

**Evaluation summary\_Summer School in Inflammatory Myopathies,  
September 5-9, 2011, Sigtunahöjden, Sweden**

**29 responses out of 30 participants**

*1 = strongly disagree; 6 = strongly agree*

**Grade (mean)**

<b>F1.</b> The level of the course correlates with the description of the course	<b>5.7</b>
<b>F2.</b> The learning outcomes of the course were adequately explained	<b>5.7</b>
<b>F3.</b> There was a clear connection between the content of, the learning outcomes of as well as the examination of the course	<b>5.6</b>
<b>F4.</b> The course design facilitated achievement of the learning outcomes	<b>5.5</b>
<b>F5.</b> The examination was focused on understanding and/or application of knowledge	<b>5.7</b>
<b>F6.</b> I achieved the intended learning outcomes	<b>5.4</b>
<b>F7.</b> The teachers facilitated the achievement of the learning outcomes in an adequate way	<b>5.6</b>
<b>F8.</b> The course was sufficiently challenging for me	<b>5.6</b>
<b>F9.</b> I have received relevant feedback during the course	<b>5.4</b>
<b>F10.</b> This course has fulfilled my expectations of a doctoral education course	<b>5.7</b>
<b>F11.</b> I was highly motivated in taking this course	<b>5.8</b>
<b>F12.</b> I had sufficient prior knowledge to be able to fully participate in the course	<b>5.0</b>
<b>F13.</b> I have contributed to and engaged in the course	<b>5.2</b>
<b>F14.</b> The course has increased my knowledge of recent advances within my field, in related areas or in general science subjects	<b>5.6</b>
<b>F15.</b> The course has increased my understanding of relevant research methodologies and techniques and their appropriate application within my research field	<b>5.5</b>
<b>F16.</b> The course has increased my ability to critically analyse and evaluate research findings.	<b>5.1</b>
<b>F21.</b> I would recommend this course to others enrolled in doctoral education	<b>Yes (all)</b>

F17. Are there any parts of the course that have been excellent? Please describe in what way.	F18. Are there any parts of the course that did not help you to achieve the intended learning outcomes? Please describe why not?	F19. Did the course cover the areas that you expected? If not what was missing?	F20. Do you have any recommendations as to how the course could be further improved?
International, sectional,	Genetic part could be understood better.	Yes	I think the epidemiology part should be ahead of genetic part, as some basic knowledge is discussed in the epide lectures.
It was <b>good with a boarding school which enabled interactions and networking</b> . It was fantastic accommodations and service from the personnel. Good and top of the line teachers! It has been a privilege. Thank you!	No answer	No answer	It was really a full schedule, it would have been nice if there were time for some <b>social activities</b> outside the boarding accommodations so the international participants would have been able to see Stockholm as well. Perhaps the <b>poster viewing could have been divided into several days</b> (5-6 presentations/day).
No answer	No answer	I would like <b>more info regarding muscle pathology, immuno histo chemistry, stainings in different subtypes</b> .	No answer
<b>The layout of lectures in the morning and group assignments in the afternoon.</b>	No	The course covered most areas, <b>perhaps a more detailed lecture on the drugs used and how they work</b> , one by one and in combination.	Just that time schedule would be even better timed so that the breaks are as long as intended, it is needed. This was a course where this was kept better than I've ever experienced but a course this dense can not have lunches and coffebreaks cut short.
Feedback from faculty - high amount of teacher working grupes - <b>challenging assignments, high experties support</b>	No answer	No answer	No answer
<b>All parts of the course</b> have been excellent. Presented were the most recent achevements in the field of IIM and their research. All teachers actively involved students in to the learning proces.	No	Yes	No
<b>The assignments</b> were excellent in giving the oppotunity for discussion. As far as everybody parcipitated, the assignments were stimulating and gave even new ideas for research.	No	Yes.	No answer
<b>Group assignments</b> were highly interesting: direct interaction between participants and lecturers.	-	Yes	extra social program at the beginning of the course, so that participants can get to know each other
<b>The structure of the lectures was excellent</b> , a lot of thought was put in to the 'flow' of the topics.	A few topics were rushed, i.e. Tissue arrays, however i understand this was down to time constraints.	No answer	No answer
I especially liked the course given by <b>Prof Nagaraju about animal models</b> .	No	See following question	I know that the course was on myositis, but it would have been nice to <b>maybe implement also other auto-immune disorders and their pathological findings?</b> Maybe this would give us ideas for future research projects?
<b>Innate and Adaptive immunity</b>	Tissue arrays and proteomics could have been more integrated and more basic, short time for a complicated "affair"	OK	No answer
<b>The speakers willingness to paticipate in the groupdiscussions</b>	---	Yes	---
<b>The topics of the lectures and their order in the schedule.</b>	Some lecturers presented own data to more extent than their designated topic.	Yes	No answer

