Evaluation results:
Course 'Rules for good scientific practice' (January 21, 2014)

Course details

Rules of good scientific practice – why and how to do honest research Good scientific practice is based on honesty and should promote public trust in scientific findings. While it can be assumed that most scientists are honest by intention, there are several sources of scientific misconduct. Lack of care applied to the scientific method but also deliberate fraud are examples of violation of good scientific practices. These violations, whether intentional or not, can spoil the public's perception of scientific research and can cause major damages to science and – even more important – to society.

11 IMPRS-gBGC students participated. More information is available on the course website: http://www.imprs-gbgc.de/index.php/Courses/GoodScientificPractice2014

Survey results

7 course participants have filled in the online survey by February 19, 2014.

IMPRS-gBGC,
MPI Biogeochemie,
P.O. Box 10 01 64,
07701 Jena, Germany

Phone +49-(0)3641-576260
Fax +49-(0)3641-577260
E-Mail: imprs-gbgc@bgc-jena.mpg.de
Web www.imprs-gbgc.de

Spokesperson:
▷ Prof. Dr. Martin Heimann
Coordinator:
▷ Dr. Steffi Rothhardt

Field summary for likes/dislikes

What did you like about this course?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	6	100.00%
No answer	0	0.00%

ID	Response
2	good for beginner scientists to know the basic ethis in research. good for peer-review process and how to write paper
8	Good topic overview Interesting examples Free choice to earn extra credit points with an essay --> better than longer course Insights into review process
11	a very positive thing which i can mention is, to know the consequences of doing falsification and fabrication. having realistic examples is helpful as well.
14	stories/examples about actual bad scientific practice
17	short and precise course, interaction between lecturer and participants/ open room for thoughts and discussion
23	Good introduction into importance of good scientific practice.

Which suggestions do you have to improve this course?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	6	100.00%
No answer	0	0.00%

ID	Response
2	seperated lecture for scientific writing will be helpful
8	don't know...
11	i would like to have more concrete suggestions of how to citate in the right way, really learning the rules is the most important knowledge to prevent bac scientic writing
14	Maybe more examples and reduce the part on scientific writing. There is already another course for that
17	incooperate the topic/ example of scientific misconduct of the homework already in the course reduce the work load of the homework
23	It was informative and clear. I have no suggetions.

Field summary for context

The course was well structured.

Answer	Count	Percentage
Strongly disagree (A1)	0	0.00%
Disagree (A2)	0	0.00%
Neither agree nor disagree (A3)	0	0.00%
Agree (A4)	3	50.00%
Strongly agree (A5)	3	50.00%
No answer	0	0.00%

Topics were explained well.

Answer	Count	Percentage
Strongly disagree (A1)	0	0.00%
Disagree (A2)	0	0.00%
Neither agree nor disagree (A3)	0	0.00%
Agree (A4)	2	33.33%
Strongly agree (A5)	4	66.67%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for content

With regard to the content …

To follow this module, my previous knowledge was …

Answer	Count	Percentage
Far too low (A1)	0	0.00%
Too low (A2)	0	0.00%
Adequate (A3)	6	100.00%
Too high (A4)	0	0.00%
Far too high (A5)	0	0.00%
No answer	0	0.00%

The level of detail of this module was ….

Answer	Count	Percentage
Far too low (A1)	0	0.00%
Too low (A2)	1	16.67%
Adequate (A3)	5	83.33%
Too high (A4)	0	0.00%
Far too high (A5)	0	0.00%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for instructor

The instructor …

… did a good job of motivating the participants

Answer	Count	Percentage
Strongly disagree (A1)	0	0.00%
Disagree (A2)	0	0.00%
Neither agree nor disagree (A3)	0	0.00%
Agree (A4)	2	33.33%
Strongly agree (A5)	4	66.67%
No answer	0	0.00%

… often included the participants (e.g. own knowledge, experiences)

Answer	Count	Percentage
Strongly disagree (A1)	0	0.00%
Disagree (A2)	0	0.00%
Neither agree nor disagree (A3)	0	0.00%
Agree (A4)	3	50.00%
Strongly agree (A5)	3	50.00%
No answer	0	0.00%

… was/were available for individual problems/questions.

