

# Connaught Summer Institute Survey Results – Summary

The Connaught Summer Institute in Arctic Science:  
Atmosphere, Cryosphere, and Climate  
Nottawasaga Inn, Alliston, Ontario, Canada  
July 14-18, 2014

## Summer Institute attendees:

(16.6% of attendees) Master's students  
(50% of attendees) PhD students  
(33.3% of attendees) PDFs

## SUMMARY OF RESULTS:

Average organization satisfaction **4.45/5 (89%)**  
Average format satisfaction **4.26/5 (85.2%)**  
Average networking satisfaction **4.43/5 (88.6%)**  
Average workshop satisfaction **3.62/5 (72.4%)**  
Average career panel satisfaction **4.35/5 (87%)**  
Average content satisfaction **4.47/5 (89.4%)**  
Average speaker satisfaction **4.55/5 (91%)**  
Average topic satisfaction **4.03/5 (80.6%)**

**Overall average Summer Institute satisfaction: 4.13/5 (82.6%)**

## What part of the Summer Institute did you find most beneficial?

(Ranked most beneficial to least beneficial)

1. Academic/scientific lectures
2. Networking opportunities
3. Informal discussions with other attendees and speakers
4. Poster session
5. Career panel
6. Writing workshop
7. Entrepreneur workshop
8. Other

## Would you recommend this Summer Institute to other students?

37 (97.4%) Yes                      1 (2.6%) Maybe                      0 No

## Are you likely to apply to attend the 2015 Connaught Summer Institute if held, assuming a different set of speakers and lecture topics will be offered?

25 (71.4%) Yes                      9 (25.7%) Maybe                      1 (2.9%) No

## **DETAILS OF RESULTS:**

### **Organization-Related Questions**

How satisfied are you:

- a) with the application process? **4.64/5 (92.8%)**
- b) with notifications of deadlines and instructions for completing items (e.g. Jamboree slide, poster abstract, poster)? **4.69/5 (93.8%)**
- c) with the transportation to and from the venue? **4.78 (95.6%)**
- d) with the location (Alliston) of the Summer Institute? **4.57/5 (91.4%)**
- e) with the date of the Summer Institute (mid-July)? **4.45/5 (89%)**

**Average organization satisfaction 4.63/5 (92.6%)**

Overall, students were pleased with the organization of the Summer Institute. They felt that the application process and travel logistics were communicated clearly and efficiently. The majority of students prefer a mid-July Summer Institute; however, some students suggested that the Institute should be later in the summer to allow those doing field research to attend. Students were happy with the variety of amenities offered at the Nottawasaga Inn.

### **Format-Related Questions**

How satisfied are you:

- a) with the overall format of the Summer Institute? **4.21/5 (84.2%)**
- b) with the Summer Institute's emphasis on training new researchers? **4.31/5 (86.2%)**
- c) with the amount of time dedicated to academic learning? **3.93/4 (78.6%)**
- d) with the amount of scheduled free time? **3.67/5 (73.4%)**
- e) with the duration of each lecture (45 minutes)? **3.95/5 (79.0%)**
- f) with the duration of the Summer Institute (5 days)? **4.39/5 (87.8%)**
- g) with the inclusion of a poster session? **4.63/5 (92.6%)**
- h) with the inclusion of an education/outreach component? **4.38/5 (87.6%)**
- i) with the inclusion of an interview workshop? **4.31/5 (86.2%)**
- j) with the inclusion of a career panel? **4.50/5 (90.0%)**

**Average format satisfaction 4.23/5 (84.6%)**

Students enjoyed a good mix of lectures and career development opportunities. Many students noted that while it is a good idea to include workshops, they should include an interactive component. It was also suggested that more lectures could also benefit from interactive components as well. Students recognized that the schedule was very busy and appreciated the 1.5 hour afternoon break. Some students would like more free time in the schedule, especially when the sun is shining; one student suggested a full afternoon off midweek, or possibly an outdoor lecture. Because of the broad range of lecture topics this year, one student suggested that each day could cover a specific topic so that they could only attend on the day(s) of interest, but most students appreciated the breadth.

