Questionnaire - Supervisors

Supervisors - Question 4, Financing
Grouped by question 4. Full summary report.

Summary
Total number of answers 36
Filter no
Group by question 4) My PhD student in the research school has been
• Fully financed by the 18 answers
• Associated with 18 answers external...

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH SCHOOL IN GENOMICS AND BIOINFORMATICS

The Swedish national agency for higher education (Högskoleverket) is currently conducting an evaluation of the initiative from 2000 to establish 16 research schools in Sweden. The following statement is taken (and translated from Swedish; the Swedish version is given below) from the instructions to the evaluation:

"The basis for the evaluation is that the research schools have provided a better way of educating PhD students in the corresponding research topics, and have provided a better collaboration between the educational institutions involved. The main objective of the evaluation is to find out to what extent these two goals have been achieved."

"Utvärderingens huvudsakliga utgångspunkt är att forskarskolorna dels ska innebära förbättringar av forskarutbildningen i de ämnen som berörs, dels bidra till bättre samverkan mellan de lärosäten som ingår. Utvärderingens huvudsyften är att se i vilken utsträckning dessa två mål uppnåtts."

The research school will submit a self-evaluation at 1/10, 2007. Therefore, it is important that the opinion of all parts involved is expressed. The answers to this questionnaire will be compiled and made available to the Swedish national agency of higher education, and results given in the report. Parts of the answers
Background information

1) Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>GU</th>
<th>Chalmers</th>
<th>HH</th>
<th>HIS</th>
<th>LU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully financed by the research school</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated with external funding</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fully financed by the research school</th>
<th>Associated with external funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) Do you see yourself mainly as a theoretician or an experimentalist?

![Bar chart showing the distribution of respondents choosing to be theoreticians or experimentalists, grouped by whether their PhD student was fully financed by the research school or associated with external funding. The chart indicates that a higher percentage of respondents chose to be experimentalists.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Theoretician</th>
<th>Experimentalist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully financed by the research school</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated with external funding</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) My PhD student in the research school has been

![Bar chart showing the distribution of respondents choosing whether their PhD student was fully financed by the research school or associated with external funding. The chart indicates that all respondents chose for A) Fully financed by the research school.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>i)</th>
<th>ii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Fully financed by the research school</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions about the student’s situation

5) Do you regard the multidisciplinary design of the research school to have been of value for your student’s education and scientific maturation? (1=not at all, 5=absolutely)

![Graph showing the distribution of responses to the question.](http://eval.luvit.se/eval/pub/153243/154112/default.asp?rn=27E2F0C0)

**Fully financed by the research school**
- **Total**: 36
- **1**: 0%
- **2**: 0%
- **3**: 16.7%
- **4**: 38.9%
- **5**: 44.4%

**Associated with external funding**
- **Total**: 36
- **1**: 0%
- **2**: 5.56%
- **3**: 0%
- **4**: 27.8%
- **5**: 66.7%

Comments
11 have commented on this question

**Fully financed by the research school [8]**
- One of the main problems facing PhD students in a multidisciplinary field is how to develop an understanding of the "research culture" (ways of thinking, etc) of researchers with a background in another field than your own. I think the design and activities of the research school has been a great help in overcoming this hurdle.
- The discussions we had with our partner institute would not have been
achieved without the context and research frame offered by the research school.
— This is the key to its success! Why interact with your own copies?
— It is mostly of value that the school is multidisciplinary. However, I think it has happened more than once that the mandatory activities have been so far away from the focus (and competence) of the student that it has been difficult to take in.
— Due to experimental difficulties, we needed to modify our theoretical part, and it evolved rather independently. However, we had many discussions together.
— Little value in own actual research but of value in networking and ability to understand the research problems of others,
— The personal chemistry between the theoretician and experimentalist pair students was excellent and promoted a close collaboration which both students very much benefited from. My student (experimentalist) has achieved a thorough understanding of the research field of his pair student (theoretician) thanks to the pair-project set-up within the research school. This has been a great benefit for his education.
— I do not think that my PhD student has used the research school activities to their fullest potential. The student has been very limited in the use of databases etc, which should easily have been incorporated in the research project.

