



## Block Course Feedback (HS21)

## **Disclaimer**

The following evaluation has no claim on completeness or correctness. All comments are without guarantee and are solely based on the voluntary contributions by students in the spring semester 2021. Courses which were not evaluated are therefore not listed.

The evaluation represents neither the opinion of the VeBiS nor the opinion of all participants of the respective courses. Additionally, block courses are adapted and improved from year to year, leading to changes in content and organization. This is especially true in times of the CoViD-19 pandemic, to which most courses had to adapt to in this semester.

The written comments were copied without any changes from the conducted feedback survey. To guarantee the anonymity of the participants, we have removed any comments which could lead to identification of participants. Any comments which were potentially hurtful and without any constructive feedback were also removed.

We are always looking to improve the block course evaluation and are happy about all feedback! If you have any comments or ideas for improvement, please contact us under [studentisches@vebis.ch](mailto:studentisches@vebis.ch).

## Contents

Bioinformatics of genetic sequence variation (UZH) .....	3
Cell Biology of the Nucleus .....	4
Image-Based Drug Screening in Human Blood for Personalized Medicine .....	7
Human Behavioural Ecology and Cultural Evolution (UZH) .....	9
Marine megafauna in Deep Time (UZH) .....	10
Microbiomes in health and disease (UZH).....	12
Next Generation Sequencing for Evolutionary Functional Genomics (UZH) .....	15
Plant epigenetics (UZH).....	16
The Mechanisms of Natural Transformation in Competent Gram-Negative Bacteria .....	19
Understanding and Engineering Microbial Metabolism.....	22
Analysis of human T and B cell responses to infectious agents.....	25
Biology and Ecology of fungi in the forest .....	27
Computational Methods in Genome and Sequence Analysis.....	29
Insect reproduction (UZH) .....	31
Mechanisms of Bacterial Pathogenesis .....	32
Membrane Biology.....	34
Paleobiology and Evolution of Vertebrates (UZH).....	36
Plant Biochemistry .....	37
Plants and People: Domestication and Evolution of Crops (UZH) .....	39
Principles of Evolution: Theory (UZH).....	40
Bioactive Natural Products from Bacteria .....	42
Biological Chemistry B: New Enzymes from Directed Evolution Experiments .....	43
Epigenetics and disease (UZH).....	45
Experimental Food Microbiology for Biologists.....	46
Methods in Cellular Biochemistry.....	48
Microbial Community Genomics .....	49
Phytopathology.....	51
Biology of Mosses and Ferns.....	52
Growth control and aging .....	54
Imaging bacteria cells in a native state by electron cryotomography.....	56
In vivo cryo-em of dynein motor proteins .....	57
Parallels between tissue repair and cancer .....	58
Plant sensing (UZH).....	60

## Bioinformatics of genetic sequence variation (UZH)

(Answers: 1)

### General

<b>Location(s)</b>	UZH - Irchel	
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00-earlier than 16:00	
<b>Longest day</b>	<8h	
<b>Block course composition</b>	Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Group projects Lectures	
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times		3
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented		2
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>		2
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate		4
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive		5
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)		none

**Comments:** *Very lax, very little work*

-

### Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent		3
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent		5
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable		5

**Comments:**

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Written exam Class participation Notes
--------------------------------------	--

### Comments:

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	3
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	1
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	2
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	5

**Comments:** *Most Relaxed Block Course you can choose - You can leave at 14:00 almost every day and usually have 2-3 hours lunch*

## Cell Biology of the Nucleus

(Answers: 4)

### General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ-Hönggerberg
<b>Typical day</b>	08:00-17:00
<b>Longest day</b>	9h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Group projects Lectures Journal Clubs
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	4.25
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	4.75
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	2, 3
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	4.75

<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	0-5h
--	------

**Comments:** *The schedule was followed but if time was needed for further explanation it was taken and it allowed a better comprehension of the subject without time restriction.*

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	4.75
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	4.25
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	5

**Comments:** *The supervisor was a real motivation for this block course. We could ask 3/4 times the same question and it would be explained until we truthfully understood what we were doing and why. We were clearly explained what we would be doing and supervised enough that we couldn't do any major errors but also left alone enough to experience a "real" lab work.*

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Written exam Presentation Lab work Class participation Lab journal
--------------------------------------	--

**Comments:** *The Lab work counted as 55%, the written exam as 20% and the oral presentation as 25%. I think it is a good proportion and allowed us to enjoy lab work without stressing too much for the final grade.*

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to acquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	3
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	3
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	5