## Networking-Related Questions

How satisfied are you:

- a) with the attendee introductory Jamboree? **4.36/5 (87.2%)**
- b) with the Welcoming “Icebreaker”? **4.51/5 (90.2%)**
- c) with the organized recreational activities? **4.56/5 (91.2%)**
- d) with the amount of time allotted for networking and sharing ideas with your peers? **4.51/5 (90.2%)**
- e) with the opportunity to chat informally with speakers during meals, breaks, and social events? **4.55/5 (91.0%)**
- f) with the Summer Institute’s overall value in helping you improve your communication skills? **4.15/5 (83.0%)**
- g) that the Summer Institute was a motivational experience for you? **4.33/5 (86.6%)**

**Average networking satisfaction 4.43/5 (88.6%)**

On the whole students were satisfied with the networking opportunities at the Summer Institute. Many students enjoyed the simple ice-breaker organized by the CREATE-AAS Trainees’ Advisory Committee (TAC) this year, and one student noted that TAC did a great job bringing everyone together. Students really enjoyed the recreational activities and suggested that more activities be scheduled throughout the week. The majority of students enjoyed the Jamboree and felt that it was an excellent way of introducing everyone at the Summer Institute, but noted that it could be organized a little more efficiently. Most students appreciated the informal conversations during coffee breaks and recreational activities but one felt uncomfortable approaching lecturers or more experienced students. Judges’ comments from the poster session were noted by a number of students as being particularly useful.

## Workshop-Related Questions

How satisfied are you:

- a) with the duration of the workshop (3 hours)? **3.79/5 (80.4%)**
- b) with the format of the workshop? **3.78 /5 (79.6%)**
- c) with the breadth of information represented in the workshop? **3.69/5 (82.4%)**
- d) that you had ample opportunities to ask questions? **4.33/5 (84.8%)**
- e) with the workshop’s overall value in preparing you to write or review scientific papers? **3.39/5 (70.2%)**
- f) with the workshop’s overall value in providing insight on entrepreneurship? **2.76/5 (73.2%)**

The majority of students felt that workshops need to contain an interactive component. One student suggested a resume/CV building or interviewing workshop. Another student suggested a post-doc research session in addition to the poster session. Two students suggested a workshop on how to create and present posters. Two more students suggested a workshop on preparing for a career in research science. Other suggestions included a workshop on writing grants, a workshop on model parameterizations for physicists, and a workshop on open access and data publication or an open science panel.

The majority of students felt that entrepreneur workshop was unsuccessful due to its lack of an interactive component. Students felt it was more of an extended lecture, and that the subject matter was either too broad, or not targeted for the Summer Institute audience.

The writing workshop was better received, though students noted that it could have been more interactive. One student suggested using the student poster abstracts in the program book as writing examples to improve on in future writing workshops. Another student commented that they wished that this workshop was presented to them in their earlier career when they had first started writing papers.

### **Career Panel-Related Questions**

How satisfied are you:

- a) with the breadth of careers represented on the panel? **4.41/5 (88.2%)**
- b) with the duration of the career panel (90 min.)? **4.33/5 (86.6%)**
- c) with the chairing of the panel? **4.51/5 (90.2%)**
- d) that you had ample opportunities to ask questions? **4.59/5 (91.8%)**
- e) with the responses and advice from the career panellists? **4.26/5 (85.2%)**
- f) with the career panel's overall value in helping you identify potential career paths? **3.97/5 (79.4%)**

**Average career panel satisfaction 4.04/5 (80.8%)**

#### **Did you use the question submission box?**

12 (21.4%) Yes

28 (78.6%) No

#### **Should a career panel be included in next year's Summer Institute?**

40 (90.5%) Yes

0 (4.76%) No

The majority of students enjoyed the career panel and thought it was done extremely well. They students were satisfied with the allotted amount of time for the panel, though two students suggested making it longer. The industry and entrepreneurial representatives were recognized in particular. A few students suggested that overall, the panel's answers were more optimistic than realistic. One student suggested preparing specific questions for each panel speaker ahead of time.

### **Content-Related Questions**

How satisfied are you:

- a) with the amount of useful knowledge you have gained from attending this Summer Institute? **4.36/5 (87.2%)**
- b) with the scope of topics presented? **4.71/5 (94.2%)**
- c) with the usefulness of the information? **4.38/5 (87.6%)**
- d) with the quality of student posters? **4.43/5 (88.6%)**
- e) that students were invited to share their ideas and knowledge? **4.43/5 (88.6%)**
- f) How would you rate the level of the lectures? **3.09** (1=too easy, 3=just right, 5=too difficult)

### **Average content satisfaction 4.21/5 (84.2%)**

Overall, students thought the Summer Institute was a very worthwhile experience. They felt it was informative and motivational, and provided an excellent opportunity to interact with peers and professionals. Almost all students indicated that the level of difficulty of the lectures was just right, though the opinions on the broad range of topics varied. Most students enjoyed the variety of topics, and a few were not interested in topics outside of their research area. Most students appreciated how lecturers were started the week with introductory/background lectures and gradually became more in-depth.

