

# LitSciMed 2016

## Summary of Evaluation Questionnaire

We hope that you found the symposium useful and enjoyable. To help us gauge this, and to possibly improve future LitSciMed events, would you answer three short questions?

---

### I. What were the three (or more) best things about the symposium?

- Very practical presentations on research grants and publications. Ideas for approaches to impact. General career discussions and the chance to hear about where others are at with their research. Catching up with everyone. Thank you so much for organising this!
- Meeting and talking with delegates working in LitSciMed. It's great to discuss research with people who have similar interests. The sessions on grant applications, impact, and the Davy Letters were particularly useful and enjoyable. Thank you for organising the event!
- Research grants workshopping. Editing session with Tim. Simon's impact session.
- Since my own career has diversified (I make films as a way of making money, and I am starting to submit my own articles following directly on from my PhD), it has been a good way to stay close to my 'chosen' profession in the academic world. It has been a good opportunity to broker collaborations. Invaluable to have the opportunity to learn more about REF, RCUK, and other aspects of academia that would ordinarily need to be gleaned.

- Networking, sharing experiences of academia, opportunity to discuss publishing, impact, and grant-writing in a ‘non-political’ environment.
- Positive and constructive atmosphere! Sometimes PG/ECR career events can be a bit depressing when the talk turns to job market etc. but I will leave here feeling energised and hopeful about what is coming next. Chance to spend time with other ECRs and more experienced colleagues. The socialising time was invaluable. Useful active sessions esp. on publications, careers, and impact.
- Details on ways to secure funding – detail in writing grant applications. Refocus of impact, collaboration, wider impact, leadership, etc. Thinking about what we really do. Working with non-HEIs – different ways of working. How to approach article/book proposals. Giving focus as to what I need to do next.
- Very helpful suggestions for grant applications, which were suitable to all career stages. Networking with new and old members of the cohort. Insight into publishing process – a handy reminder for someone who is looking to build on a solid publication record.
- The research grants talk, publications, and editing discussion. Also the opportunity to see everyone again and to refresh and make new contacts. It’s been an excellent couple of days. Impact talk! Thinking about careers and the language I need to use (Jerome’s bit!).
- Great speakers! Topics were really relevant and felt like lots of anxieties/questions were answered. Really well organised, good venue. So good to see everyone and catch up but also hear about their varied careers and projects.
- The people! Wonderfully supportive environment/network. The fact that non-academic jobs and non-HEI bodies were considered. This helped those of us confronting challenging career prospects. Opportunity for networking. The useful feedback – especially on grant applications.

- Pace and depth of the speakers. Diversity of content. Range of institutions represented (via attendees and speakers). Range of disciplines represented. Time for breaks to network. Chance to network with attendees and speakers. Senior level of speakers – authorities in their field and speaking subject.
- Deconstruction and dialogue surrounding scholarly processes (funding/publication/editing etc.). Making these processes more transparent! Getting to meet and learn about the research of an existing and developing group of academics from varied backgrounds/institutions/roles/career stages etc. Blend of interactivity and ‘knowledge transfer’ (sharing of expertise).
- Relaxed atmosphere, supportive. Sessions on grant writing and impact – detailed, pitched at the right level, informative. Perfect organisation and information before and during the event.
- Alice Jenkins’s talk on grant capture. All sessions: new ideas, inspiration, and advice about career moves. Networking: making new connections with peers and reconnecting with fellow ‘LitSciMeders’.
- As ever, Sharon’s enthusiasm for this network and her amazing ability to create programmes both stimulating and useful mark out the event in general and Sharon herself in particular. It was good to have ‘down time’ in the programme to connect/reconnect with LitSciMed participants. Alice’s workshop on funding bids was particularly insightful.
- Connecting with fellow participants and sharing professional experiences. Hearing about relevant projects (academic, public, etc.) that scholars are undertaking. Discussing opportunities for future career trajectories.

**2. What three (or more) things could we change or improve in future?**

- It might have been nice to discuss current research projects of participants at more length → feedback and general collaborations. Perhaps a sort of newsfeed/updates of different projects participants are involved with? Perhaps a biennial ‘reunion’?
- More space for us to share our own research. Could we think about possible ways of working together on a joint publication, such as a special issue of *JLS* on theories and methods? Something on teaching LitSciMed and convening modules on it.
- I feel we could have had more space to share our research and other projects with each other more formally. It would be good to have a platform to encourage and help to actually formulate a real project to be submitted for funding.
- I’d have liked more focus on LitSciMed itself, maybe a kind of ‘taking stock’ session about how the field has changed since the first events and how the research has developed/changed. This could definitely be incorporated into the BSLS.
- A more central location – long journey. One more practical session on Day 1. Would have liked to have experienced a Wordsworth walk!
- The session on non-HEI careers seemed unplanned.
- More strongly linked to themes unique to LitSciMed. Something about interdisciplinary teaching and innovation in curriculum design. More creative examination of careers outside academic.
- Earlier finish needed on last day – just an hour would make a difference – due to the location.
- It was all very good – I’m sorry I can’t be more useful!
- The advice given in the session on jobs outside academia wasn’t very useful.
- Maybe something on how to come up with a viable research project after the PhD could be useful – obviously difficult to generalise but issues such as how close to PhD topic, how much new stuff/methods etc. are viable etc. Maybe add a hands-on work session on proposals in progress.

- Time to discuss future directions of LitSciMed. I'd be very keen to be involved in a network/offshoot of the programme. It would be great to have a single forum for discussion, e.g. online group.
- An early discussion about the state of the field. More sharing about individual projects and methods. Less advice that overlaps with the regular 'Career and Placement Services' talks.

### 3. Is there a future for LitSciMed?

- Yes – definitely! Perhaps more collaborative endeavours (application?). Perhaps a handbook of sorts?
- Events in future? Yes, please! Particularly good for 'new' PhD students coming into LitSciMed.
- I definitely think there is a role for future events – this is a very useful network. Maybe a session at BSLS but I think it would need to have similar levels of audience participation and useful activities.
- There is room for further LitSciMed work in the future – BSLS?
- Would definitely attend future events PLEASE.
- Would definitely attend future events – continuing to offer funded opportunities would be amazing. Potential to develop collaborative projects?
- I'd definitely come to future LitSciMed events both on career development matters and/or current/general discussions in the field.
- There is categorically a future for LitSciMed. It's never over! But I do wonder if future events might focus more on intellectual/disciplinary questions than on development/training (useful though this was).

- I should hope so. It is a rare and valuable opportunity to continued academic exchange, and one that has proved useful in forming new collaborative projects and sharing knowledge and experiences. The ‘discipline’ seems also to be growing. Quelle surprise!
- It seems to me cruelly unfair that PhDs starting in the LitSciMed field, say, this September, won’t have access to the opportunities which this programme provided. Is there a way of making it into an annually recurring networking event which might aspire to attract 50% old hands and 50% new PhDs? It’s quite clear that the new people who were present at Event 7 really got a lot out of it.