Questionnaire for JSPS-DST Asian Academic Seminar 2008 Participants

In order to improve the AAS activity in future, I, we would like to request you to evaluate 2008AAS by answering the following questions as much as possible.

December 2008 2008AAS Organizing Committee
(Chairperson: Akira Ishihama)

Part1

Please put the following mark in each question:

---

5 = strongly agree
4 = agree
3 = neutral
2 = disagree
1 = completely disagree

---

1. Organization of the Seminar

1. The time allotted to each part of the program was appropriate. (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
2. The size of the classes was optimal. (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)

2. Lectures by Lecturers

1. Sufficient time was allocated for the lectures. (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
2. The lectures were useful in my research. (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
3. The level of the lectures relative to my educational background and experience was optimal. (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)

3. Short Talks and Posters by Participants

1. Only the selected participants were allowed to give short talks. (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
2. Sufficient time was allocated for the short talks. (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
3. Sufficient time was allocated for the posters. (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
4. Location and facilities for poster presentation. (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)

4. Overall

1. Location of AAS is convenient for you to come. (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
2. Lecture hall and accommodation. (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
3. Supporting facilities and supporters (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
4. Travel supports (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
5. I found my participation in the seminar to be meaningful. (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
6. I was able to create and expand working networks with other researchers by participating in the seminar. (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)

Part 2

Evaluation of the lecture sessions.

---

5 = very good
4 = good
3 = fair
2 = poor
1 = very poor

Session A: Genome Regulation

1. Akira Ishihama, Hosei University (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
2. Taku Oshima.Nara Institue of Science and Technology (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
3. Dipankar Chatterji, Indian Institute of Science (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
4. Sue Lin-Chao, Institute of Molecular Biology, Academia Sinica (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
5. Hiroji Aiba Nagoya University (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
6. Parag P. Sadhale, Indian Institute of Science (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
7. Tapas Kundu, JNCASR (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
8. Cheng-Ming Chiang, Univertity of Texas (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
9. Purnima Bhargava, Centre for Cellular and Molecular Biology (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)

Session B: Nano-biology and Biophysis

1. Akihiko Ishijima, Tohoku Universit (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
2. Sudipta Maiti, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
3. Nobuo Shimamoto, National Institute of Genetics (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
4. Yamuna Krishnan, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
5. G.V. Shivashankar, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
6. Shige H. Yoshimura, Kyoto University (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
7. Fumihito Arai, Tohoku University (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)

Session C: Response to Environmental Stresses

1. Kaneyoshi Yamamoto, Hosei University (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
2. J. Gowrishankar, Centre for DNA Fingerprinting (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
3. Jung-Hye Roe, Seul National University (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
4. Ikuro Kawagishi, Hosei University (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
5. Kelly T Hughes, University of Utah (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)

Session D: Expression of Pathogenesis

1. Dipankar Chatterji, Indian Institute of Science (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
2. Toru Shimizu, Kanazawa University (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
3. Suman K. Dhar, Jawaharlal Nehru University (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
4. Masahira Hattori, University of Tokyo (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)
5. M.R.S. Rao, JNCASR (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)

Part3

The following comments are excerpted from questionnaire answers.

1. **The most successful aspect of this seminar was:**

2. **The least successful aspect of this seminar (if possible, suggestion for important) was:**

Part4

Your personal information

Age: A. 20-24
B. 25-299
C. 30-34
D. 35-39
E. over 40

Title: A. Ph.D. student
B. Postdoctoral researcher
C. Research associate
D. Lecturer
E. Researcher
G. Other( )

Research field or research subject:

Thank you for your collaboration,

Questionnaire for JSPS-DST Asian Academic Seminar

Part 1

	5	4	3	2	1	No	Ave
No. 1							
1	18	28	4	2	0	1	4.19
2	20	23	5	1	0	4	4.26
No. 2							
1	25	21	4	2	1	1	4.34
2	18	26	8	0	1	1	4.21
3	16	24	9	0	1	4	4.16
No. 3							
1	15	25	8	3	2	0	3.91
2	17	23	8	2	2	1	3.98
3	24	16	7	5	0	1	4.13
4	19	18	9	4	0	3	4.04
No. 4							
1	30	12	8	2	1	0	4.28
2	29	18	2	1	1	2	4.43
3	31	18	1	1	0	2	4.54
4	33	10	5	1	0	4	4.53
5	28	21	1	0	1	2	4.49
6	23	16	11	1	1	3	4.47

53

Questionnaire for JSPS-DST Asian Academic Seminar

Part 2

	5	4	3	2	1	No	Ave
Session A							
1	31	17	0	1	1	3	4.52
2	12	26	8	1	0	6	4.04
3	17	23	6	3	0	4	4.11
4	22	23	3	1	0	4	4.35
5	22	21	3	0	1	6	4.34
6	13	23	11	2	0	4	4.13
7	25	21	3	2	0	1	4.27
8	27	17	4	1	1	3	4.21
9	13	15	22	2	0	1	3.75
							4.19

