in talks.
The comments I wrote are below... I should be checked before the symposium.

Almost every presentation had a different slide layout (headers and footers). Is it possible to ship basic models for the most often used softwares?

From What's next?

If more people were allowed to speak, it would make the audience more attentive. I felt that sometimes the speakers were too focused on the technicalities of their work instead of engaging the audience. I believe that more informal sessions could be organized to encourage more open discussions.

The full institute names on name tags made it easier to identify posters of a session scattered/more space. I wouldn't invite any "experts".

The paper was too cold. Please separate the posters of the same session. It was too crowded.

You should invite more PhD students just to listen.

Give more time for the posters and presentations.

The position of speakers in front of the audience - this time, it seemed the speakers were trying to draw the audience in, but it was often a failed attempt.

Having one person speak for the posters and approximately 2 for the talks.

More time for the posters. I'm not sure whether the handouts are that useful. I think it would have been okay to see them at the internet, and paper could have been saved. I fear that 90% of participants won't have any further contact.
- invite public audience

Solve technical problems before starting the lesson.

I think it might be use of own laptop. Don't allow specials to change slides in presentation mode or switch.

There should be a broader spectrum of talks. It was strange that there were talks of horticulture and two of them even had the same title.

2.3) What skills have you learned that you will be able to put into practice in the future?

- I got some good cludes to make a better poster
- Never change a winning system (compute staff?)
- I think there is part of the feedback
- How to prepare a presentation.
- Practice for field is important
- Comments and experience for preparing a good poster.
- Time management

Communication skills

I have not received feedback yet.

Not being in tune with the audience.

- Speaking slowly.

can't know if that means I have a feedback

balance of amount of content info. too much or too empty

/things were the second page/)

I was/am unsure how to make it funny.

Abstract writing, timing in presentations

I need my feedback to answer that.

Presentation of my work in a short time and also to a much general group of people who are not from my own fields.

Style and themes of good presentations. Technical details.
Presentation skills

To cope with the research point

useful hints on how to make a good presentation.

non (as expected)
### Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subunit:</th>
<th>Doktoranden Symposium 2008/2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of the instructor:</td>
<td>PHD Symposium 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the course:</td>
<td>General Questionair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2) Was the symposium interesting for you?

- **Very much**
- **To short**
- **Not at all**

av. = 1.96

1.3) - speakers

- **Very much**
- **To short**
- **To long**

av. = 2.65

1.4) - posters

- **Very much**
- **To short**
- **To long**

av. = 2.89

1.5) - breaks

- **Very much**
- **To short**
- **To long**

av. = 3.04

1.6) Was the symposium helpful for you?

- **Very much**
- **Not at all**

av. = 2.52

1.7) Please rate the catering arrangements

- **Very good**
- **Very bad**

av. = 1.43

1.8) Please rate the symposium facilities

- **Very good**
- **Very bad**

av. = 1.98

1.9) How would you rate the symposium handouts?

- **Very good**
- **Inadequate**

av. = 1.65

1.10) How would you rate the symposium overall?

- **Very good**
- **Inadequate**

av. = 1.85