**Comments:** *If you're even a little interested in the cell nucleus it is a super course to start with. It gives a great view on lab work and with the lectures, the theoretical understanding is further improved. The mood during all the block course was really friendly, fun and motivating. I would greatly recommend this block course !!!*

(# Answers: )

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	
<b>Typical day</b>	
<b>Longest day</b>	
<b>Block course composition</b>	
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks (e.g. handing in a report)</b>	

**Comments:**

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	

**Comments:**

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	
--------------------------------------	--

### Comments:

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	

### Comments:

## Image-Based Drug Screening in Human Blood for Personalized Medicine

(Answers: 3)

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ - Hönggerberg
<b>Typical day</b>	10:00-17:00
<b>Longest day</b>	<8h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Group projects Lectures Journal Club Insights into other research projects Examining prepared samples Project/experiment proposal
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	4
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	4.67
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	2
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	3
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	4.67

VeBiS

Block course feedback (FS/HS)



<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	none
--	------

**Comments:** *The course was structured to be very efficient and informative - it had a very good pace.*

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	3.33
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	4.67

**Comments:** *We were able to work independently but also able to approach anyone if we would require more assistance/guidance which was optimal to suit everyone's working style.*

*The assistants are really helpful, nice and ready to lend a hand (especially during the Matlab sessions). The PI himself has been really nice with all of us.*

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Presentation Lab work Result presentation Journal club
--------------------------------------	---

**Comments:** *It is not clear how the final grade came into place; although the focus was mainly on our two presentations (one journal club presentation and one analysis presentation + research proposal), there was also apparently a grade for our participation in the class but it is not certain what the criteria were. Nonetheless, it was a very fun course to learn about this new technology in personalized medicine and it gave you relevant insights into cutting edge research.*

*No one was really sure how the grading took place and how our lab performance would have been graded. They said they mostly taken into account the lab journal presentation and the final project proposal and discussion analysis*

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	3.67
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	2.33

<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	2.67
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	5

**Comments:** *The workload for this course was less than in other courses. We had to do a journal club presentation individually and a presentation of our results in groups of 2. Wet lab in the first 2 weeks and lots of computer analysis with Matlab. Really interesting lectures from other group members presenting their projects. Whole project is very research oriented but you work on your own example project, not on existing project with a supervisor.*

*We didn't get the chance to work a lot in the lab, it was rather computer-analysis-driven so if you enjoyed system biology or computer science you will love it. I personally didn't like Matlab at all but after this course I could definitely see myself working with it. Especially because we were not left alone during the learning process, but whenever something was not clear the assistants were there for us! Consequently, you learn and improve a lot with Matlab :)*

(# Answers: )

## Human Behavioural Ecology and Cultural Evolution (UZH)

(Answers: 2)

### General

<b>Location(s)</b>	UZH - Irchel
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00-17:00
<b>Longest day</b>	10h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Group projects Lectures Journal Club Project/experiment proposal Experiments (on students)
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	3.5
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	4
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	4,5
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4.5
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	4.5
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	0-5h

**Comments:** *Was very loosely structured, first week lectures in the morning about the experiments done the previous afternoon, second and third week time for group projects almost all day, morning journal clubs*

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	4
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	4.5
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	5

### Comments:

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Presentation Report Class participation
--------------------------------------	---

### Comments: *graded very nicely :)*

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	2.5
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	2
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3.5
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	5

**Comments:** *The Professors are amazing. Totally chill, kind and their lectures were really interesting. In the first week, they did social experiments with us and the week after that we could design our own experiment and test it on other studets. It was quite exciting and funny.*

*interesting topics, good first block course, easy introduction into scientific writing with a bit larger groups (4-5), competent and nice profs :)*

## Marine megafauna in Deep Time (UZH)

(Answers: 1)

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	UZH - Irchel	
<b>Typical day</b>	08:00-17:00	
<b>Longest day</b>	8h	
<b>Block course composition</b>	Group projects Lectures Journal Club Insights into other research projects Examining prepared samples Individual literature review	
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times		5
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented		4
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	Changing group sizes during the course Individual work	
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate		5
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive		5
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)		none

### Comments:

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent		5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent		4
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable		5

**Comments:** *The professor and the teaching assistant were really nice and very helpful, good climate.*

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Presentation Report Class participation Literature review
--------------------------------------	--

**Comments:**

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	2
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	5