**Associated with external funding** [ 3 ]
— Students gain an awareness and appreciation of research activities in different disciplines, and are exposed to a broad range of scientific questions.
— It was very good to combine theoretician and experimentalist. It enables students to broaden their view of research.
— Of course the research school has been of value. However, I believe that the students that attend the school as a pair (from different affiliations) gain the most.

6) When writing the personal studyplan for your student, have you considered that the research school have a number of compulsory events/courses? With other words, did you make sure that the workload for the students linked to the research school was not greater in terms of courses etc compared to other students at the department? (1=not at all, 3=to some extent, 5=absolutely)
Comments
7 have commented on this question

Fully financed by the research school [5]
— The demands from the research school and from the departments could in most cases be met without any extra workload, so this was not a big problem.
— Well, we have a large course requirement in the department, but also a lot of flexibility conc. content.
— A resulting problem was however that the student ended up with compulsory courses from both the research school and the home institution essentially doubling the course load (and time needed to be spent on courses)
— The student has taken a great responsibility in this and made sure that the balance between course work and research was appropriate.
— My PhD student has been given the opportunity to participate to the research school activities with absolutely highest priority in comparison with other tasks.

Associated with external funding [2]
— The research school schedule was not included, in writing, in the personal study plan, but we made sure that we had time for the compulsory events in the daily planning of our work.
— The events/courses offered by the research school were not always of high interest for the project I have been supervising

7) How would you rate the time your PhD student has spent on events
linked to the research school (courses, workshops, open days etc), compared to other activities (research, teaching etc.) if you look over the whole period of the research school? (1=too little time, 3=perfect balance, 5=too much time)

Comments
8 have commented on this question

Fully financed by the research school [7]
— The student was initially unwilling to attend any activity that did not fit exactly with the dissertation project. This situation improved gradually, and I think this is understandable. As a student becomes more comfortable with his/her own project and more confident that he/she will complete the project, then it is probably feels less stressful to attend those activities that are less directly connected to his/her own project.
— Say 3 weeks per academic year has been spent on activities arranged by the research school
— See comment above
— Looking at this from the outside as supervisor, I think the activities offered by the school has been important to form a 'real' school where students/supervisors physically meet at regular intervals. Also, to learn more about the 'other side' (i.e. experimental biology for theoreticians and vice versa) needs quite some time and effort. I consider the activities by the school as highly beneficial to stimulate a broader knowledge than the student would have had otherwise. With other words, even though the research school has demanded quite some time from the students, it has been a time well invested.
— There were too many lectures, although I am generally positive towards the school and the way it has been run.
— Some courses and seminars have simply not been relevant. However, I do not think that my PhD student has used the research school activities to their fullest potential. The student has been very limited in the use of databases etc, which could have been easily incorporated in the research project.

— I believe that he has had a good balance because it is the kind of activities he appeared to appreciate, at the earnest.

**Associated with external funding [ 1 ]**

— Too many workshops, not so many courses

8) Is it your opinion that the PhD students have formed a social and scientific network that actually will last even after they have finished the research school, and that could be of value for them in their future career as researchers? (1=not at all, 5=absolutely)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fully financed by the research school</th>
<th>Associated with external funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 1  2  3   4  5</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully financed by the research school</td>
<td>18  0%  5.56%  27.8%  38.9%  27.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated with external funding</td>
<td>18  0%  0%  5.56%  50%  44.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36  0  1  6  16  13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

9 have commented on this question

**Fully financed by the research school [ 5 ]**

— it's a "loose" and wide network, rather than a "tight" and narrow one, since such a wide range of areas is covered by the research school. But I think this is very useful for the students. They now know some researchers from many different areas, whom they will be able to contact for multidisciplinary collaborations in the future.

— More than 5 bonus papers written with participation of other students (outside the pair my student belongs to)

— This is mostly due to the personality of my PhD student
— Absolutely! They meet each other regularly outside of the lab!
— I believe so. The only threat to that might be that the students do not work within the area they are trained within the research school.

