



## Workshop on “Effective Proposal Preparation for the MSCA”

NTU@One-North Executive Centre, Singapore

Tuesday, the 22d of May 2018

**Total participants: 26**

**Total evaluation forms gathered and analysed for this report: 18**

The final analysis of the 18 participants’ evaluation forms clearly shows a predominance of an **excellent evaluation** (1 - I agree) in terms of workshop’s contents, location, material distributed and the for usefulness of the workshop for future applications. All 18 respondents clearly stated that they will recommend the same workshop to others, and this can be considered as a clear indication that the training was considered by all participants as very successful indeed. The trainer was also considered by all 18 respondents as very knowledgeable on the topic.

The two group exercises on Individual Fellowships (IF) and on the evaluation of a real RISE proposal were considered very useful by the majority of respondents (17). The time allocation of the programme was reviewed as very good with the right length (16 respondents), and most of participants rated between very good and excellent the audio-visual, the meeting room and the overall programme (just a minority of 2 participants scored fair for acoustic and meeting place).

In general terms there are no negative scores at all, making the evaluation results in balance between 1 (excellent) and 2 (very good). Some minor improvements can be done in the future in terms of handouts (5 voted the material as good, 5 as very good and 6 as excellent).

### **Quality of researchers/participants**

This was a very interactive class, with all participants actively engaging with each other during the group exercise, and with the trainer. The workshop itself has been considered by most attendees as for beginners and intermediate, with only 2 participants considering it as advanced training, and this was the type of level we were looking for when constructing the workshop contents.

I think there will be at least 2 very successful re-submission of an IF (this comes from the individual meeting organised after the training) and at least other 5 interested PhDs and post-PhDs in applying for this year or for next year call (depending on when they will obtain their PhD)

### **Suggestions for future training events**

The free comments underline a positive impact of the workshop, but there is still a need to see a real IF application but bear in mind this can be quite impossible to do due to privacy issues of an individual tailored project. There is also a need for other types of trainings, such as on entrepreneurship, commercialization of research output or how to publish scientific articles (Open Science). Also networking and how to find an host seem to be an issue for further training for some participants.



## Evaluation Results

	agree		disagree		
1. The workshop content was what I expected	1	2	3	4	5
	<b>16</b>	<b>2</b>			
2. The content was useful for my MSCA application	1	2	3	4	5
	<b>17</b>	<b>1</b>			
3. I will recommend this workshop to other researchers	1	2	3	4	5
	<b>18</b>				
4. The programme was well paced within the allotted time	1	2	3	4	5
	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>			
5. The trainer was a good communicator	1	2	3	4	5
	<b>17</b>	<b>1</b>			
6. The material was presented in an organised manner	1	2	3	4	5
	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>			
7. The trainer was knowledgeable on the topic	1	2	3	4	5
	<b>18</b>				
8. The exercises were useful	1	2	3	4	5
	<b>17</b>	<b>1</b>			
9. Given the topic, was this workshop:	<input type="checkbox"/> a. Too short		<input type="checkbox"/> b. Right length		<input type="checkbox"/> c. Too long
	<b>1</b>	<b>16</b>			
10. In your opinion, was this workshop:	<input type="checkbox"/> a. Introductory		<input type="checkbox"/> b. Intermediate		<input type="checkbox"/> c. Advanced
	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>		<b>2</b>	
11. Please rate the following:					
	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
a. Visuals	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
b. Acoustics	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
c. Meeting space	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
d. Handouts	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
e. The programme overall	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>



**12. What did you most appreciate/enjoy/think was best about the workshop? Any suggestions for improvement?**

- The group activity was great. I learnt most about the Dos and Dents by listening to everyone's comments.
- The ample material and information provided in the workshop. The trainer was very knowledgeable.
- Font size of the text on the slides needs to be bigger.
- Exercises and insider tips.
- Proposal format discussions were very useful.
- More exercises using real (successful) proposal would make the training more effective.

**13. Please list any topics you would like to learn more about in the next 12 months:**

- How to write a research proposal.
- Information on social science related funding opportunities.
- Networking opportunities with potential hosts / How to find a host.
- Follow-up workshop closer to application deadline.
- Information on exchange programmes for postdocs.
- Workshop on entrepreneurship, commercialization of research output.
- Proposal clinic prior to submission of application / Feedback on draft proposals 2-3 months prior to submission.
- Finding a host.
- Training on how to establish research collaborations.
- Training on how to get published / writing for journals.