

Course Evaluation Results

1. Information on evaluator

Number of evaluation received:
 ■ 28 (1 absent and 1 left early)

Discipline of primary training:
 ■ Chemistry - 11
 ■ Physics, Phy Chem, Materials Science– 2
 ■ Engineering/ Tech - 15

Highest academic qualification:
 ■ PhD: 11
 ■ ME/ M Tech/ MS (Engg): 4
 ■ MSc/ PGD / BE/Tech etc: 12

2. Overall evaluation of the course

Content met your expectations	5.5 (0.69) 28 (7-4) ☐
Content organized logically, well	5.6 (.73) 28 (7-4)
<i>Overall pace, schedule, info density</i>	4.4 (1.1) 28 (7-3) ☐
Lecture-discussion-exercise balance	5.4 (1.2) 28 (7-1) ☐
Quality of presentations	5.5 (0.69) 28 (7-4) ☐
Usefulness of the objects of the course	5.35 (.95) 28 (7-3)
Overall course rating	5.6 (0.77) 28 (7-4) ☐

Rating Scale
 1 = Bad
 2 = Well below avg
 3 = Below average
 4 = Average
 5 = Good
 6 = Very good
 7 = Excellent

Rating Scale
 1 = Too slow/little
 2 =
 3 =
 4 = Just right
 5 =
 6 =
 7 = Too fast/ much

How to use this evaluation:
 ■ Numbers are quoted in the order: **Mean (Std dev) Count (Min-Max)**
 ■ Standard deviation gives a feel for level of agreement/ disagreement in ratings.
 ■ A plus sign ⊕ indicates improvement and minus sign ☐ indicates a fall in comparison to the last wave.

Course Evaluation Results

Rating Scale
 1 = Bad
 2 = Well below avg
 3 = Below average
 4 = Average
 5 = Good
 6 = Very good
 7 = Excellent

3. Evaluation of the instructors

M V Shankar

Quality of presentation. Uses blackboard and visual aids well	5.6 (0.95) 28 (7-3)
Explains clearly, answers questions well. Enunciates clearly	5.9 (0.76) 38 (7-4)
Encourages questions, is sensitive to class	5.7 (0.95) 28 (7-4)
Excites interest and is enthusiastic	5.5 (0.99) 28 (7-4)
Usefulness+ relevance of workshop to you	5.3 (0.8) 28 (7-4)
Overall rating	5.7 (0.7) 28 (7-4) □

4. Evaluation of the workshop

Rating Scale

- 1 = Bad
- 2 = Well below avg
- 3 = Below average
- 4 = Average
- 5 = Good
- 6 = Very good
- 7 = Excellent

Rating Scale

- 1 = Too slow/little
- 2 =
- 3 =
- 4 = Just right
- 5 =
- 6 =
- 7 = Too fast/ much

Content chosen met needs, was relevant & complete. Emphasis/balance right.

5.28 (0.84) 25 (7-4)

It was made clear how you could apply learnt material to your work.

5.28 (0.93) 25 (7-3)

Pace was too slow or just right or too fast ?

3.6 (0.81) 25 (5-2)

Discussions and exercises were relevant, interesting and sufficient.

5.1 (0.9) 24 (7-3)

The section was under-emphasized, emphasis was just right or over-emphasized.

3.5 (0.65) 25 (5-2)

Overall rating

5.5 (0.83) 25 (7-4)

- Try to apply on biological stream problem, try to include biological problem also to increase the pace and impact
- Include book in course material after course reading
- Enroll students to mailing list of TRIZ India after their approval
- Collect data about backgrounds of participants which can help cater examples
- Have workshops on weekends
- Give CD in place of hardcopies including videos
- Some more principles of TRIZ in further details
- Nice but short. Make workshop - 2 days
- Well organized. Interesting videos. Overall presentation was interesting
- More efforts required on IT related issues
- More case studies expected
- Too cramped. Too many concepts. Need to be more slower in pace
- Add engineering examples.
- Well organized. Send new course details through mail

- More practical examples
- Reorganize participants after afternoon session, language problem is quite substantial than one is aware of.
- No cross flow of ideas between teams, no open discussions. Too much emphasis on methodology. Seating arrangement should allow easy movement
- Presentation was encouraging and enhances interest. Gives directions to think in an innovative way.
- More duration of work on some TRIZ soft wares
- Identify candidates for further training in TRIZ to make them TRIZ masters. More such workshops. Split as industry need. Series of workshop should be held.
- Share videos with group, One live problem should be solved in workshop. Training and food arrangements were excellent.