**Associated with external funding [ 4 ]**
— Even the limited presence that has been possible for my student has given remarkably useful contacts. Networking and interaction is always extremely valuable and providing possibilities for that is one of the most important results of the research school
— no idea
— Yes, but again I believe that the students that are fully financed from the research school are more committed to it and, in turn, form a more permanent network.
— This is clear from the way that students interact with each other, with seniors, and with external guests at Research School events, and from collaborations between students that have arisen spontaneously.

### Questions about your own commitment to the research school

9) Have you been involved in courses arranged by the research school?

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully financed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated with</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

10) Have you presented your research at OPEN DAYs or the conference?
### 11) Has the multidisciplinary design of the research school been valuable for your own research projects? (1=not at all, 5=absolutely)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fully financed by the research school</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associated with external funding</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

9 have commented on this question

**Fully financed by the research school** [7]
— I have gained insight into areas that I might not have come into contact with otherwise. I have also made new contacts, which in a couple of cases have led to concrete collaborations. My own scientific network has grown.
— Enabled a fruitful and concrete collaboration with mathematicians.
— Yes. I have come into contact with many people whom I would not have got in touch with otherwise. Also, it has increased my own knowledge and understanding of 'the other side'.
— The low score is because I moved to Stockholm 5 years ago.
— partly this project has meant a new direction of my research, and my student and I have worked together. My student has presented work that was ours together.
— This projec could not have been carried out in only one of the partner Departments
— I had 2 advanced courses in image analysis, offered within the master curriculum of Halmstad University, which are also offered to PhD students, including those of the research school. I appreciated the additional courses that were offered through the research school, greatly completing the course offer of our university towards PhD students. Due to the size of our university, the courses offer coming with the school were a relief.

Associated with external funding [ 2 ]
— Only to the extent I have participated on papers written by my student
— I would have liked to participate more. A full time position is a prerequisite for that and I have only 50%.

12) How many of the research schools activities (courses, workshops, conferences, summerschools, OPEN DAYs) have you taken part in during the life of the research school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully financed by the research school</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-10</th>
<th>11-</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully financed by the research school</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated with external funding</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
external funding
Total 36 4 12 7 4 3 6

13) How would you overall value the activities you have taken part in? (1=very poor, 5=super)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fully financed by the research school</th>
<th>Associated with external funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18 0% 0% 16.7% 61.1% 22.2% 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully financed by the research school</td>
<td>18 5.56% 5.56% 5.56% 44.4% 22.2% 16.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated with external funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36 1 1 4 19 8 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
7 have commented on this question

**Fully financed by the research school [2]**
- Overall very good and interesting. Perhaps the grade I set is slightly biased since I chose not to attend some Open Days, and of course I selected those that seemed more interesting to me.
- Especially, the (functional genomics) workshop and the open day I attended at Göteborg university were efficient to interact with research of other disciplines.

**Associated with external funding [5]**
- Would like them to be more representative of disciplines involved e.g. I thought CS component could have been much stronger.
- Have not taken part
- Could not take part in it...
- I can give very little input here
- Since it has been very good for my PhD student it has of course been good for me.

14) Would you say that you via the research school have acquired better contacts with researchers and students at the other
universities/university colleges in south-western Sweden, compared to other PhD students at your department? (1=no, 5=absolutely)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully financed by the research school</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated with external funding</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
8 have commented on this question

**Fully financed by the research school** [ 5 ]
— I’m not sure I understood the question, so I chose a neutral grade..
— I would not come into contact with the disciplines that I in fact could interact within the school, if the school did not exist; I would not get in touch with these disciplines in the same principled way at least, if I had to initiate these interactions.
— The research school provides a broader network for the students in the research school than for regular students.
— See comment on Question 11.
— Yes, especially with Lund University

**Associated with external funding** [ 3 ]
— A would probably have aquired better contacts if I have had the opportunity to participate more
— No comments since I am a supervisor and not one of the students. Or maybe I do not understand the question
— The research school has been quite positive in this respect, but the benefits would be greater if level of participation of more seniors was higher.

