

# GK Evaluation: Analysis of strengths and weaknesses, discussion

11.12.2012



# Organisation of GK in general

Organisation of GK in general

# General Remarks

- kind of okay
- The organization could be better. Often you get information only after asking explicitly about it
- I had the feeling that more time should be allocated for the organization of the GK.

## Communication with M. z. Nedden and others

- no reply to mails; maybe to much organizational work for one person
- dates of block courses announced too late; in general announcement of events etc. well in advance would be appreciated
- sometimes a bit chaotic
- In general I would suggest reviving the GK homepage again, trying to keep it more up to date (or better "advanced to date")
- good; good in general
- sufficiently fast in case of questions
- not so cool a year ago some people did not know who there GK-supervisor was.
- Often you get information only after asking explicitly about it
- Received many mails by Martin with good information concerning the offerings. Martin always answered when I had questions, all in all very good communication (9/10)

# Reactions to earlier critique & evaluations

- Not everybody always gets what they want. My requested topic from the last feedback questionnaire was not chosen, but I know many people requested neutrino physics in March and there promptly was a session on neutrino physics in October.
- do not know about earlier critique – that is a problem, too
- I had the impression that people took the earlier critique and results from evaluation into account
- I totally missed that. I think the reactions could have been better.
- I am not aware of any input from our side to the GK.

# Information on and meaning of GK-reports (midterm, final)

- I'm not sure what you mean with 'GK-reports (midterm, final)' which I guess is because I don't have enough information about it, so..
- very little information on how and when to provide those. I submitted my outline after being in the GK for 6 months, but never heard back if my report was actually read? It would have been nice to get some feedback or at least a confirmation of reception after the upload
- It would have been nicer, if one had got a feedback on the midterm report as it was quite a non-negligible amount of work to prepare it. On the other hand it was of course useful for oneself in order to organize one-self and in order to get an overview of what was and still is to be done.
- the midterm report is useless in my opinion, as in the first half people are usually doing service/OTP/Authorship tasks in our field and the main topic might change anyway
- poor information. Is there a midterm report?

# Information on and meaning of GK-reports (for the continuatio of GK )

- This was not very well communicated. First of all, I did not know that I actually contributed to the GK main report. I would have written it differently, if I had known where it would end. Second, I updated the report, because we had published some papers. I entirely rewrote the text. However, in the final report, only the citations were updated not the text. This is really a pity, because the old text does not give any meaning at all any more with the new citations.
- poor: latex compilation not possible and misleading information
- For a member that is not directly paid by the GK I found these reports very superfluous, time consuming and in no way sensible for my work. I am aware of the fact that they are necessary for the continuation of the GK and that you have to do something for your traveling money. Nevertheless I do not think that the reports are suited for that. Alternatives: poster presentations, talks (also external, at schools etc.). (1/10)

# Transparency of decisions made by the organisers

- Could be circulated as general announcements via (regular) mails
- the process of coming to decisions did not seem transparent to me
- Could have been better, but I cannot really judge it.
- no information on decisions is apparent
- I didn't hear of these discussions, only of the results. Only now, at the end of the GK you notice the internal discussion, but this is very important! (9/10)
- What kind of decisions? So far, I can't remember having been asked about anything. I don't see the requirement that everything should be decided by the whole GK.
- Not very transparent from my point of view. Do not know how decisions are reached and such.



# General concept of GK

- I really appreciate the concept of having a second supervisor but it does not seem to work in every case, sometimes maybe due to a lack of interest of the 2nd supervisor
- was not always clear to me
- I really like the concept of GK. And I think there is a big benefit from having connecting to other disciplines.
- good, very good

## General concept of GK II

- In general, I really like the concept of the GK. It provides us PhD students the opportunity to still be Phd STUDENTS and have lectures on topics which are of specific interest to us, also tutorials, etc. The problem is more of an underlying problem: We are so involved with our research and incorporated with the collaboration's work, that we do not actually have time to take advantage of these opportunities. Also, supervisors sometimes expect results to be produced within the week of the Blockkurs. This is a contradiction to the GK principles. How can we take it seriously if the supervisors do not take it seriously?
- I understand it and support it. Especially the collaboration of different institutes such as the TU Dresden, HU Berlin, and DESY. Of course, financial support is always a good thing. The lectures were good (I attended three external lectures and have learned a lot). A better organization is missing though and some concepts have to be executed with more routine. (8/10)

