



Research Misconduct Screening Panel training course – 6 November 2017

Evaluation Questionnaire

The aim of the course was to enable those participating in research misconduct proceedings as members of a screening panel to become familiar with their powers, the procedures and outcomes.

1. Did the course meet its aim?

Fully	Substantially	In part	Not at all
10	3		

2. We aimed to check your understanding of the scheme and to give you an opportunity to clarify any uncertainties you might have. Did we achieve this?

Fully	Substantially	In part	Not at all
8	5		

Comments:

- Good.
- I was new to this – great introduction.

3. We aimed to consider issues surrounding a) the nature and quality of evidence that a Screening Panel might encounter and b) also to reflect on the skills necessary for the good conduct of a hearing. Did we achieve this?

Fully	Substantially	In part	Not at all
4	9		
Comments: - The limits of time mean it's always possible to do more... - Found this particularly useful – iding evidence and the skills necessary to id evidence - Testing my skills was difficult. - Good to have a 'real' case			

4. We aimed to explore the range of a) team working skills, and b) communication and questioning skills that are necessary for Screening Panels, and give you an opportunity to practise them. Did we achieve this?

Fully	Substantially	In part	Not at all
5	7	1	
Comments: - The questioning process was (necessarily) artificial. - Again, time is limited – and this wasn't the priority for me anyhow. - Good to discuss.			

5. We aimed to provide delegates with the opportunity to make, albeit in outline, a reasoned decision and to reflect on the challenges in this task. Did we achieve this?

Fully	Substantially	In part	Not at all
9	4		
Comments: No comments given.			

6. Was there any aspect of the course that worked particularly well?

Comments:

- Chance to question.
- Discussion with experienced people was valuable
- The case study worked really well and questioning.
- The practice on a particular example case.
- The example was good.
- Good mix of active participation and presentation.
- I thought that the case study was very good and the ability to practice asking questions was great.
- Working on the case.
- It moved along at the right pace. Good interactive session at the start to engage people.
- Small working groups - good communication.
- The interactive session and the ability to work in groups.

7. How could this course be improved for future delivery?

Comments:

- Perhaps vary case study? Something a bit more complex – medical?
- Maybe the Registrar/Academic Services can explain more about the secretary's role to panels, e.g. guide them through process, produce first draft for report etc.
- Use of real case studies and outcomes, though I realise the difficulties about confidentiality.
- Need to discuss review panel dynamics and open up discussion more on challenging bias – discussed in round- table really useful.
- Less fragmented questioning.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.