Course Evaluation Results
- Patent Drafting, 18-20 Feb 2011-

IPFACE

1. Information on evaluator

Number of evaluation received:
- 15

Discipline of primary training:
- Chemistry - 2
- Physics, Phy Chem, Materials Science– 3
- Engineering/ Tech - 5

Highest academic qualification:
- PhD: 2
- ME/ M Tech/ MS (Engg): 2
- MSc/ PGD / BE/Tech etc: 3

2. Overall evaluation of the course

Content met your expectations	5.5(15)(3-7)
Content organized logically, well	5.7(15)(4-7)
Overall pace, schedule, info density	4.7(14)(4-7)
Lecture-discussion-exercise balance	5.8(15)(5-7)
Quality of presentations	5.6(15)(5-7)
Usefulness of the objects of the course	5.8(15)(4-7)
Overall course rating	5.7(15)(5-7)

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.

VENTURE CENTER

Course Evaluation Results

IPFACE

3. Evaluation of the instructors	Srividya Ravi	Bina Dandekar	Siddharth Jabade	Vasant Savangikar
Quality of presentation. Uses blackboard and visual aids well	5.8(15)(5-7)	4.9(13)(4-6)	6.2(14)(5-7)	4.6(13)(2-7)
Explains clearly, answers questions well. Enunciates clearly	6.2(15)(5-7)	5.2(13)(4-7)	6.2(14)(4-7)	5(13)(3-6)
Encourages questions, is sensitive to class	6.3(14)(5-7)	5.2(13)(4-7)	6.5(14)(4-7)	5(13)(3-6)
Excites interest and is enthusiastic	6(15)(5-7)	4.9(13)(4-6)	6.3(14)(4-7)	4.6(13)(3-6)
Usefulness+ relevance of workshop to you	6.2(14)(5-7)	5(13)(3-7)	6.3(14)(4-7)	4.6(13)(3-6)
Overall rating	**6.2(15)(5-7)**	**5.1(14)(4-7)**	**6.2(15)(4-7)**	**4.9(14)(4-6)**

VENTURE CENTER

IPFACE

Course Evaluation Results

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.	5.6(14)(5-7)
It was made clear how you could apply learnt material to your work.	5.6(14)(5-7)
Pace was too slow or just right or too fast ?	*4.4.(14)(3-7)*
Discussions and exercises were relevant, interesting and sufficient.	5.5(14)(4-6)
The section was under-emphasized, emphasis was just right or over-emphasized.	*4.7(14)(4-7)*
Overall rating	**5.6(15)(5-7)**

Comments received:
• The workshop is very good. Group discussion is also good. The course is very good and enjoyable for me. This technolegal system also used for both chemical, mechanics, computer and electronics. Group discussion & some teaching method is good. All liked by me.
• I have been referring to patents for the past 30 years. However, it is only after attending this program that I was fully able to appreciate the intricacies of patent drafting.
• Attending the workshop gave better understanding of basic components of patents, drafting of patents (mainly different types of claims). Besides this, the w/s illustrated different intends behind filing patents & need of careful drafting of patent accordingly. Furthermore, this workshop taught me how to read patents & how to interpret them. This is important to understand prior art & helpful to draft my patent (mainly claims) in better manner. Suggestion: Instead of conducting course in 3 days in one stretch, it can be conducted on 2-3 weekends (total of 4-6 days). This will give participants some time for reading & completing the homework. Accordingly tome 3 days are insufficient to conduct such w/s.

VENTURE CENTER