F17. Are there any parts of the course that have been excellent? Please describe in what way.	F18. Are there any parts of the course that did not help you to achieve the intended learning outcomes? Please describe why not?	F19. Did the course cover the areas that you expected? If not what was missing?	F20. Do you have any recommendations as to how the course could be further improved?
The lectures were excellent and helped to get a good overview over the current knowledge in myositis research	-	The course covered all areas	Perhaps it would be good to skip the group assignments for one day and have half a day off to do <b>some activities like visiting Sigtuna or Stockholm</b> (for foreign people attending the course)
All presentations covered their field in an comprehensive and easy understandable way	No	The content of the course was well balanced	No
Several parts were excellent. <b>Many of the talks were were of excellent quality.</b> The quality of many posters were impressive. <b>The over all planning of the course exceeded that of comparable courses.</b>	No.	The schedule was a little too tight.	Just as stated above.
No answer	No	yes	No answer
Many!!! <b>Interaction between students and with lecturers too.</b> The atmosphere was for learning and sharing ideas. My confidence grew as the week progressed.	No answer	No answer	<b>It was a highly packed course with full days.</b> I was there to learn so didn't mind this but I found it very difficult on the Monday to stay focussed during the Posters, I had been up at 4am to get to the airport. I didn't like eating starter/desert whilst doing the Posters. But I understand that time was restricted and pleased that the Poster session was then modified to last over the next few days. Would <b>of preferred the Poster Session to have started on the Tuesday night.</b>
We could learn more about the researches in myositis in other countries and <b>we got a lot of new ideas. We got the latest ans newest informations about myositis.</b>	I think there was no such a part.	Just one missing thing, I <b>expected more information about the therapic aproches in myositis.</b>	No, I haven't.
<b>Basic immunological processes in myositis, including muscle physiology, autoantibodies, histology.</b>	No.	Yes	<b>More IMACS Core set measures presentations and examples.</b>
<b>The small number of participants allowed for close interactions with peers and professors. The lecturers were excellent: very knowledgeable, approachable and enthusiastic.</b> The themes covered in the course were very relevant to the field.	I felt some of the group discussions were not so effective because of the great heterogeneity in the students' interests and academic background. In the future, <b>I would suggest dividing participants into groups and activities according to their interests.</b>	Yes, I felt the course was very broad and covered most of the important aspects. <b>Perhaps some time could be dedicated towards teaching how to perform the MMT-8, the functional index, the different muscle biopsy techniques (pros and cons of each) and MSK ultrasound.</b>	Maybe the group discussions could be replaced by <b>group activities geared towards different participant interests</b> , as I previously exemplified.
The first two dayes were more clinically orientated and so closer to my research area. However <b>the whole course was excellent.</b> I appreciate personal meeting of people, who are in myositis research very important and whom I knew only as autors of articles and people, who I collaborate with, but knew them only from e-mail conversations. <b>Perfect organisation, no leaks in programme, thank you very much!!</b>	No	I would be interested in <b>lecture about cancer associated myositis</b> , and there was a bit too much genetics for me:-)	No answer
In general I think <b>lectures were really good</b> , mainly because of the high level of lecturers. <b>Also the work in groups was a good idea.</b>	I think was all fine.	Yes	Perhaps it is possible to improve the part of poster presentations
I liked specially <b>the availability of the lecturer to discuss.</b>	No	Yes.	It was excellent in every way. <b>I feel difficult any further improvement</b>
<b>Assignments with Teacher's guidance &amp; poster discussion</b>	No answer	No answer	No answer