General questions about the research school
15) Do you think that the multidisciplinary design of the research school (and the training and contacts that your student has gained) has in some way shaped your own research topic at your institution? (1=no, 5= a lot)

![Bar chart showing responses to the question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully financed by the research school</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associated with external funding</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
9 have commented on this question

**Fully financed by the research school [ 7 ]**
— Difficult to say, so I choose a neutral grade again. Our topic is multidisciplinary and we work together with various groups in our home institution. I think we would probably have done that with or without the research school, although perhaps it has been facilitated somewhat by the research school.
— We are several researchers that have entered new subject areas in my department.
— The contacts via the research school resulted in work that used as base for a VR application that was funded last year. This would not have happened without the research school.
— It has enabled me to pursue some of my research plans, but has not really shaped new topics.
— Yes, we have been able to go much deeper into certain areas of research than we would have done otherwise. There are mainly two reasons for this: funding (i.e. fully financed PhD student) and multidisciplinary research. Through the school, we got access to expertise in areas where our own knowledge was limited.
— Here I mean the Lund math department.
I have definitely learned from other research communities, including multidisciplinary methodologies, within the school but it is difficult to say how I would shape my research if the school did not exist. I am enriched but I can not quantify it.

**Associated with external funding** [2]
- Improved the statistical evaluation of our results.
- To some extent we are all shaped by training a PhD student so some influence from the research school must have spilled over also to me.

16) Mention three not so good sides of the research school in Genomics and bioinformatics (consider both research and education)
27 have answered this question

**Fully financed by the research school** [17]
- From the perspective of a small "hogskola", the worst aspect is that the funding is limited in time, and then converted to a usual "anslag" which goes only to the central GU budget. It was of course great that we got a couple of students financed through the research school, but when this runs out then we are back to square one again, in terms of our funding. Also, some of the work put into building up the "infrastructure" of the research school will be wasted if there will be no continuation. The second is the low attendance of supervisors at Open Days. (I am somewhat guilty of this myself, and I think it would have helped with some obligatory attendance). The third is that that the mix of courses could have been planned a bit better. I think we would have found the right "formula" for this after a few years, if the funding had been more long-term.
- 1. The roles of the partners in the same project could be less stiff. 2. The PhD students from the same project but different partners could be forced/encouraged to publish together in each other's publication arenas, such as conferences and journals. 3. The advisers could have informal meetings, such as a retreat-day on a ski resort or beach, to have brain-storms to identify the challenging but important problems, and what potentials we have to cope with them in the school.
- Demands on PhD students from several Departments that have different traditions. Inter-disciplinary work always takes more effort, money and is slower in the start, than conventional projects. Thus, it can be difficult to get the invested efforts back. Especially with the often short sighted funding situations that are prevalent in Sweden.
- 1. A bit too much of courses and open day activities. 2. The mandatory activities have not always been designed to suit all students. 3. Poor engagement from many supervisors.
- The focus of all activities were very strongly on biology (of course, this is normal). However, it could have been more recognized that theoretical works with a connection to the central projects also have an independent interest. Only then would it be truly multidisciplinary.
- 1. The school has been very broad in context. Some courses and presentations have therefore simply not been relevant to our project. (However, I do not think that my PhD student has taken full advantage of the research school activities. The student has been very limited in the use.
of databases, programming etc, which should have been easily incorporated in the research project.) 2. Too many compulsory activities. 3. — too many open days Multidisciplinary design — Too many courses and conferences — 1. Lack of involvement of supervisors 2. Ideally should involve all of Sweden 3. Less project-specific, more omics — * The events are good by themselves but perhaps the total amount could be decreased. * This is especially so for students whose topic is an 'outlier'. — too little new contacts along the way two few specialist courses given too few supervisors at the activities — I don't see any problems with the school. The problem I have is lack of time to participate because of too many other obligations. Perhaps the school should be divided into sections with more focused aims. Sometimes it is difficult to see the value of attending lectures about plants when your interest is human disease. — The only negative is that there were too many lectures that were compulsory. I cannot think of other negatives. — Too broad with respect to topics. Too few laboratory (wet) courses. Despite signed contracts, few of the supervisors of fully financed students have attended workshops and organized courses — No real ambition to bridge the gap between theoreticians and experimentalist, or between different biological areas. — Quaite some time has been consumed in traveling Some of the approved projects were not truly cross-disciplinary More supervisors should have been involved in the school; not only in receiving funding — -The general participation level by supervisors -The late scheduling of some of the activities -The balance between male/female supervisors and open day speakers could be better