Answer	Count	Percentage
Strongly disagree (A1)	0	0.00%
Disagree (A2)	0	0.00%
Neither agree nor disagree (A3)	0	0.00%
Agree (A4)	3	50.00%
Strongly agree (A5)	3	50.00%
No answer	0	0.00%

Do you have other comments?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	1	16.67%
No answer	5	83.33%

ID	Response
14	no

Field summary for general assessment

The goals and the structure of the course matched well with the course description.

Answer	Count	Percentage
Strongly disagree (A1)	0	0.00%
Disagree (A2)	0	0.00%
Neither agree nor disagree (A3)	0	0.00%
Agree (A4)	4	66.67%
Strongly agree (A5)	2	33.33%
No answer	0	0.00%

The course was well structured.

Answer	Count	Percentage
Strongly disagree (A1)	0	0.00%
Disagree (A2)	0	0.00%
Neither agree nor disagree (A3)	0	0.00%
Agree (A4)	3	50.00%
Strongly agree (A5)	3	50.00%
No answer	0	0.00%

Overall it was worthwhile for me to attend the course.

Answer	Count	Percentage
Strongly disagree (A1)	0	0.00%
Disagree (A2)	0	0.00%
Neither agree nor disagree (A3)	0	0.00%
Agree (A4)	2	33.33%
Strongly agree (A5)	4	66.67%
No answer	0	0.00%

Space for comments

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	2	33.33%
No answer	4	66.67%

ID	Response
11	spending 1 day of my time was ok, but more detailes would habe been useful
14	I forgot to say: I liked also the peer-review part

Field summary for gains

By attending this course, I gained …

… an overview about the topic.

Answer	Count	Percentage
Strongly disagree (A1)	0	0.00%
Disagree (A2)	0	0.00%
Neither agree nor disagree (A3)	0	0.00%
Agree (A4)	3	50.00%
Strongly agree (A5)	3	50.00%
No answer	0	0.00%

… useful knowledge for my future activities.

Answer	Count	Percentage
Strongly disagree (A1)	0	0.00%
Disagree (A2)	0	0.00%
Neither agree nor disagree (A3)	0	0.00%
Agree (A4)	2	33.33%
Strongly agree (A5)	4	66.67%
No answer	0	0.00%

… interdisciplinary thinking.

Answer	Count	Percentage
Strongly disagree (A1)	0	0.00%
Disagree (A2)	0	0.00%
Neither agree nor disagree (A3)	1	16.67%
Agree (A4)	4	66.67%
Strongly agree (A5)	1	16.67%
No answer	0	0.00%

… contacts to other IMPRS-gBGC members.

Answer	Count	Percentage
Strongly disagree (A1)	0	0.00%
Disagree (A2)	0	0.00%
Neither agree nor disagree (A3)	3	50.00%
Agree (A4)	3	50.00%
Strongly agree (A5)	0	0.00%
No answer	0	0.00%

Here you can comment on the previous statements.

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	1	16.67%
No answer	5	83.33%

ID	Response
8	I already know most people ;)

Field summary for basic conditions

The time frame for this course (e.g. duration, time of day) was well chosen.

Answer	Count	Percentage
Strongly disagree (A1)	0	0.00%
Disagree (A2)	0	0.00%
Neither agree nor disagree (A3)	1	16.67%
Agree (A4)	4	66.67%
Strongly agree (A5)	1	16.67%
No answer	0	0.00%

The offered course material was very helpful (e.g. handouts, videos, slides, ...).

Answer	Count	Percentage
Strongly disagree (A1)	0	0.00%
Disagree (A2)	0	0.00%
Neither agree nor disagree (A3)	1	16.67%
Agree (A4)	4	66.67%
Strongly agree (A5)	1	16.67%
No answer	0	0.00%

Any comments on the basic conditions?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	2	33.33%
No answer	4	66.67%

ID	Response
11	we discussed the official rules of the MPG, and for realistic examples we had enough material. but i would not say that it was VERY helpful
17	maybe its better to make a two day workshop out of it --> one day discussing the principles, the other day going into depth on one example of scientific misconduct