

Event 4

Questions Responses	Three best things	Things to change or improve
Student 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The speakers were specifically relevant to my PhD, and they all gave excellent presentations. They were also extremely approachable and I was able to discuss with them in-depth issues that I could not have asked about in front of the rest of the group as it was specific to my area of expertise. • The location was easy to get to, and I would now consider visiting both universities to meet with staff and use their facilities. • The structure of the events was well planned out, with day 1 concentrating on philosophy of science / epistemology, and the following day applying what we had learned to approaching poems in a practical way. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reading lists for some of the presentations were rather lengthy – for convenience I would prefer to have more journal articles to read and 1 or 2 core books. • In the last event we were not given a ‘lead’ to help us with our poetry appreciation; this was due to a speaker having to return home due to family illness. This was unforeseen, and could not be avoided, but we could have done with some help to clarify our varying opinions on the poems. • I cannot see any other ways in which it could have been improved – it was an excellent training event!
Student 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hasok’s lecture • Sharon’s party was a great opportunity to chat to peers. This may seem like a minor point but for the past events (not including the first one) there seemed little opportunity to mix. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus of second day seemed to be on analysing poetry, not on looking at the reasons why poetry is useful for LitSciMed. I would have shifted the focus slightly.
Student 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All the speakers were excellent – enthusiastic, well-prepared and expert in their fields. • It was such a friendly event – I didn’t know many people but it felt very relaxed and it was so kind of Sharon Ruston to host the dinner, this made it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tea and coffee on arrival? A small thing but we were gasping! Especially those that had travelled to the event that morning (not myself). • Perhaps invite a poet to give a reading? • Nothing else I can think of, I really enjoyed the event and

	<p>feel even more friendly and welcoming. Thank you!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I liked the structure of the events – History/Sociology of Science in Day 1, Science & Poetry on Day 2, with plenty of breaks. It was intellectually very stimulating, but therefore also tiring so good to have breaks between each session. 	<p>thought it was well-organised and really interesting. Thanks again!</p>
Student 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very well composed programme; it made sense, it was interesting, good mix of topics. The preparation - although taking up quite some time - was very helpful for the event and in general • John Holmes's lecture was brilliant, both in terms of content and style of presentation • Friendly atmosphere 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More input from scientists' viewpoints • Maybe put group work on the first day, so participants get to know each other sooner (but as it fitted with the topic of the second day this could not have been done at event four) • The information about what to prepare for the event was spread over several emails and thus a bit disjointed and hard to keep everything in mind <p>I very much enjoyed the event and found it enormously interesting and helpful for my project. Thank you!</p>
Student 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only three? This will be hard to narrow down! First, the range of speakers from different disciplines. • John Holmes' inspirational talk on science and poetry. • Hasok and David's talks and discussions on SSK. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group work on poems we had brought could perhaps have culminated in something like a group presentation on one of the poems. • Sorry, I can't think of anything else – it was excellent!
Student 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Talks were varied and insightful, from different disciplines • Relaxed atmosphere • Well organised 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More scientists and those from medical backgrounds • Another seminar-like session with small groups (perhaps one a day?) • A more precise list of preparatory work, I felt it a little hard to follow the lists given and to prioritise the

<p>Student 7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I thought the standard of the speakers was particularly high, even compared to the other events so far, across both days • The provision for socialising with the other attendees was both useful and enjoyable – especially impressed that Sharon opened her house to us, in a staggeringly generous move! • As ever, it was good to be alongside people from different periods and disciplines 	<p>necessary work from the suggested work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think that the poetry workshop at the end of day 2 would have been a little more useful if the group leaders had all been at the rest of the event, or even at the rest of that day. • I'm concerned (although not certain) that the very Eng Lit-heavy second day wasn't made approachable enough for those of us who came from other disciplinary backgrounds. I'm from English myself so I got a lot out of the day, but I wonder if it might have been confusing and/or irritating in places for some others.. I think English has to tread more carefully than other disciplines here because it always runs the risk of coming across as presumptuous.
<p>Student 8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organisation of the second day was particular conducive to targeted discussion in the final session. Having been given two talks with intellectual tools and questions, it was then far more constructive to apply these to the selected poems that to simply have discussion without this background. • I was particularly impressed by John Holmes' paper. It covered a lot of ground, but gave justification for the importance of the kinds of study which LitSciMeders are carrying out. It is easy to feel marginalised in a discipline (or multi-discipline) such as this, and it was encouraging to hear, in a very well-articulated manner, exactly how our own research can contribute to the wider 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The discussion/seminar sessions on day one, whilst useful, could, I think, have been improved through the use of small-group work. I felt that there was a lack of direction to the discussion, particularly in the science communication session, and this would have been helped had there been a period for groups of four or five people to analyse in more detail some of the sources before returning for a roundtable. The same went for the session on discussing the format/validity of the scientific paper. • Although very interesting and informative, the two lectures on day two assumed a great deal of knowledge (to my mind) about the current state of play in English literature scholarship. It should be an assumption of the speakers that they are talking to a group of graduate students who work in an interdisciplinary environment,