**Comments:** *In the mornings you've time to work on a literature review of a marine megafaunal species and in the afternoons you'd discuss a paper together, or there would be a lecture or a talk by a external specialist. Small exams after the lecuters sometimes but they're managable. Generally very good atmosphere. Mostly in a classroom.*

## Microbiomes in health and disease (UZH)

(Answers: 1)

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	UZH - Irchel, University Hospital
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – 16:00
<b>Longest day</b>	9h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Lectures
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	4
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	3
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	2,3
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	5
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	5
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	none

**Comments:**

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	2
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	5

**Comments:** *Not much independence, basically going through pre-prepared experiments*

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Presentation on Poster made during course
--------------------------------------	---

**Comments:**

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	2
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	4

**Comments:**

(# Answers: )

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	
<b>Typical day</b>	
<b>Longest day</b>	
<b>Block course composition</b>	

<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks (e.g. handing in a report)</b>	

**Comments:**

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	

**Comments:**

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	
--------------------------------------	--

**Comments:**

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	

I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	
--	--

**Comments:**

## Next Generation Sequencing for Evolutionary Functional Genomics (UZH)

( Answers: 1)

### General

<b>Location(s)</b>	UZH - Irchel
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – 17:00
<b>Longest day</b>	8h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Lectures Insights into other research projects Project/experiment proposal
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	5
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	4
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	Individual work
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	5
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	5
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	0-5h

**Comments:**

*Typical structure of the day:*

- Morning - lecture about a specific method in genomics or an overview about topics and/or methods used in genomics. Examples are mostly from research of plants / ecology (focus of the group coordinating the course).

- Afternoon - lecture-related practical in data analysis with assistants (PhD/PostDoc) that help with any questions or issues. Exercises are very well guided to make sure all computer tools are working and that the concepts are understood. In the exercises you analyze data from real studies, either ongoing or published.

-

### Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	5
---	---



<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	5
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	5

**Comments:** *There are many chances to experiment with UNIX commands/tools and R scripts that are provided for the exercises if you want to obtain more information about the data that you analyze, but only if you already know some UNIX/R (what you learn in Praktikum Bioinformatik and Statistik 2 is enough). If you have no background knowledge in any of the two, the professors do a great job explaining the most important commands and tools from scratch.*

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Written exam Presentation
--------------------------------------	------------------------------

**Comments:** *80% of the grade is based on a written exam about the concepts covered in the block course. The project (20% of the grade) is an experiment proposal (in presentation form) that describes the workflow as covered over the course of the semester. It can be done alone or in pairs. You need to come up with the idea on your own, but you are told what you need to include in the presentation.*

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to acquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	1
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	2
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3
<b>I would recommend this block course.</b> 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	5

**Comments:** *One afternoon in the first week was spent doing wet lab where we were guided through the process of obtaining samples from plant tissue for NGS analysis, but after that we only did dry lab. The assistants and professors are very nice and like to chat about their research, interests, study background and so on. ETH students are definitely well-prepared for the contents of the course because the 2nd year courses cover much of the theoretical background behind the lecture topics, while the course covers the topics in a bit more detail.*

## Plant epigenetics (UZH)

(Answers: 1)

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	Botanical Garden
<b>Typical day</b>	08:00-17:00
<b>Longest day</b>	8h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Group projects Lectures Journal Club
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	4
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	1
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	2,3
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	3
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	4
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks (e.g. handing in a report)</b>	none

**Comments:** *The three weeks differed much in organization structure/waiting time/start & end time/, as different professors organized them and they were held in different parts of the group.*

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	2
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	5

**Comments:**

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Written exam Poster Paper Discussion/Journal Club
--------------------------------------	---

**Comments:** *Took them a long time to tell us the grades. More than four weeks.*

-

VeBiS

Block course feedback (FS/HS)

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	3
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	4

**Comments:** *I really enjoyed taking a look into the institute at the botanical garden (uzh) as the atmosphere there is nice. However, the block course was similar in structure to "Grundlagenpraktika", we just did experiments to do them and learn how they work and not to generate new results. We did not perform too many experiments and one could really take time to understand them and ask questions like: "What does this chemical do and why do we use it here?".*

(# Answers: )

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	
<b>Typical day</b>	
<b>Longest day</b>	
<b>Block course composition</b>	
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks (e.g. handing in a report)</b>	

**Comments:**

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	

**Atmosphere**

1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable

**Comments:**

-

## Grading

**Elements relevant for grading****Comments:**

-

## Total impression

**"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."**

1: not accurate // 5: very accurate

**Compared to other block courses, this course was...**

1: much less work // 5: much more work

**The block course was...**

1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical

I would recommend this block course.