# General concept of GK III

- good idea of bringing together different fields of particle physics to learn from each other
- practical realisation not very good as GK events are mostly regarded as mandatory waste of time instead of opportunity of learning something
- It would be nice to have an info-sheet about what is offered in general (travel money / lectures / workshops), something simple that details what is expected from one (taking part in block courses / talks / mid term reports / final reports etc.) and when (maybe even motivate and say why it has to be done)

# Office space

- very good, ok
- ok
- cannot comment on this (I am associated member)
- quite independent of GK, no?
- I don't know if that is GK-related, but it would be nice to have a common room for informal meetings other than the meeting room which is always booked.
- I am happy with my working place :-)

# Block courses

Block courses

# General Comments

- a common and not addressed issue is a social dinner. Inter disciplinary interaction is not giving a platform in the berlin courses. This has not changes for more than 2 years now although mentioned in the evaluations
- Too often! Once a year is sufficient. The best block courses were outside of Berlin/Dresden. Good opportunities to establish contacts, learn something and have some variety in one's work life, get new input, also to relax a bit). (10/10 for the block courses outside Berlin/Dresden/Zeuthen) Regarding the other block courses the number of attending people and the going-back-to-work ratio was not good. Also they seemed to be less well organized and sensible. (7/10)
- think they were good (except the involuntary character) - no other comments, just that the nuclear physics people do not get much out of it.
- I found the organization of the block courses very good

# Lecture topics

- Suitable, since they are varying among the topics covered by theses written within the GK.
- I've only been to one block course so far, that was I think pretty interesting, but I guess it is just really hard to find topics that are interesting and understandable to everyone, because people are working on so many different things.
- OK, fine
- could be more theoretically oriented imho
- Maybe one could think about having some more general courses, like those offered by the HGS (academic writing, presentations,...) With a stronger focus on physics

# Lecture topics II

- Lecture topics are relevant and generally good, although somehow the content has decreased with time.
- good lecturers and locations were chosen. Unfortunately this wasn't always the case. The lectures at the block courses were equivalent to lectures during the semesters. (6/10)
- Super! Many (not all) things met my interests. Learned some new things. (9/10)
- too specific, rather concentrate on methods than on physics topics



# Mutual understanding of students talks (theory vs. experiment)

- I think it is important to hear what the other students do even if that is not related to one's own research and the student's talks are a good opportunity for that.
- good, okay
- I did not like the student's talk. They were too much like parallel talks for conferences. If one really want's to learn something from other disciplines, then the talks should be more pedagogical with the aim of explaining the idea to a broad audience.
- Good, of course it was harder to understand the talks from other fields of research but there was an effort to keep all the listeners in mind
- could be better (but that is a person-specific problem)
- kind of hard for me to understand talks on theory/neutrino physics

# Mutual understanding of lectures (theory vs. experiment)

- good
- usually good (but that is also a person-specific problem)
- introduction session usually very helpful, further session mostly at a too high level
- Mostly too much presented. Powerpoint is always hard to follow.  
Suggestion: Bring slides to public IN ADVANCE of lecture

# Evaluation of block courses, especially: "Were the right questions asked?"

- The evaluation is fine, I don't know whether this is already being done at the moment but it might be nice to tell the students what will be done with the feedback.
- This could have been improved. I suggested several times to change the concept of student talks, nothing changed.
- is not anonymous (By the questions asked the respondent can be identified.)
- good
- good point. I think often the questions in the evaluation do not apply. E.g. it is asking the quality of the student talks.
  - 1) several student talks which might not be comparable in quality
  - 2) can not improve next time → different students

→ Suggestion: fun 'competition': best student talk awarded a prize by the audience, to give some stimulation for students to make the talks more understandable for everyone, as well as the audience to listen

# Response to and announcement of results of evaluations

- It would be good to circulate the outcome with a short statement of what will be changed on a shorter/longer term.
- I've not heard anything about the outcome of the last evaluations
- Not really communicated
- have the results been announced??
- what announcement? I have never seen one.
- never heard of any result of the evaluations

# Accomodation

- I only needed accomodation for the spring block course 2012 and the hotel there was very nice.
- excellent, very good, fine
- good, last time we had no internet in the hotel in Berlin.  
Rathen/Krippen was always very good!
- I am completely satisfied with the accomodations we had so far

# Relevance of topics offered at block-courses for everyday life in research

- Usually the topics are not directly relevant for my own research. One exception was a course on Lie algebras. However, many topics were of course interesting anyway and contributed to my physical general education.
- the first paper seminar was very useful
- For me: very limited, unfortunately.
- Not very much, though still interesting.
- not so much ( most probably since I am at the theoretical border of the GK), what for example about some workshops? (Mathmatica?)
- given only for the beginners (1st year) as good introduction in the relevant physics fields
- for the advanced students, its very hard to realize, as nearly everyone works at a different analysis/with different tools ...

# Relevance of topics offered at block-courses for everyday life in research II

- rather small (too small) → move to talks/lectures on methods
- Sometimes more, sometimes less relevant, also due to the variety of research topics in the GK. I think the most important thing is that people get more involved (which also requires them to have the time to be involved - so they cannot be swamped with other work during the Blockkurs... and I don't know how to solve that problem)
- I do not think one can tell at this point but it should be good. The evening lectures were interesting and rewarding. The rest of the lectures were too.

## Additional idea for block courses:

- There are often topics/words/techniques that are used on a daily basis, but sometimes one does not really (or exactly) know what it means. An improvement of the block course might be a session where dedicated topics are explained (either by students or by lecturers) on enquiry. I could imagine a call for questions like 4 weeks before the block course and maybe the possibility to put them anonymously into that post box, since some questions tend to be embarrassing, if you missed the right point to ask them right in the beginning. And it is likely that one student is not the only one to have that question in mind.



# Available funds and spending

Available funds and spending

# General comments

- Do not know when a business trip is payed by the GK. More information would be useful here.
- it is not known how much one may use, what the limitations are and therefore what is possible → mis-communication

# Salaries

- I am an associated member and do not get a salary or a scholarship from the GK.
- I think these are just the 'normal' German PhD salaries right? So not much to say about that.
- ok. Due to the fact that I'm employed by the HU, but work in Zeuthen (and the state of Berlin paying less than all other states) my income is actually lower than that of all my co-workers. This is however a small effect and you can live well from the money if you live alone.
- ok, good
- no complaints (but I don't have a family depending on me)
- as always in physics: unsatisfactory. A part time job for 200% work that's a factor of 4
- the same as for a normal PhD student, isn't it? well, more would be nice but I think this is not up for discussion

# Travel money

- The travel money from the GK is very important for me to attend schools and conferences. I also appreciate that there is no sharp limit on the amount of money one can spend.
- This is really great, so far I've been able to go to everything that I wanted to go to and it was very useful for me and I learned a lot.
- excellent, very good, good
- For associated members: very positive additional money for travelling and other things
- misunderstanding between the available funds and the secretaries. This is creating issues and should be improved!
- no idea, how much this is exactly (heard that it is 1k EUR per year)  
→ sufficient

# Advance money

- good
- ok
- What's that?

## Further things such as books, hardware

- I appreciate the idea of having some money available dedicated to hardware. Or maybe being able to choose of how money is spent (travels vs. hardware?)
- I did never ask for. I did not know that one could order books. If I had known that, I would have made suggestions.
- can't complain
- unnecessary administrative complications: e.g. the poster of a summer school could not be printed from GK money although the summer school was paid. Why?

## Further things such as books, hardware II

- Never got any books or hardware. It would be nice if we could get laptops through the GK since we really need them and mine is really bad, but I am hesitant to spend too much money on it since I use it for work 95%.
- Did not use that. If something is bought for the institute with the GK money it would be nice to get a notification about that.
- For ATLAS members a laptop is mandatory for our work. Would be nice to get one from the institute. But this is of course luxury and I think that one should rather spend the money on more reasonable things (travel money, institute's flat at CERN,...)

