2nd RFC Verification Workshop Evaluation

The survey was filled out at the end of the workshop by the participants. Below are the results and comments from 16 participants.

WORKSHOP CONTENT (Circle your response to each item.)
1. I was well informed about the objectives of this workshop

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
U	1	2	3	4	5
Answers:				**9**	**7**

Comments:
Objectives should have been addressed more on the verification team phone calls.

2. This workshop lived up to my expectations.

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
U	1	2	3	4	5
Answers:			**1**	**8**	**7**

Comments:

3. The content is relevant to my job.

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
U	1	2	3	4	5
Answers:				**7**	**9**

Comments:

WORKSHOP DESIGN (Circle your response to each item.)
4. The workshop objectives were clear to me.

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
U	1	2	3	4	5
Answers:			**3**	**10**	**3**

Comments:
I was not exactly clear whether the objective was learning how to do verification or setting objectives for what kind of verification activities the RFCs should be doing, or setting a verification team "policy".

5. The workshop activities stimulated my understanding and learning.

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
U	1	2	3	4	5
Answers:				**7**	**9**

Comments:
Step-by-step examples of how to do many different things with the software (as workshop exercises) would be helpful.
Yes, but the time spent on actually trying to interpret verification graphics was much too short.
The exercise format was more effective than last year.
I was not in the first workshop and I was new to a lot of the metrics discussed; I appreciated the first hour of the day to address this, plus additional sources mentioned.

WORKSHOP PRESENTORS (Circle your response to each item.)
6. The presenters were well prepared.

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
U	1	2	3	4	5
Answers:				**7**	**9**

Comments:
Very good preparation.
Good variety.

7. The presentations were helpful.

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
U	1	2	3	4	5
Answers:			**1**	**7**	**8**

Comments:
I would like to have more opportunity to discuss the interpretation of graphics and actual strategies, and what direction we need to go with verification now, rather than presentations about future research activities. Especially Hank Herr's IVP demo. Would be nice if this was recorded on a webinar and the recording would be available to the workshop participants. Got some insight on EVS from James Brown's presentation.

WORKSHOP RESULTS (Circle your response to each item.)
8. I accomplished what I set out to accomplish from this workshop.

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
U	1	2	3	4	5
Answers:				**8**	**8**

Comments:
I certainly learned much more about what kind of verification activities the RFCs are doing.

9. I will be able to use what I learned in this workshop.

	Strongly disagree					Strongly agree
U	1	2	3	3.5	4	5
Answers:				**1**	**6**	**8**

Comments:
Yes, there is much to bring back to the RFC to discuss.

10. How would you improve this workshop? (Check all that apply.)

1__Provide better information before the workshop.

1__Clarify the workshop objectives.

1__Reduce the content covered in the workshop.

  __Increase the content covered in the workshop.

1__Update the content covered in the workshop.

2__Improve the presentation/instructional skills and methods.

3___Make workshop activities more stimulating.

___Improve workshop organization.

 __Make the workshop less difficult.

___Make the workshop more difficult.

6___Slow down the pace of the workshop.

___Speed up the pace of the workshop.

4___Allot more time for the workshop.

___Shorten the time for the workshop.

4___Add more visualization to the workshop.

5___Provide beverages and snacks.

11. What other improvements would you recommend in this workshop?

Spend a bit more time describing and comparing common statistical measures.

Discuss systematic procedures for dissecting forecasts and present case studies.

Focus more on what RFCs should do now and on how to interpret the graphics. More time for discussion, fewer presentations. The presentations were all useful. I just always feel like we learn the most in discussions and exercises; so possibly fewer presentations would be useful.

More time for hands-on activity with case study. Good to try to understand plots with other minds.

More hands-on training.

Hands-on use of IVP and EVS would be helpful. Having Hank Herr present would have been nice.

I still feel somewhat uncomfortable with EVS, which can only be remedied by my picking the product to verify, creating datasets needed and running the program. Only 2 RFCs have good knowledge on EVS. Maybe if a third workshop is confirmed, present additional RFC case studies using EVS.

I felt too hurried at times.

I would like to have more overrun time built into the daily schedule. I would rather finish a bit early than force presenters to rush through their material to catch up.
Make sure the speakers have adequate time or get to use their allotted time.

I would like to see clear objectives followed up with action items from the workshop. Otherwise we will have the same issues next year; for example, of we need volunteers, we should identify them before moving on.

I would have liked to get the presentations, even in draft form, before the workshop.

Presentation on Thursday from HQ was too hard to hear.
I know that we can't get around the conference call…but it makes it difficult.

Provide larger room.

12. What is least valuable about this workshop?
Difficult to take so much information in such little time and with everything squeezed together.

Not least valuable, but I thought the lab example could have been stronger.
I wasn't able to draw much conclusion from lab.
Group exercises were too exhaustive.

Some of the RFC presentations were not very helpful.

Presentations of PoP verification were not helpful. In general I thought there was little value in the WFO/Meteorological presentations.
Presentations pertaining to WFO.
Most are aware of "ground truth" limitations, but maybe valuable enough to keep in workshop.

Salt Lake City is very beautiful, however rather far. Is it possible to have the workshop in a more central location?

13. What is most valuable about this workshop?
Introduction to new materials.
RFCs and HQ sharing current and planned verification activities.

Discussion of various topics such as using EVS, QPF timing issues, interpreting graphics, how to communicate verification information to our users, verification tools and strategies we can share among RFCs and OHD.

The one-to-one interaction with discussions, questions, etc. The exercise was valuable too. The CHPS-FEWS and implicit verification plans were very informative. The workshop provides an excellent forum for communicating plans at the national level.

Info on WR activities, James' presentations, and conversations about useful metrics and where we are going.

The face-to-face exchange of information and seeing what others are doing.

Seeing what other groups are doing (e.g. in academia).

Direct interaction with the experts.

Hard to choose just one. Being able to share verification experiences with all the other RFCs and OHD participants. The discussions were excellent.

Intense, hands-on, no "routine" office interruptions.

Hands-on.

IVP and EVS software demos. Also liked seeing what RFCs were doing. I liked having most of the workshop at the hotel.

The workshop was great. I am very impressed by both the knowledge of the presenters and the enthusiasm of the team members.