Associated with external funding [ 10 ]
— much meetings for students more administration — -Fewer courses than what was announced -Distance between Lund and Gbg — many supervisors can not find time to participate in all activities — My impression is that the school has been more about genomics than bioinformatics. I had expected more tool courses in bioinformatics to show up during the six years. Few (any?) activities directed specifically towards supervisors — As an absolutely very minor comment I don't think all of the Ph.D students should have presented at every open day, since they didn't really have time to generate new data between each time. — Too medical (there is much more out there than medicine!) Too little courses Late notification of meetings (clashes with full agendas) — Too little on clinical research. Too little participation from other PhD supervisors whose students are associated to the research school. Overall, slightly too many events. — 1. The topics (both for research and education) are sometimes extremely far from one's own focus. 2. It may sometimes be difficult to include the compulsory events in the ordinary schedule of the lab. — - Funding for travel to workshops limited to events organised by the
research school, should be extended to major conferences etc. - Associated disciplines should be better represented when organizing events eg. Computer Science. - Summer school events should be better planned. — Somewhat diverse topics Meetings not only at home university (take some time)

17) Mention three strong/good sides with the research school in Genomics and bioinformatics (consider both research and education)

31 have answered this question

Fully financed by the research school [ 18 ]
— The mix of projects from different disciplines was very good. The students have been offered a good collection of courses and other activities. There has been good opportunities for supervisor to network and establish contact with other groups.
— One makes new acquaintances among the other supervisors It has been interesting to get insights into the other projects The students have been exposed to other environments than "home base"
— 1. Extremely good organization and leadership by Anders Blomberg. 2. Most students have a good training in several "omics" techniques and are broader in their knowledge than an average PhD student. 3. Many possibilities for interactions between supervisors.
— 1. Enabled collaboration 2. Good finance for five years PhD studies. 3. Some activities have been very pertinent to my activities and my PhD student's project.
— Multidisciplinarity Focus
— Establishing new networks and acquaintances between both students and supervisors. Summerschools. A good way to increase interactions between research groups at different universities
— highly competent research represented nice network of students good international contacts
— Leads to good interaction with researchers in other fields.
— * Very good organisation * Interdisciplinary contacts giving general education in genomics and bioinformatics. * Conferences/meetings of high quality.
— 1. Provides great opportunities for cross-disciplinary education and research. 2. Provides a network for students/supervisors. 3. Provides a highly stimulating environment.
— Very good management and dedication by the research school leader. The multidisciplinary aspect of the school was very beneficial for the student Visits to other labs including the visit to Cambridge were really beneficial.
— Multidisciplinary design Training for the student to make presentations Possibilities for the students and the supervisors to make valuable contacts for future research
— idea of pair projects: very good! regular meetings where students present their work;
— A difficult task that all in all was given a good try. Some good collaborations must have come out of it.
— Has build strong connections between departments Good interdisciplinary courses Strong network among the PhD students
— The networking The fascinating variety of applications The interdisciplinary pair projects
— 1. pair partnerships of the project 2. course offers from the school 3. open days