# Supervision

## Supervision



# General Comments

- Actually, I do not know how much this applies to me as an associated member
- my very personal view: supervision is unsatisfying; during diploma thesis hardly any help/support/input from supervisors and post-docs; situation improves as soon as possible publications are involved...
- did not see it as bad that there wasn't much communication

# First supervisor

- great, very good, fine
- In the beginning I felt a little bit un-supervised. Now I think we supervise each other (among the students) which works really well. First supervisor's supervision is very good considering the constraints of the first supervisor. Actual daily-work supervision should come from post-docs which is rarely the case as I found. But I can't complain now.
- Super!!!! Allocates time for me and answers my mails! He does the best he can given his limited time budget. Less administrative tasks on his side would surely improve my supervision.

## Second supervisor

- I don't think that it is necessary to have a second supervisor of the other field. E.g. for an experimentalist in most cases a theory-enthused experimentalist professor is enough to discuss his/her theory issues. It would help to choose the second supervisor depending on the thesis (or maybe even qualification task) subject.
- Very bad. My second supervisor has never contacted me (I didn't do so also). We talked shortly twice at a block course but that was it. (0/10)
- I found out from the website that I have a second supervisor, but nobody told me about this, so communication about this could be better. Both me and my second supervisor are also not quite sure what his role is supposed to be.
- I did not discuss much with him, but if I did, it was very good.
- great

## Second supervisor II

- might not be needed, I never discussed my work with him
- The problem is, that your supervisors are so busy, that it is already hard to have enough time for their main students, so its nearly impossible to find also time for students, where they are second supervisor. I see not really a need for assigning such a second supervisor
- Nice to have, although not desperately necessary (at some point you learn to ask questions to everyone you think could know the answer, regardless if they are official supervisors or not). But it is good to have someone who is sort of responsible, in my case from theory.
- No comment. No/next to no contact.

# Assistance of post-docs

- great, very good
- very good
- could be better
- would really like to have post-docs closer to actual analysis (not sure whether/how this is possible given the external conditions on teaching, administration...)

## Further support, e.g. IT (for example the CMS people at HU)

- I am unaware of the options of support I could get from IT..
- IT could be more centralized/professional (though I don't want to blame Mr. Happ and Mr. Bunk)
- It would be great to have dedicated IT people. I think our admins who are doing this next to their normal work are doing a great job.
- There is a lack of IT support, only support among us which is no professional support. Money should be spent on that.
- we do it ourselves

# Networking

## Networking

- I haven't really done a lot of networking yet, so I don't know about the opportunities for this.
- only applies partially
- only Christoph Wasicki and Clemens Lange who gave me a helping hand with technical issues

## With fellow GK students within the same group

- There are none
- contribution of GK negligible
- good
- works very well (GK not necessary for that)
- Does work on its own.
- very good exchange of knowledge in the same group (not only GK), I doubt that this is related to the GK in any respect



## With fellow GK students within the same department

- More opportunities would be nice but on the other hand I have the feeling that everyone is already pretty busy
- very good, good, okay
- was boosted by GK
- works very well (GK not necessary for that)
- Does work on its own.
- very little

## With fellow GK student from other departments

- More opportunities would be nice
- One aspect I like about the block courses is especially the contact to students from other groups and to learn how doing a PhD differs from group to group (e.g. experiment vs. theory).
- good
- was boosted by GK
- not very much
- mostly through the Blockkurse. I think this is really helpful especially for people in big collaborations. In the beginning you don't know anyone except from your group. Through the GK at least you know people from Dresden and Berlin.
- Here the GK helped!
- basically no exchange (due to distance, I would say)

# With people outside the GK

- almost non-existent
- contribution of GK negligible
- good, very good
- Also works, mostly through schools (Helmholtz) and other meetings.
- No networking caused by the GK.
- very good communication to PhDs in the same group

## With master/bachelor students

- as we are not at the university, interaction is somewhat limited.
- not very well.
- contribution of GK negligible
- ( in my group:) good
- hardly any GK related networking
- Does work on its own.
- very ambitious BA/MA thesis topics require baby-sitting → cost a lot of time from the PhD students