1: No way! // 5: Definitely!

**Comments:**

## The Mechanisms of Natural Transformation in Competent Gram-Negative Bacteria

(Answers: 1)

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ - Hönggerberg
<b>Typical day</b>	10:00 – 17:00
<b>Longest day</b>	10h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Lectures Journal Club Insights into other research projects Individual presentation

<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	4
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	5
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	2
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	5
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	10+h

**Comments:** *While I attended the block course, also a lot of other stuff was going on in the lab (e.g. moving into a new laboratory, finishing a paper,...). Regarding this situation, it was super well organized but I think we did do a bit less lab work than usual and lab days also were shorter than usual. People attending this course next semester should probably expect longer working days.*

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	3
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	5

**Comments:**

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Presentation Report Lab work Lab journal Participation in a pymol exercise.
--------------------------------------	---

**Comments:** *The grading system was explained in detail at the beginning of the block course.*

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	2
--	---

<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	2
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	5

**Comments:** *I would definitely recommend this block course! It was interesting and research-oriented, all group members are very nice and I learned a lot.*

(# Answers: )

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	
<b>Typical day</b>	
<b>Longest day</b>	
<b>Block course composition</b>	
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks (e.g. handing in a report)</b>	

**Comments:**

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	

**Comments:**

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	
--------------------------------------	--

### Comments:

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	

### Comments:

## Understanding and Engineering Microbial Metabolism

( Answers: 3)

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ - Hönggerberg
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – 17:00
<b>Longest day</b>	10h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Lectures Lab meetings Insights into other research projects Examining prepared samples
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	4.67
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	5
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	2
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	3.67
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	4

<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	5-10h
--	-------

**Comments:** *Block course very well organized. There were some waiting times, but there was a room reserved for the students, so that we could go and analyse our data/prepare our presentations during those waiting times. We worked in small groups and had the opportunity to really do hands-on work in the lab. There was a good balance between wet lab and dry lab.*

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	4
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	5

**Comments:** *We could perform the experiment by ourselves, but constant supervision was required, which was not a bad thing (and was even quite necessary), given the nature of the experiments conducted*

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Written exam Presentation Report Lab work
--------------------------------------	--

**Comments:**

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	3.33
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	4
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	5

**Comments:** *Very good blockcourse, very well planned. The assistants were very nice, the projects interesting. It was probably the best block course that I attended this semester. I warmly recommend it !*



*(translated from German) One of the BEST block courses. Very small groups allow active work and personal acquaintance with the lab. The instructors were very nice and answered questions with pleasure and competence and were able to pass on the joy of the projects. For people who want to "chill" I would not recommend the block course, because it is very time consuming. In our projects we used CRISPR/Cas9 to create knockouts in yeast.*

(# Answers: )

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	
<b>Typical day</b>	
<b>Longest day</b>	
<b>Block course composition</b>	
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks (e.g. handing in a report)</b>	

**Comments:**

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	

**Comments:**

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	
--------------------------------------	--

### Comments:

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	

### Comments:

## Analysis of human T and B cell responses to infectious agents

(Answers: 4)

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ - Hönggerberg
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – 18:00
<b>Longest day</b>	10h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Lectures Examining prepared samples
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	2.5
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	2.75
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	4
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	3.75
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	3.25
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	5-10h

### Comments:

VeBiS

Block course feedback (FS/HS)

The protocols should be revised, since some procedure steps were missing

I would have liked more to read papers about the research and to do something more relevant to the research group

Organization ok but sometimes waiting time due to missing lab preparation. all groups do the same experiments so sometimes waiting time until all groups are finished.

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	3.5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	2.5
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	3.25

### Comments:

The protocol was often wrong and the supervisors had to tell us the changes every time, losing a lot of time. I also think that they could have tried to explain the concepts better and to do it to all of the people.

Supervisors changed after 2 weeks. Some were better than others. Independent work according to script, you really have to ask for help if needed.