Associated with external funding [13]
— Regularly meetings with other PhD students Building networks for future learn from each other Interdisciplinary approach
— 1. Broadens one's research view 2. Networking!
— The multidisciplinary approach. Fantastic summer schools. Gives a very positive view on the social part of performing scientific research.
— It is a good opportunity for PhDs building their networks
— -high level of teaching -networking
— A wider than usual network for the participating students A multidisciplinary environment High-profile international teachers on courses
— It is multidisciplinary The courses have been excellent The Ph.D. - students get a network early in their career.
— Broadens the horizon of student Promotes student independence
— students network good courses suitable interdisciplinary topic
— High ambition and standard of the courses/workshops. The multidisciplinary approach with both theoretical and experimental "students/projects". That students gain access to a scientific network involving other categories of researchers than the supervisors.
— - Brings people together - Summer schools very inspiring - Good coordination with Functional Genomics international conferences
— The range of activities offered by the Research School have helped to build an open collaborative spirit within the School. Through participation in the School's events, students gain an awareness and appreciation of research activities in different disciplines. Students also gain experience in presenting their own research to colleagues with different backgrounds at the School's open days and workshops, which provide students and supervisors with regular forums to review progress and obtain feedback on different facets of the projects.
— Networking for you scientists

18) How would you say that the research school has been regarded by you colleagues at the department? (1=poor activity, 5=excellent activity)
Comments
9 have commented on this question

**Fully financed by the research school [5]**
- The colleagues who have participated are very positive, while those who have not participated don't have any opinion.
- Extremely well appreciated by the applied scientists
- Few colleagues have even been aware of it - they work on completely different topics (non-biotech).
- Most do not know it existed
- This is an activity that has been important to our laboratory as there were 2 PhD students working on it, with the great involvement of 3-4 senior researchers.

**Associated with external funding [4]**
- Have not been discussed
- Although few may have an opinion
- But many do not know about it.
- I have not discussed the research school at any length with colleagues in the department.

19) Finally, how would you rate the research school in Genomics and bioinformatics as a way of educating PhD students, compared to the education and training that the other students at your department is given? (1=Very poor, 5=excellent)
Comments
10 have commented on this question

**Fully financed by the research school** [5]
- Real world connections is highly important in my theoretical discipline. The students get tons of that. Modelling and data analysis are in focus all the time. Very constructive!
- I think the pair PhD project concept is excellent, but the success depends completely on the personality of the PhD students. The drawback of the wide scope can be seen as a strength, if the individual student is able to grasp the very wide overview of current scientific activities, and make use of it in his/her own research project. Either by initiating additional collaborations or by using the gained knowledge him-/herself.
- As already said above, the pair-project set-up has given an extra dimension to the PhD education within the research school.
- I think it was in general better because it offered more to PhD students of the school.
- The situation for our other students is very mixed. Some students are in similar multidisciplinary programs, and they are also very good. Some students are not in any programme, and in those cases the situation is different from case to case - it sometimes works quite well, and sometimes not. Overall, I think there is great value in multidisciplinary research schools involving several institutions.

**Associated with external funding** [5]
- The students in the research school are exposed to a broader range of scientific areas, and have the opportunity to form a wider scientific and social network.
— assuming that "3" means no difference
— As a complementary course during regular PhD student training.
— provide something beyond
— I believe that most of our PhD-students get an excellent education. That means the school is also excellent, but different.

20) Do you think it would be valuable to continue this type of research school activity in Genomics and bioinformatics in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully financed by the research school</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated with external funding</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment
8 have commented on this question

**Fully financed by the research school [5]**
— Absolutely.
— It is unvaluable that PhD students feel to belong to a strong community with involvement of a network of senior researchers, from day 1.
— Extremly important for the specific research areas
— I think that cross disciplinary research is very important, and I think that this is one of the best ways of promoting it.
— It has a great potential. The idea of crossing different disciplines is good!

**Associated with external funding [3]**
— ABSOLUTELY! It would be big mistake to discontinue after momentum has been generated by dedicated efforts of many people put into it.
— But focus more on fully financed students
— While I am certainly positive to research schools I would suggest that the topic of the school is discussed in a wider scientific community before a continuation under the same heading is decided
21) If the research school was to be continued, mention some ways that you see it could be improved!