	5	4	3	2	1	No	Ave
Session B							
1	19	21	7	1	0	5	4.21
2	16	22	9	0	0	6	4.15
3	16	23	6	1	0	7	4.17
4	29	17	4	1	0	2	4.45
5	29	16	3	1	0	4	4.49
6	19	18	5	1	1	9	4.21
7	17	18	8	1	0	9	4.16
							4.26

	5	4	3	2	1		
Session C							
1	8	17	15	3	0	10	3.71
2	28	16	4	1	1	3	4.44
3	11	17	11	2	1	11	3.83
4	11	20	10	1	0	11	3.98
5	17	23	3	1	0	9	4.27
							4.05

	5	4	3	2	1		
Session D							
1							
2	20	20	6	2	0	5	4.21
3	26	21	4	1	0	1	4.38
4	16	24	8	1	0	4	4.12
5	25	20	3	1	1	3	4.34
							4.26

Questionnaire for JSPS-DST Asian Academic Seminar

Part 3

1) The most successuful aspect

Well organized seminar. The place selected for the meeting was excellent. Speakers were best-picked up and the talks were informative.

The area of esearch discussion is very powerfull. The arrangement of facillities wonderful.

The variety of talks as there were speakers from different fields.

Most of the talks were excellent. For any scientists and students, it was a great learning.

Interdiscriplinary coverage from the classical studies to the modern advancement.

The broad title from nanobiology to pathogenesis. It allowed lot of ideas on a single platform. Most of the areas were covered under the same platform.

Informative. Lernt many things.

All lectures were very informative.

Broadning of our research horizons.

Introduction to novel techniques and approaches to answer biological questions.

The broad are of topics covered. The seminar spanned as many topics of biological research as possible. This variety of lectures is very enlightening particulary for the student community.

Very good organization and time allomentfor each session.

Selection of diverse topics.

Talks on wide variety of aspects. Good lectures which could be used for my research.

Wide range of topics was enlightening to have from people outside one respective field.

Seminars included sufficient introduction to make it informative to those from other fields.

All the subjects were interesting from nanobiology to pathogenesis.

The union of people from different scientific fields trying to understand the genome regulation and vaious aspects of it.

It went smoothly and lots of interaction.

Help for advanced research approaches in the frontier of science.

Talks by senior scientists were good; basic introduction to topic helped us understand their work better.

Exposure to the work going on currently in different laboratories and knowledge of the various approaches used.

Ample scope for interaction with international scientists.

Interaction between students and faculties.

Short talks by students and post-doc fellows were really of high quality.

Students seminars. Really good to give opportunity to graduate students to showcase their work.

Students were given with a chance to present their work.

Student short presentation and posters.

Good opportunity was given for the graduate students to persent their work in front of renowned scientists.

The best part was the direct discussion among the graduate students and masters of differentares of reseach.

Short talks by students and interaction among students.

Students were given with an opportunity to present.

Active partipipation from all over Asia.

Many young scientists were given the chance to talk.

I could present my research in oral presentation in English for the first time of my life.

It is a very good opportunity for young scientists to show their performance.

Good opportunity for the graduate students, postdoctoral people and scientists of Japan to understand the Indian science and vice versa for the Indian people to understand their research

Time for interaction was quite enough during seminar as well as lunch or dinner time.

I will say the student seminars were the best aspect, but it could have been most successful only if all the students who were promised a talk by Email were actually allowed.

Very good interactoins.

Interaction with scientists.

Discussion with scientists

Communications with a number of scientists from different fields.

Ineraction with students of various institutions and countries, which will obviously help in future research.

To create working networks with new people in research community.

Hospitality and chances of interactionwith other researchers.

2) The least successful aspect

Having session solely devoed to new technology coming up in the field.

Some seminars were too specific instead of discussing the concepts.

Clinical applications. Applied clinical sceitists may be involved in this kind of global meeting.

Time arrangements.

Too much date in lecturers talk.

There should be a small session (may be 1 hour or so) where studens can discuss their routine lab experimental problem

Give information of AAS and select undeveloped area peoples. It may useful for develpming the reseach knowledge to all kinds of peoples.

A full day's session for students' presentation.

More chanse for students to speak; more talks by students

Little more time to students presentation could be given.

Give 15 min for short talks instead of 10 min.

The selection of students for poster was not justified. I was informed that I will be allowed to speak via E-mail, but I did not find myself in student speaker list.

Couldn't appreciate the work by few people outside India primarily because of lack of communication. It would have been more helpful if there was some interaction with them like how we havewith the Indian science group.

Communication language needs to be improved.

More people should be invited from other countries, if possible.

Apart from India and Japan, many more partcipants from othe Asian countries should have been included.

Communication in English needs to be improved for better exchange of scientific ideas.

The discussion between the students from different country was not successful due to the insufficient knowledge of interacting language, so some of the topics were unable to understand clealy and the discussion was not helpful.

Guest house was not confortable. It was so cold.

Food