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Presentation Lab work Class participation
--------------------------------------	---

**Comments:** We didn't really know how to prepare our presentation, since we received few instructions

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	3
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	3.5
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3.25
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	2

**Comments:** *No insight into research of the group at all. You learn the methods and techniques they would use however no real application in course. Not at all research-based. Feels more like a practical course from year 1 oder 2 than a block course.*

## Biology and Ecology of fungi in the forest

( Answers: 1)

### General

<b>Location(s)</b>	WSL Zurich
<b>Typical day</b>	08:00 – earlier than 16:00
<b>Longest day</b>	8h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Lectures Excursions
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	4
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	3
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	2, 3
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	5
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	0-5h

**Comments:**

-

### Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	4
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	3
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	4

**Comments:**

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Written exam Presentation Report
--------------------------------------	--

### Comments:

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	3
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	1
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	2
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	3

### Comments:

(# Answers: )

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	
<b>Typical day</b>	
<b>Longest day</b>	
<b>Block course composition</b>	
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks (e.g. handing in a report)</b>	

### Comments:

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	

### Comments:

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	
--------------------------------------	--

### Comments:

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	

### Comments:

## Computational Methods in Genome and Sequence Analysis

( Answers: 2)

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ - Hönggerberg
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – 17:00
<b>Longest day</b>	8

<b>Block course composition</b>	Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Group projects Lectures
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	4
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	1
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	Individual
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	3
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	0-5h

**Comments:** *Occasionally it was too fast to follow, especially on a Windows laptop. The lecturers also sometimes started to talk about not very related topics when asked about certain things, which would end up taking time away from the topic at hand.*

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	4
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	4
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	4

**Comments:** *Most questions that would require supervision are about technical / program issues and there are really only 2 people max on spot to help out, and sometimes troubleshooting on the internet would be better than distracting from the taught topic.*

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Written exam Presentation Class participation
--------------------------------------	---

**Comments:** *Most of the grade depends on the individual (assigned) project presentation, less of the grade depends on a written practical exam on the last day. It isn't clear how exactly the grading is distributed, and perhaps participation in form of questions or suggestions also affects grading.*

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	3
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	3
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	2
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	3.5

### Comments:

*In the last week, there is an individual project assignment that can be hard to implement without additional experience in programming. But it is doable and is a great learning experience.*

*It's very helpful to remember Python basics from Grundlagen der Informatik because programming will be done from the very first hour of the block course. The project assignments aren't actually as strict as implied in the course, as long as you can clearly state what you're focusing on in your project work, and as long as you keep biological significance in mind when writing code.*

## Insect reproduction (UZH)

( Answers: 1)

### General

<b>Location(s)</b>	UZH - Irchel
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – 17:00
<b>Longest day</b>	9h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Lectures Insights into other research projects
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	4
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	4
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	Individual, 2
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	3
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	2
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	none

**Comments:** *Most of the wet lab was kind of repetitive because we worked on many flies (to have big sample sizes). It was always mostly: establishment of a population under certain conditions, sometimes behavioral measurements in-between, counting, dissecting and working the statistics in groups. The*



second week had no wet lab though, it was only statistics all day long (helpful, but...). The whole block was very easy-going. During very repetitive parts (such as dissections) you could listen also to some music on your own.

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	3
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	5
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	4

**Comments:** *Very nice people. We had no actual "script" though, so most of the time they explained everything you had to do in the beginning and it was not always clear.*

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Presentation Poster Writing an abstract for a given paper
--------------------------------------	---

**Comments:** *They were a bit fussy for the abstract correction.*

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	2
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	2
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	4

**Comments:**

## Mechanisms of Bacterial Pathogenesis

( Answers: 2)

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ - Hönggerberg	
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – 17:00	
<b>Longest day</b>	10h	
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Group projects Lectures Lab meetings Insights into other research projects Project/experiment proposal	
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times		5
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented		4.5
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>		3
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate		4.5
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive		5
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)		10+h

### Comments:

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent		5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent		5
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable		3

**Comments:** *Our assistant was great and helped us to understand all the concepts. Everyone in the lab was very friendly and welcoming.*

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Written exam Presentation Report Class participation
--------------------------------------	---

### Comments:

VeBiS

Block course feedback (FS/HS)

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to acquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	3.5
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	4.5

Comments:

## Membrane Biology

( Answers: 4)

### General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ – Hönggerberg & PSI
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – 17:00
<b>Longest day</b>	9h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Lab meetings Journal Club Insights into other research projects Examining prepared samples
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	2.5
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	4.75
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	Changing group sizes during the course, 3
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	3
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	4.5
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	none

Comments:

*We had to choose between different lab to work in. Too little information was given about the topics of each lab group.*

*There was hardly any information available before the start, that was annoying.*

*The plant research group was nice but very unorganized. Plans changed the last minute, we had long waiting times, once had a 3h lunch (rather than starting earlier) and were finished at 18:00.*

VeBiS

Block course feedback (FS/HS)

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	4.5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	4.5
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	3.25

### Comments:

*The assistants were ready to help us at any moment.*

*The supervisors were fantastic.*

*Experiments could have been explained more clearly (plant group).*

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Presentation Lab work Poster
--------------------------------------	------------------------------------

### Comments:

*The grading is a bit unfair. The Professor in charge of giving the grades to all groups (Zentrum, PSI,..) was also the head of the PSI group... which automatically makes the grading a bit unfair for everyone*

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	2
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	2.5
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	4
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	4.25

### Comments:

We saw a lot of different methods and were able to try them so the course gave a great overview on what kind of techniques a structural biology lab uses.

