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9 EMBL-ABR Nodes, 92 registrants

QLD: QCIF (Brisbane), JCU (Townsville, Cairns)
NSW: UNSW (Sydney), SCU (Lismore)
VIC: Monash, UniMelb (Melbourne)
SA: UniAdel (Adelaide)
TAS: UTas (Hobart)
Virtual + Physical Training Workshops

Genome Annotation using Apollo
Prior to the session

- Agree content with Monica

- Set up Nectar VM with training environment (software + data), Snapshot

- Identify participating nodes

- Recruit facilitators at each site

- Local room booking, tech/network checks (zoom, eduroam)

- 2hr train the facilitator session (via Zoom – recorded – onto YouTube)

- Organise registrations (Eventbrite), Advertise

- Resourcing enough VMs for 110 participants

- Assign user accounts for each registrant
During the session

- Each site had at least one previously trained facilitator
- Get registrants connected to training environment
- Training sessions conducted over zoom (recorded)
- One (or two) zoom connection per site – projected onto screen
- Ideally each site had a camera facing the audience
- All sites were muted during Monica’s presentation
- Each site could “raise their hand” to ask Monica a question by the facilitator typing a message into the Zoom chat box
- A site could be unmuted for direct communication
After the session

- feedback requested from participants (on content and the delivery method)
- links provided to slides, recording, training environments, training datasets etc.
- feedback sought from facilitators – de-brief session planned
How did it go?
How did it go?
n=15

Q2 This was a useful workshop that enhanced my knowledge and skills.
How did it go?

$n=15$

Q8 The pace of the course was adequate for my learning. (If you choose 1-3, should it be slower or faster?)
How did it go?

$n=15$

Q11 The facilitator was responsive to individual questions and needs.
How did it go?

$n=15$

Q12 The method of workshop delivery (offsite leader and groups with local facilitators meeting online) worked well.
How did it go?

$n=15$

- A chat system that all participants were on might have made things livelier. In Software Carpentry style workshops, a shared text editor and chat system is used called Etherpad.

- I think this was a very well organised workshop and I gained a general overview of some of what Apollo can do. I know I work better face-to-face and struggle learning in online/screen situations, so my low score in whether this workshop style works is probably more a reflection of my preferred learning style rather than a reflection of the quality or organisation of the workshop. Thanks to all involved.

- this worked remarkably well for a multiple site training course. Well done to those who put all the careful thought and work in to preparing

- Overall this was a good overview training. However, it might be required to increase the hands-on experience time.
How did it go?

\( n=15 \)

- It would be good to always enlarge the screen display to be able to see the menus etc during the demonstrations

- This format will definitely work better if the local facilitators in each hub will be given time to interact more with the local participants.
How did it go?

“THANK YOU for running such a great workshop. I think it went brilliantly (after I had a few issues here: my own fault) – great content, good pacing given that it was recorded, and the mode of delivery worked really well. I think we should continue delivering things this way”.

Mike Charleston – University of Tasmania – EMBL-ABR Node Head
Will we be doing more?

“…given how well it ran... can we run one each month? I have a dream, where EMBL-ABR (or someone) runs a workshop / webinar from each node. I think Tasmania can do one on phylogenetic inference pretty well”.

Mike Charleston – University of Tasmania – EMBL-ABR Node Head

The model and the EMBL-ABR network has been proposed to underpin an expanded national Genomics Virtual Lab training program

… so YES!
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