# Career advancement

## Career advancement

- I cannot evaluate that but I don't think that the GK contributes much here
- very high: I think the possibility of attending schools/conferences has the biggest impact on our careers. Not sure, how much of this is sponsored by the GK though.
- priority should be: school & conference for the personal education (of course, giving talks on conferences is better for institute's reputation)
- Yes, I was able to attend conferences on the expense of GK-money, cool thing!. Unfortunately I did not attend any courses, would have liked to do it, had no time so my fault

# Conferences and schools

- it's great that we get the opportunity to go to conferences and schools.
- very good. I attended a lot of schools. These schools were in general more specific than the GK block-courses. For this reason, I would suggest to have only one block-course meeting a year. The GK meeting would be more broad, whereas individual schools can be very specific.
- I think we attend many conferences, which is good. Schools are also very important, it would be nice to be able to attend one every year.
- I do not know which schools are funded by the GK. In principle I was able to attend a sufficient number of schools.

# Courses of the HGS or similar institutions of excellence

- So far I did not attend any of these courses, but I am aware of them and especially interested in the courses on teaching skills.
- not yet used, but plan on doing so later on in my PhD
- I think they are very useful
- I attended some courses. All of them were very good.
- Never had time to attend one of the HGS workshops, but the topics sound very interesting and I would like to do it some time.
- HGS courses announced regularly, not feasible for people based at Dresden; did not yet check programm in Dresden (is the TU career service something similar?)

# Lecture courses within GK

- The video transmission of lectures from Dresden to Berlin and vice versa is a very good idea! It saves a lot of travel time. To improve: If in Dresden the room with the video conference system is booked by someone else, there is no transmission to Berlin. The room should thus be organized well in advance to avoid these problems. It would be good to have a second transmission to Zeuthen.
- I'm not German but I think all the courses offered at the HU and Dresden are in German, so it's not possible for me to follow them.
- I have already heard most of the lectures before joining the GK, so even though generally very interesting, not so for me



# Lecture courses within GK (cont'd)

- I attended three courses. They were very good and interesting. But for my daily work, I did not really need them.
- The idea is very good, but e.g. in experiment groups we are already such busy with the different OTP/Authorship tasks, analysis, meetings, workshops, conferences, teaching, computing, supervision of Bachelor/Master students ... , that there is mostly just no time left for these courses (\*).
- I attended one lecture which was good.

# Participation of students

## Participation of students

- Probably I haven't been a member of GK long enough to notice anything about participation of students
- not much

# Involvement of GK students with scheduling of GK events

- Would be great.
- I have the feeling that participation is not very high for most members no idea why
- None
- not involved

# Involvement of GK students with preparation of GK events

- a little through the feedback formular
- I think this was started with the student paper session and should be done more in the future.
- Little.
- little involvement, more involvement in the planning of the programme would be helpful

# Work of and communication with the student representatives within GK

- The communication about the choosing of a new student representative was a bit strange, first people were asked who would like to do it and then there was going to be a vote, but this never happened and I'm not sure what the status is now.
- good
- Little

# Social issues

## Social issues

Block-courses were very helpful!

# Advancement of women

- As a woman, I feel that we're well represented in the GK
- I am not interested in it, but honestly, I have not heard a word about it so far!
- This is a very difficult topic and I don't think it is solvable by any easy measures if you consider some of the opinions people have in their heads (thinking of some comments I have heard in the past in the GK and elsewhere). The problem is that the advancement of women is always emphasized so much, that people tend to think the only reason a woman gets any credit (jobs, talks, awards, funding, etc) is because she has to be supported only because she is a woman, not due to her work. This is also not GKspecific at all, but widespread in the GK as well (all levels from students to professors).

## Advancement of women (cont'd)

- I am sure it is good! We need women in science! I just don't see the point of treating them differently. I do not know of stumbling blocks that kept a woman from doing science. Therefore I am not fond of treating women differently but support the idea of equal opportunities. This I found in the GK.