24 have answered this question

**Fully financed by the research school [ 16 ]**

— More emphasis on common grounds between different subjects. Specialisation is good but with too much specialisation in a totally different area from your own research the point gets lost
— I could perhaps be even more efficient to try to work more locally in Göteborg, with some, but fewer, activities involving also other cities. (of course this would be less interesting for smaller places like Skövde)
— I think the focus should be a little more narrow. The pair projects within the core of sequence analysis - genomics - bionformatics have definitely benefited from the structure of the school, whereas some more peripheral projects might not have had the same benefit. This does not necessarily mean it should be the same as it has been - Systems Biology may be a better focus for a continued school. But it always boils down to how the individual PhD student decides to use the resource that the school community is, so maybe there should be some additional work done on the recruitment and student selection.
— It should take a step forward and include e.g. systems biology pair projects.
— I have been involved too little to make good suggestions, but see comments on Question 16
— money set aside for making interactions happen between projects
— I think it could continue but with more focus on specific research topics, e.g. human disease, plants, yeast ..... 
— I should have turned up more but that was more fate linked than I would have wished....PJ
— Similar to the way it was organized with fewer compulsory lectures for the students.
— Please, see comments above
— Try to design the mandatory courses and activities to better suit ALL students. Try to engage the supervisors more by more frequently asking them to present their research at open days etc.
— Maybe it should be more divided between Lund Nad Gothenburg to intensify local contact but yet a couple of joint courses per year
— Allow Post Docs in the system; in the project I was part of my colleague at the theoretical Department and I had rather different expertise, but by starting a PhD student that had already done 2 years PhD training he could bridge the gap between us. Had we started with a “fresh” student there may have been problems. A Post Doc that had worked in similar projects before could have acted as a “bridge”. I understand that one main argument for the School was the education of new PhDs, but some post docs in the right project could be useful. Also, it is very cost-effective for the project to offer a post doc continuation after the PhDs, even if it is necessary for the PhD to do a post doc period abroad at some point.
— By adjoining postdocs By Scandinavian and European collaborations with similar schools By more courses on writing and more interactions between supervisors not in original pairs
— The 3 most negative points I mentioned in point 16).
— It should be obligatory for supervisors to attend Open Days at least once per year, and to present their own research at least once. I don't think it would be wrong to cut the funding if this is not fulfilled.

Associated with external funding [ 8 ]
— I believe that some resources must be given to the supervisor. It is also beneficial for the supervisor to participate, but there is a time-cost
— - Involve other disciplines (eg Computer Science) more centrally, say with a joint Director position to reflect true multidisciplinarity. - Improve funding for PhD students and faculty involved.
— See above!
— Take away the "not so good sides" mentioned above and those that will have been mentioned by our colleagues.
— There has to be some future for the Ph.D.-student, so there should have been some post doc positions available as well.
— Since my activity has been only marginal it would be presumptuous to suggest improvements. I think you have done a wonderful job!
— Perhaps fewer events but with a clearly expressed compulsory participation from supervisors.
— student exchange between laboratories

22) Any additional comments you want to make in relation to the research school that has not been part of the given questions?
7 have answered this question

Fully financed by the research school [ 2 ]
— Most important is that this model is considered as a template for so many other needed multi-disciplinary research areas as possible. Two supervisors with two students in a joint project is a "stable system" which in a healthy way helps shaking the too intradisciplinary university culture.
— I am very grateful for the funding and the framework that I have received during the time course of the school.

Associated with external funding [ 5 ]
— The Research School's web site could be used more effectively to publicise the Research School and to communicate research school activities to those involved.
— All-in-all a very successful arrangement and something that should be implemented in many more disciplines
— Earlier information about the events of the school. It is hard to plan a whole day to Gbg with late notice.
— It was good that the school was not compulsory for supervisors. Although one likes to attend several times, there is a lot of other issues that scream for our attention. I am sorry it has to be this way. I like to thank you for running the research school (it is a tough job, and you really have to be there all the time!) and I wish you success with rounding off the evaluation.
— Not that I can think of
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