

Department of Chemistry
SUMMER UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH PROGRAM

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM, Summer 2005

This form, although several pages long, can be filled out very quickly if you provide just the minimum information requested on the left. However, there is also room on the right for your extended comments wherever you think appropriate. We ask that you give us at least the minimum feedback, and of course we hope for more. We would like you to fill this form before you leave, so that you have some perspective on the summer project but haven't yet forgotten important details. Thanks for your comments, which will hopefully let us offer an even better program in the future. Thanks also for your participation in the program. **Please return to this to Prof. Grabowski during your Exit Interview.** (P.S., I'm using (most of) a "standard evaluation form" to facilitate national comparison/statistics – I agree some of the questions below are a bit lame – but please answer them to the best of your ability anyway. Prof. G.)

Name (optional): _____

1. Accommodations:

a. Was it a good idea to house Fellows together?

- No
 Yes

b. How would you rate the housing facilities?

- Poor
 Acceptable
 Good
 Excellent

c. How would you rate the partial meal plan?

- Don't use in the future; give us the cash
 Strongly Desire
 No Opinion

d. Do you have any suggestions for improving the housing and/or the food plan?

2. Your Research Project:

a. How much input did you have in choosing your project?

- Not very much
 A moderate amount
 Quite a lot

b. Did you feel your project was well-designed and doable?

- No
 Yes

c. By the time of your Oral presentation, what was your level of interest in your project?

- I was marginally interested
- I thought it was pretty interesting
- I thought it was the best thing since sliced bread!

d. How hard did you work on the project?

- Not very hard
- Moderately hard
- Quite hard indeed

e. How satisfied were you with the outcome of your project?

- Not very satisfied
- Reasonably satisfied
- Quite satisfied

f. How did the outcome correspond to that anticipated in the prospectus?

- Not very closely
- Reasonably closely
- Very closely

g. Do you have any suggestions for improving the nature and/or conduct of future projects?

3. Your Research Supervision:

a. How well were you and your lab sponsor matched?

- Not very well
- Reasonably well
- Quite well

b. Who most directly supervised your work?

- The sponsor (faculty member)
- A postdoctoral fellow _____
- A graduate student _____
- Someone else _____

c. How often did you have supervisory contact?

- Daily
- Every few days
- About once a week
- Every few weeks

d. Did your lab or your sub-group have regular research meetings?

- No
- Yes

e. Did you ever present at a lab research meeting?

- No
- Yes

f. Did you ever have trouble getting help when needed?

- No
 Yes

g. Do you have any suggestions for improving the style and/or quality of supervision?

4. Academic Tutorials:

a. What proportion of the talks did you attend?

- Less than half
 A majority
 Nearly all
 All

b. In general how was the level of the talks?

- Too elementary -- boring
 About right
 Too sophisticated -- over my head

c. Were there any particularly good talks? By whom?

d. Were there any particularly bad talks? By whom?

e. Do you have any suggestions for improving these talks? For example time of day, frequency, topics, etc.

5. Written and Oral Program Requirements:

a. Would it be valuable to write an initial Prospectus?

- No
 Yes

b. Was it valuable to give the poster in week 8 at the Duquesne Unified Symposium?

- No
 Yes

c. Was it valuable to make the Final Oral Presentation?

- No
 Yes

d. Would it be valuable to prepare (in addition to the poster and the oral session) a written final report?

- No
 Yes

f. What aspect of these requirements would be the hardest?

- Prospectus
 Poster
 Final Report
 Final Oral Presentation
Why?

f. Next year, which requirement(s) should we have? Check all that we should require.

- Prospectus (due in week 1)
 Poster at Duquesne
 Final written Report
 Final Oral Presentation

f. Do you have any suggestions for improving these requirements?

6. Social Activities:

a. In general, is it a good idea to have any activities?

- No
 Yes

b. How was the frequency of activities planned by Pitt staff/faculty?

- Too few -- more needed
 About right
 Too high -- more free time needed

c. How was the frequency of activities planned by REU students?

- Too few -- more needed
 About right
 Too high -- more free time needed

d. Were the activities adequately organized?

- No
 Yes

d. Which activities should be organized by Pitt staff/faculty for next year?

- Welcome Breakfast
 Evening outing on Gateway Clipper (e.g., dinner cruise on the rivers)
 Thursday nite dinners (e.g., communal Chinese take-out dinners)
 Picnic at Windwood (with the HHMI program)
 Goodbye Dinner (at a restaurant)
 Celebration picnic after the Oral Symposium

e. Are there additional activities you would have liked?

7. Most Important Things:

a. What is the most important thing you learned from this program?

b. What did you like least about the program?

c. What did you like most about the program?

d. What is your most important recommendation for change in the program?

e. What else should I have included on this survey so you could tell me about it, but I didn't?

We would like to hear from you, by letter, phone, e-mail, or whatever, at any time. Don't be a stranger! Round about March of every year, think about visiting our REU web page and filling out the on-line "keep in touch" form that you will (eventually) find there!