



## Evaluation results: Communication skills (January 29-30, 2020 )

### Course details

Instructor: Susanne Kallista

More information is provided on the webpage: <https://www.bgc-jena.mpg.de/domains/impres-gbgc.de/index.php/Courses/Communication2020>

6 out of 17 participants filled in the survey by February 04, 2020

### Survey results

#### Did the goals and the structure of the course matched well with the course description?

1. Not particularly. I thought it would be about learning new communication strategies, but we focused on none in particular, and I don't think I learnt or practiced many at all.
2. yes.
3. Yes
4. yeah, roughly, all points were mentioned but not always stated clearly as section
5. Partially. I did not like spending much time on finding out OUR goals, then checking whether OUR goals could be SAID to have been met. It is like going to a cooking course, and being asked which dish you want to make, and then often revisiting the idea (so do you now know how to cook it? do you?) This is not education, but more like exposition. The course content should stand on its own legs without our constant feedback to check whether the tidbit we learned in SOME WAY - SOMEHOW - can be explained to be related to one of our 'topics'.
6. Yes

#### To which extend has the course improved/clarified your general notion of communication skills?

1. Not at all
2. I was already aware of a lot of the techniques but nevertheless, it was a good reminder.
3. I got introduction to various communication tools that would be beneficial to me.
4. difficult to answer one day after the course as one needs to practice the skills. Thus there are some points I will try to focus on in the future.
5. I think skill theories were presented, but the 'improvement' or 'clarification' of communication as a process was too superficial for me personally.
6. Generally not, as there was nothing new for me personally. I still believe that such courses have an impact later on

**Do you think the workshop was helpful for your skills? Would you recommend this course to others?**

1. No, and no.
2. yes for sure!
3. Yes, I would recommend this course.
4. Communication courses as definitely worth to attend.
5. I think the course was a bit underwhelming; I do not think I learned as much as I expected to. Unfortunately I would not recommend the course to my colleagues (researchers in science), given that it takes two full days and I think that this is much too long for the information and skills presented.
6. Yes

**Did the trainer take sufficient time / opportunities for questions and discussions?**

1. Too much of the workshop was more like a seminar, with the trainer talking for much of it. The questions she asked were confusing and strangely phrased, so that often I had no idea what sort of answers she was looking for.
2. Yes, she was very engaged and also took serious people who approached her in the breaks, for example, for more private conversations.
3. Yes. However, more practice would be beneficiary.
4. The discussions were extensive, sometimes too much
5. Yes, though discussions were rather short. The successful discussions were not longer, or more encouraged, than the unsuccessful discussions.
6. She tried and was very responsive to our needs. We could have need more time, but it was an exhaustive time anyways

**Which parts of the course were especially good (and why)?**

1. The case study during the last day was interesting, as it allowed for open discussion on the best methods for communication in a difficult situation.
2. The practical applications because it is always one thing to hear about the theory but another to apply it.
3. Peer to peer case study.
4. The case study/role play(s) as one can directly notice and practice certain techniques
5. The discussions. I feel the most 'real communication learning' occurred then. I think the instructor was very sympathetic.
6. Practice time in Small groups

**Which parts of the course were not so good / not so fitting / not well enough presented?**

1. The course and content were both disappointing. The trainer was used to giving the training in German, so partly perhaps it came from her not being used to phrasing the content in English, but I would say the problems went beyond that. She mostly lectured, and when she asked questions they were either very vague or confusingly phrased so that none of us knew how to answer. She had no idea on the type of conflicts that could present in academia, so most of our examples were confusing to her. There were many awkward silences, and I don't think I learnt much at all.
2. I wouldn't know how to make anything better. I think, maybe a third day would have been beneficial. But the trainer made the most out of the short timeframe we had.
3. There were some long stretches of discussion that could have been shortened.

4. Clarity, structure and connection between topics could be improved and more actively linked to role plays and practice maybe even in the whole group, to get feedback and be able to observe others.
5. The board 'our topics' and 'our tools' board parts. We talked in circles and that was just a complete waste of time for me and certainly for most others. This had to proceed more quickly; very often it was agreed that we were 'talking in circles' about something instead of making new grounds. Lots of momentum was lost here.
6. Transfer discussions in the big group, since everybody takes something else out of it

**Do you have other suggestions for a future seminar?**

1. A trainer who was more used to speaking to scientists would have been more appropriate.
2. Clean Coding.
3. More practice with real life scenarios or role plays.
4. see 6.
5. More content and more commitment to practice or demonstration. For scientists, these concepts are simple and for some people the tools were sometimes painfully self-evident. I don't think we took away new and fresh insights. Also, I think the instructor must be better prepared to address the workshop audience (science research in academia) better.