# Advancement of minorities

- good
- did not notice anything

# Family-friendly policies

- doesn't apply to me/not informed
- Seems ok (but not applicable to me so others should judge this).
- No special efforts in the GK I think.

# GK team spirit

- Should definitely be improved!
- good
- negligible
- This could have been better. There were several attempts to do that (common dinner...) but we were not really successful.
- Not that noticeable
- Nothing special.
- I would rather call it "group-spirit", no connection with GK students from Berlin
- Does this exist? There is really something missing to achieve that. Perhaps one does see each other not enough and that the drinks have to be paid by everyone individually unlike at Helmholtz/DESY workshops

# Work load

## Work load

General: work load much to high (working during weekends, holidays, in the evenings considered "normal"); problem rather due to ATLAS than related to the GK; need to find a way of contributing to ATLAS with normal work loads  $\Rightarrow$  requires more support by group leaders/post-docs (in turn requires better understanding of doing an analysis by group leaders/post docs)

## Fixed period of promotion of 3 years, regardless of project

- That does not make sense, since in experiment there are lots of issues that can delay your PhD.
- should be standard and my topic should fit well within those 3 years
- I'm not sure what this means for us in practice. Will we not have funding after 3 years? That seems a bit strict to me, there's so many ways in which students could be a bit delayed, without it being their own fault.
- I think 3 years is pretty short especially compared to doing a PhD in other departments/subjects/countries

# Fixed period of promotion of 3 years, regardless of project

- not often very usefull/realizable
- That is a problem, since it really differs what people have to do in their project.
- as if a fixed 3 year period would work in research
- Probably not manageable.
- should be more flexible as of different "work speed"; end promotion should be bound to the accomplishment of a study/task (maybe with an upper limit on the time) rather than fixed to a time period

## Required courses (colloquia., Seminars, Meetings) and feasibility to attend and doing one's job

- Sometimes too much, with all the other experiment-based meetings. It is not useful to interrupt the work at least twice a day for another meeting/lecture/...
- I think it's possible as long as one doesn't have to teach too much
- I've only been to two block courses yet, but two weeks of this per year seems a bit much.
- I think there is in general too much workload of courses and things that one should do. I would prefer if everything is voluntary.
- not always possible - one should e.g. make only one block course per year obligatory
- Okay.
- so far only the attendance of one GK course is required?!; making more courses mandatory could help, but not feasible with work load in ATLAS

# Concerning experiment (shifts, servicetask, authorship quali.)

- Seems to be a high work load, but I don't know what GK can do about it...
- ok
- so far, time spent on shfits and authorship qualification looks reasonable
- I think the authorship is superfluous for me, but important for the experiment. I don't think there is a way out and one has to live with that. I think shifts are super and instructive. Service tasks also.



# Concerning theory

- ok
- vast amount of expertise one has to accomplish before being able to conduct scientific work

## Associated members < – > full members, buck-to-bang ratio similar?

- I get a scholarship from another institution which does not include money for traveling. So for me financially the main reason to be an associated member of the GK is the travel money. Because this scholarship also involves an evaluation and reports, the extra evaluation procedures of the GK reduce the buck-to-bang ratio for me.
- I have no clue what the difference is.
- not informed
- I do not think so, associated members have easier life

## Associated members < – > full members, buck-to-bang ratio similar? (cont'd)

- I am associated and I cannot complain
- I think this is not how you should see it, since the money helps the entire group regardless of who specifically gets their money from GK and who gets it from other sources. Since people in our GK get equal pay to people with other sources of salary (which is not the case in all GKs and which should be positively mentioned), I think it is unfair to say associated members should contribute less. If we did not have the GK jobs, there would be less people in the institute and it could be anyone who would not have a job, not necessarily the person on the GK salary.
- Did not notice advantages for any of the mentioned groups

# GK reports

## GK reports

- the midterm report is useless in my opinion
- Would be good to know ahead of time when they have to be done.
- Annoying, not useful for myself.
- not needed up to now
- here I found the organization to be bad also. TeX that did not compile / information on traveling etc not as easily available as hoped. The GK should have a table somewhere who is paid for what and when. This does not seem to be the case, at least I haven't gotten any information on that