	<p>scholarly debate in such things.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two introductory talks one day one – Hasok’s on Philosophy of Science, and James’ on the development of HSTM – were accessible, well-organised, and covered all the key concepts that are necessary in understanding how approaches to history and philosophy of science have shifted over the last fifty years. 	<p>and therefore are not necessarily well-versed in the practices/approaches of any one discipline. A leaf, I think, could be taken out of the talks given on day one (see above).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the discussion of poems was useful, I felt as though we could have been better prepared. Breaking the students down into small groups right at the end was a good idea, but surely it would have been more worthwhile to indicate which students would be in which groups prior to the Event? This way, we would have been able to pay special attention (as the group leaders were able to) to the poems and commentaries of those with whom we were working. I had read all of the material on the social space, but felt it would have been more worthwhile to concentrate on the poems of those in my group.
Student 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting other researchers working in similar areas to me. • I enjoyed the two poetry sessions in particular. They were extremely useful for me in terms of thinking about my work • I found that the combination of historical and philosophical material on day one and then in depth work on poetry on day two worked really well together. There was variety, but the ideas worked well together. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I was extremely tired by the end of the first day so could not concentrate properly on the last session as I would have wished. If another break had been possible on the first day during the afternoon, even if just a quick one that would have been good. • I can’t think of anything else – I thought the whole thing was fantastic and there really wasn’t anything else I think could have been improved.
Student 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting the delegates and discussing our research projects • The John Holmes talk – his enthusiasm was 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perhaps a more in depth comparative study of methodologies? Something that could help us develop our own (hybrid?) method.

	<p>inspiring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparing the methods of History/Philosophy of Science/Technology to those of Literary Criticism. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I thought the group work was interesting, but wanted more. Maybe a more focused exercise? Or more time? • I really can't think of anything else. The event was great!
<p>Student 11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sessions on day one were pitched to the perfect level – challenging and yet accessible. We were introduced to new ways of thinking about the history and philosophy of science. I was unfamiliar with the sociology of scientific knowledge until James Sumner's session, but came away from it with plenty of food for thought, much of which can be directly applied in my current research. • It was brilliant to get the chance to meet and discuss ideas with people who were engaged in exciting research. I found that their interests often touched on similar themes to my own, but they were also highly diverse, and a great source of new information and ways of thinking. We were given ample opportunity to mix with other delegates and with the speakers both during the breaks in the day and at the enjoyable dinner hosted by Sharon Ruston. • I found John Holme's session highly engaging and thought-provoking. Coming from a literature background myself, I thought he made an excellent case for poetry's special importance as a means to conceptualising our subjective experience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would have liked more time to discuss the poems in the final workshop. We weren't able to look at some of the chosen texts as closely as we might have done. • We may have benefited from more time at the end of day two to share our findings from the group work in the final workshop. • More coffee on the first day would have been good! – we were flagging somewhat before it was provided in the afternoon.

<p>Student 12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the small group discussions about our poem assignments • Hasok Chang's lecture • John Holmes' lecture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the discussion period at the end of James Sumner's talk, I think it would have furthered the discussion—even though it was already a great discussion—if we were given debate questions to mull over prior to the event. • As always, it was a great event and I'd have to be too inventive to come up with criticisms. Thanks again, Sharon.
<p>Student 13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p>Student 14</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •