



**Radiological protection of the environment – training course  
CEH Lancaster 27<sup>th</sup>-28<sup>th</sup> April 2010**

**FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE**

For each question below, please circle the answer which most accurately reflects your view.  
Average scores from the 15 participants who completed the questionnaire are shown in red

**Content**

1. How clear were the objectives of the course?	Unclear 1 2 3 4 5 Very clear <b>3.9</b>
2. How well structured was the course? <i>(Was the introduction clear, did it progress logically)</i>	Poorly 1 2 3 4 5 Well <b>4.1</b>
3. How relevant was the course content?	Irrelevant 1 2 3 4 5 Relevant <b>3.9</b>
4. How did you find the amount of material covered?	Too much 1 2 3 4 5 To little <b>2.7</b>
5. How difficult did you find the material covered?	Difficult 1 2 3 4 5 Easy <b>2.9</b>
6. How interesting did you find the material covered?	Not interesting 1 2 3 4 5 Interesting <b>4.1</b>

**Practical**

7. How did you find the practical exercises?	Not interesting 1 2 3 4 5 Interesting <b>4.3</b>
8. Did the exercises help you understand the material presented in the course?	No 1 2 3 4 5 Yes <b>4.5</b>
9. Were you given sufficient guidance to enable you to carry out the exercises?	No 1 2 3 4 5 Yes <b>4.1</b>
10. Was the balance between presentations and practical exercises correct?	No 1 2 3 4 5 Yes <b>4.2</b>

**Facilities**

11. How suitable were the computing facilities?	Not suitable 1 2 3 4 5 Suitable <b>4.7</b>
12. How suitable was the lecture room?	Not suitable 1 2 3 4 5 Suitable <b>4.3</b>
13. Were meals provided acceptable?	No 1 2 3 4 5 Yes <b>4.5</b>
14. Was accommodation acceptable?	No 1 2 3 4 5 Yes <b>4.7</b>

**Summary**

15. Did the course fulfil your expectations? <i>If not, please state why in the box below</i>	No 1 2 3 4 5 Yes <b>4.1</b>
--	-----------------------------

If you would like to make any additional comments, please use the box below.  
Leave your name if you require any feedback.

See below for collation of all comments received

*Continue over if required...*

**Thank you**



## **Radiological protection of the environment – training course** **CEH Lancaster 27<sup>th</sup>-28<sup>th</sup> April 2010**

### **Additional comments from participants of 27<sup>th</sup>-28<sup>th</sup> April course:**

- 1) The intro to how to use ERICA was too short – double time would be useful
- 2) No comments
- 3) Good course, especially enjoyed the practical's. Practicals are very important as they are the things we are going to have to do, but it is good to have understanding of derivations. Good for EA people to have to have gone through training for radiological assessments for human health and wildlife (habitats) spreadsheets. It is just what I needed.
- 4) Room was a little warm and dry throughout both days. Struggled a little on the first day with the practical. As felt overloaded with detail. Easier on the second day to use ERICA.
- 5) Improve interpretation of practical exercises with presentations on underlying theory.
- 6) Good course, enthusiastically presented; engaging. Could reduce the amount of detail about dosimetry otherwise well balanced between presentations and practical sessions. Worth considering putting more of the practical work earlier in the day, on day 1.
- 7) Final exercise seemed to go off the rails towards the end, needed more controlled supervision. Please handout the modelled scenario answers as a check against the practical exercise. Aide memoir/ practical tips would be handy. NB. Some handouts had their contents obscured also 3 slides per page would have relieved the volume of the training pack.
- 8) Maybe needed to do this over 3 days. Less on the software tools for me. Slower through the presentations. However, excellent. Thank you.
- 9) No comments
- 10) Too high level. No attempt to really explain what was happening. Very disappointing. I feel totally confused. Obviously more work in getting message across in a simpler way.
- 11) Practical exercises were really good at driving messages home and the problems/uncertainties that you would face if you had to do a real assessment. Theory helps support why you would make certain decisions and what you would need to consider. Written summary at end of each exercise about key factors that the practical raised e.g. problem of what to use for Tc99m would be useful to take away and look back at.
- 12) Practical exercises really useful – feel I have enough knowledge to go away and useful/develop my understanding of ERICA. An excellent interactive course.
- 13) Afternoon sessions on Day 1 about ERICA were confusing in advance of practical session. This was more difficult to perform at the end of the day after long lectures – was much better on morning of Day 2 when we were fresher. Somewhat illogical to do transfer and effects before dispersion. Agency- specific practical sessions were very useful for me personally. Calibre of course tutors obviously very high and was a privilege to be trained by such experts.
- 14) Came with an open mind re: course objectives. Learnt a lot about the assessment tools available and the way considerations required.
- 15) Introduction in the first practical should be clear. In later practical, instructions can be more common, because people have already used the program. It is worthwhile to encourage people to try different options, especially ERICA is so user friendly that it is always possible to go back and change parameters.