## Forced positive statements

- I understand the pressure, but it will sound implausible in the end and I think one should be allowed to express an opinion.
- I was abit shocked, that in two cases where the statements of former members were not so positive, the 2nd supervisor asked me what the problems were. I think he definitely should have known about these things much before!!! I'm also not sure, whether their statements have been printed aas they were
- none from me
- applies to some extent
- It is good that we have this internal meeting so that at least inside the GK the problems are known. Should be done more often!
- no, usually very positive reaction to criticism, but only little changes

# Time spent vs. usefulness

- can be improved by more efficient organization. one important point: The meeting in Dresden (11 Dez) is in my opinion not necessary. Organizers could meet and discuss important points, then separate meetings for TUD and HUB.
- administrative work is always annoying but I see the point of reports
- less would be more
- one is given the best for the PhD anyway and should regularly discuss with the supervisor about the progress, so I see no need for too many reports

## Poster for january session

- Will take lots of time and are not useful for the ones who haven't even started (in my opinion at least)
- I don't like the GK layout. Maybe one should change this a little for the new funding period. In general I find it quite illusory that all members (including the former ones) could be free during a normal working day to present a poster
- by far too much effort and hype, its a pity about the time which could be used much better (also for the supervisors); only political decision in my opinion, but if the sponsors want to have it, there is probably nothing to do; not sensible for the students as they know what they do and what most of their colleagues do
- Has to be. Is ok and will be interesting to do. Okay.
- did not know about that, did the GK now?; I think it is not correct to force associated/finished GK members to prepare a poster!

## Scheduling of vacations and conflict with GK required courses/events

- The only problem that I'm foreseeing is that my collaboration meeting could coincide with the block course, in that case I would prefer to go to the collaboration meeting as this is very important for me, I hope that will be okay.
- This is a problem, especially for those associated members, who have to teach, since they can only take holidays during the semester breaks, when also some conferences and schools are, so that there is hardly any time to take some days off. I still have about 20 days of vacation this year, for example.
- as I see it, if a GK event is not announced in time, and you booked a vacation, you should go on vacation. The important things just have to be announced early enough (which is often not the case).
- No problems up to now.
- no problems so far, in case of urgent reasons, not attending the GK event would have always been possible



# Work load by GK membership status (e.g. Alumni i-j Evaluation)

- This alumni evaluation thing won't work because not all former members could be free
- Too high, but by a small amount

# GK-lecture courses

GK-lecture courses

# Content

- AdS/CFT was good, probably some more lecture on Integrability/integrable Systems, String Theory II, AdS/CFT II, Mathematical Physics?
- good
- sadly, no time to attend them so far

# Choice of topics

Good

# Required time

- traveling to Dresden/Berlin for the courses is not really worth it in my opinion, but one can chose the local ones, which is fine.
- Okay.

## Video-broadcast (Dresden/Berlin-Zeuthen)

- The video transmission of lectures from Dresden to Berlin and vice versa is a very good idea! It saves a lot of travel time. To improve: If in Dresden the room with the video conference system is booked by someone else, there is no transmission to Berlin. The room should thus be organized well in advance to avoid these problems. It would be good to have a second transmission to Zeuthen.
- A video lecture is not useful at all if there are several days which cannot be broadcast due to the room in Dresden being overbooked
- Very useful. It makes no sense to let people travel every other week to Berlin / DD. Please always do a broadcast, we have so much video equipment anyway.

# Internal GK-Evaluation

internal GK-Evaluation

# Meaningful?

- Not that much.



## More often? (how often, when, how?)

- Maybe twice per year is enough, if it is structured in a meaningful way AND acted accordingly afterwards.
- no, why?
- yes, more often is a good idea. Perhaps once a year.
- No!

# Other

General comment/Big question: What is my personal advantage of being a GK member? Same salary, more work (reports/talks/posters), but more travel money? Of course, being paid by the GK is an advantage for the whole group.

# Infrastructure (Webserver. . .)

- all ok
- No problems, website is average.
- I always have problems to find the GK document server
- availability of the site seems rather shaky