

Evaluation results: Eddy Covariance (October 5-9, 2020)

Course details

Instructors: Mathias Goeckede, Olaf Kolle, Mirco Migliavacca, Tarek El-Madany

More information is provided on the webpage: <https://www.bgc-jena.mpg.de/domains/impres-gbgc.de/index.php/Courses/EddyCovariance2019>

8 out of ?? participants filled in the survey by ?? ??, 2020

Survey results

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

1. yes = 6
2. Yes. This course gave an overview of the theory, instrument, processing, and analysis of the eddy covariance method.
3. they did very well match

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

1. From this course I gained additional field work knowledge as well as the whole working procedure of EC data processing, which I believe benefit a lot for my practice skills and logic thinking ability. I was already aware of a lot of the techniques but nevertheless, it was a good reminder.
2. Help me learn more about practical management for the Experiment sites, and also the basic methods of conducting scientific observations.
3. Not to a great extent
4. No idea
5. Not so much as it was only focused on my academic career?
6. The topic is completely related to development in the academia.

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

1. yes, it is very helpful! highly recommend!
2. Some parts were useful or insightful
3. Sure, very helpful! Of course I would like to recommend this course to others.
4. Very helpful
5. Yes. I will recommend it to others.

6. I would recommend this course to Eddy covariance users who are curious about the behind theory and post-processing.
7. For me this course was very helpful, and I would definitely recommend this course to everybody who is doing the kind of work that I am doing.
8. I had very little knowledge about the topic, the course significantly increased my understanding of the physical principles, data acquisition, pre-processing

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

1. most of the time we have the time to raise the question and receive the feedback.
2. Yes, usually
3. YES!! I mean all of the trainers are super nice :)
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Yes, we could have enough time for them.
7. yes. just in times they were a little bit fast (both in talking and in topics)
8. Yes

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

1. footprint estimation and the practise-on exercise at the last of two days
2. Personally I could follow more easily the more practical parts, or the applied ones that would benefit the end user. Also the first introductory part on the method in general was very clear.
3. All these part are in good arrangement. From the beginning of theory part to understand the mechanism and after every theory explanation there was time for hands-on work. I like the arrangement. Personally I like the data post-processing part given by Mirco because I consider it the most useful part for my future work. Also it is very interesting to do the data filtering and gap-filling by myself.
4. Practical programming of pre-processing, processing, and post-processing of Flux data.
5. Hands-on sections were really good. It was very informative.
6. Data post-processing, troubleshooting by Mirco. I could experience the night time correction process using u star value and application to ecological problems in person.
7. all the parts where there was first the background-knowledge explained and then a hands-on session (preprocessing, processing, postprocessing) I guess to see the instrumentation setup is also really important, but as I already built them up it was repetitive for me
8. The data exercises clearly help to clarify concepts and get a better feeling of data constraints.

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

1. theory part maybe it is too fast and intense
2. The listing of single specific methods and instruments was for me of little interest, since I think that only people already versed in the field could actually follow.
3. Maybe this problem just for me...I am completely new to R, so in the first day to do exercise on R I am very confused...But later on I became more familiar and better to understand the codes. So I think it would be better to present some introduction materials in advance for those not so familiar to this language.

4. the pace of the introduction and background for Eddy covariance may too fast for newbies.
5. Every part gave enough explanation about its topic.
6. Some things were doubled, especially when we did the instrumentation part. Friday was a bit hard to step in that kind of new topic...
7. In general, all topics were covered

Do you have other suggestions for a future seminar?

1. Maybe the theory part for the meteorology is a little bit be shorted
2. More time for the exercises with concrete questions maybe, less long, in detail listings on topics that will probably not be understood or remembered easily, depending on the audience.
3. Just mentioned above. This course is really really helpful. Thank you all for your effort!
4. No
5. None
6. Especially the day about the postprocessing, which is really important, was really fast. If you never did anything like that it is hard to follow what you have to do and why and maybe that needs a little bit more time. Maybe that needs to be stretched somehow and take the time from another part. The Friday-lecture was very interesting, but to handle with the new scripts and the new data in that time is really fast. Maybe at some point slow it all down a bit
7. It was a very comprehensive course from my perspective.