### **Speaker-Related Questions**

How satisfied are you:

- a) with the quality of the speakers? **4.5/5 (90.0%)**
- b) with the variety of speaker expertise? **4.43/5 (88.6%)**
- c) with the speakers' responses to student questions? **4.64/5 (92.8%)**
- d) that the speakers explained concepts clearly? **4.45/5 (89.0%)**
- e) with the opportunities to interact with speakers informally? **4.74/5 (94.8%)**

### **Average speaker satisfaction 4.55/5 (87.0%)**

Students agreed that a great range of topics was covered by this year's speakers. Overall, students thought it was nice to speak with speakers professionally during lectures, coffee breaks, and meals, and then engage informally playing soccer, horseshoes or minigolf. One student noted that it would be helpful to have speakers repeat student questions during lectures because it was not always easy to hear them being asked.

### **Topic-Related Questions**

How relevant/useful/interesting did you find the following topics?

- a. Sea ice remote sensing (C.Haas)
- b. The sea ice climate system (C.Haas)
- c. Sea ice change (C. Haas)
- d. Inuit Traditional music (D.Serkoak)
- e. Past Arctic ocean climate evolution (J. Halfar)
- f. Arctic climate sensitivity to black carbon (M. Flanner)
- g. Getting it done: time management for scientists within the context of a happy life (L. Miller)
- h. Application of models #1: reducing uncertainty in future climate projections through improved understanding of aerosol radiative forcing (C. Fletcher)
- i. High Latitude marine paleoclimatology (J. Halfar)
- j. Arctic Oceanography (L. Miller)
- k. Introduction to climate models and modelling (C. Fletcher)
- l. Cryosphere radiative forcing and climate feedback (M. Flanner)
- m. Application of models #2: understanding the role of snow parameterisations and feedbacks in simulations of climate variability and change (C. Fletcher)
- n. Crustose coralline algal marine climate reconstructions (J. Halfar)

- o. Monte Carlo modeling of radiative transfer in snow (M. Flanner)
- p. Inuit social history (D. Serkoak)
- q. Arctic Ocean and climate change feedbacks (L. Miller)
- r. Limnology: what's going on in polar waters (M. Douglas)
- s. Polar stratospheric ozone (D. Tarasick)
- t. Paleolimnology and environmental change: part II (M. Douglas)
- u. Paleolimnology and environmental change: truths from the mud part I (M. Douglas)
- v. Carbon Cycling in the Arctic Ocean (L. Miller)
- w. Road to Nunavut (D.Serkoak)
- x. Tropospheric ozone and transport processes (D. Tarasick)
- y. Practical Applications of Soil Gas and Surface CO<sub>2</sub> Flux Measurements (C. McNaughton)
- z. Workshop on writing and reviewing scientific papers
- aa. Workshop on entrepreneurship

**Individual scores ranged from 2.43/5 (62.8%) to 4.74/5 (88.0%)**

**Average topic satisfaction 4.20/5 (84.2%)**

The vast majority of comments were very positive and students were pleased with the topics covered throughout the week. One student commented that the speakers did a great job of keeping things entertaining yet also informative.

### **Planning-Related Questions:**

#### **Where did you initially hear about this Summer Institute?**

(Some students chose more than one option)

12 - Attended the 2011, 2012, or 2013 CREATE Summer School in Arctic Atmospheric Science	1 - University of Toronto Department of Physics website
2 - CREATE website	1 - University of Toronto School of Environment email list
2 - NETCARE website	0 - University of the Arctic website
1 - CanSISE website	0 - Facebook
0 - CREATE trainee email announcement	0 - Twitter
1 - CANDAC/CREATE Co-Investigator	18 - Supervisor
1 - NETCARE Co-Investigator	1 - Colleague or peer
3 - CanSISE Co-Investigator	1 - Connaught Summer Institute poster
1 - APECS website or email announcement	5 - Other (please specify)
1 - ARCUS website or email announcement	-CAG list (2)
1 - IRWG email list	-Google
0 - ArcticNet student network email list	-email from department
0 - ArcticNet training opportunities webpage	

#### **Do you recommend any other locations or email lists etc. for advertising next year?**

AWI mailing list, CAG, CLIMLIST, Cryolist

**What influenced you to attend our Summer Institute? (Please check all that apply)**

27 - My supervisor encouraged me to attend

26 - Topics to be covered are relevant to my research

13 - On- site food and accommodation included

11 - My peers were also attending

9 - Confirmed speakers

6 - Location and/or venue of Summer Institute

5 - Career panel

3 - Other (please specify)

*-topics that are outside my field of research*

*-experience- a "conference" poster type event and to network with community to get involved!*

*-opportunity to interact with other Arctic Scientists*

*-topics relevant to adjacent areas which may be useful in the future*

*-opportunity to meet fantastic scientists*