There were no lectures at all, only practical work. If you don't like that, it's not for you.

All in all the organisation of our lab work was a bit annoying but the overall vibe of the course is rather chill and the professors are very nice.

## Paleobiology and Evolution of Vertebrates (UZH)

(Answers: 1)

### General

<b>Location(s)</b>	UZH – Zentrum & Paleontological Museum
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – earlier than 16:00
<b>Longest day</b>	8h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Group projects Lectures Insights into other research projects Examining prepared samples Excursions
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	4
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	3
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	2
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	3
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	0-5h

### Comments:

-

### Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	4
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	4
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	5

### Comments:

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Presentation Report
--------------------------------------	------------------------

### Comments:

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	2
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	5

**Comments:** excursion to Sauriermuseum Aathal, project in groups of 2 is description and determination of a fossil

## Plant Biochemistry

(Answers: 2)

### General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ – Zentrum (LFW)
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – 17:00
<b>Longest day</b>	10h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Group projects Journal Club
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	3.5
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	4.5
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	Changing group sizes during the course
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4.5
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	5

<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	5-10h
--	-------

**Comments:** *There was not really a schedule. If we could not finish an experiment we did it the next day or if it failed, we repeated it. We just did what our assistant had to do anyway. However, the experiments we performed followed a common thread.*

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	3.5
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	5

**Comments:** *At first our assistant guided us through the experiments but once they explained them and showed them they allowed us to perform them ourselves. But we could always ask questions if we were unsure.*

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Presentation Lab work Lab journal One presentation of a paper One presentation of the results we generated in the lab
--------------------------------------	---

**Comments:** *It is important to work actively on the project you assigned to and be interested in it, e.g. what is the result of my experiment and not only mixing stuff together.*

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to acquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	3
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3.5
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	5

**Comments:** *This block course gives a really good insight in how labwork for a phd or post doc really looks like as we did what they would have done anyway. There were no lectures (except introduction). Background knowledge had to be acquired in self-study (reading papers and review, asking the assistant). However, this theory learning was casually along the way. The presentations (paper and results) were held in front of other group members of the Zeeman group just like other researches in the lab would have done it.*

(# Answers: )

## Plants and People: Domestication and Evolution of Crops (UZH)

(Answers: 1)

### General

<b>Location(s)</b>	Botanical Garden
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – earlier than 16:00
<b>Longest day</b>	<8h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Lectures Written assignments
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	5
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	2
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	All course participants together
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	5
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	none

**Comments:** *Mornings lectures, afternoons for individual work*

-

### Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	3
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	4
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	5

**Comments:** *Very nice professor, knows a lot about any plant you'd ask him about*



## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Presentation Three assignments Written exam
--------------------------------------	---

**Comments:** *The assignments were quite alright.*

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	1
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	2
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	2
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	5

**Comments:** *If you're interested in plants, history and the origins of agriculture, this is perfect.*

## Principles of Evolution: Theory (UZH)

(Answers: 2)

### General

<b>Location(s)</b>	UZH - Irchel
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – 17:00
<b>Longest day</b>	10h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Lectures
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	2.5
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	2.5
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	Changing group sizes during the course
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4

<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	5
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	none

**Comments:** Lectures + practicals (data analysis), capped off by a 4h exam

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	4.5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	1.5
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	3

**Comments:** In the practicals, we had to fill out templates of R Scripts. Not really my impression of independence

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Written exam Report Class participation
--------------------------------------	---

**Comments:** "Reports" had to be sent in after each practical, but they were at most 2 pages

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	2.5
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	3.5
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	1.5
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	3

**Comments:** There is a significant amount of theory in this course, all of which is tested in a 4 hour final exam. With appropriate effort the workload is very manageable. Very similar to ETH Evolutionary Analysis.

# Bioactive Natural Products from Bacteria

(Answers: 3)

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ - Hönggerberg	
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – 17:00	
<b>Longest day</b>	10h	
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Lab meetings Insights into other research projects	
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times		5
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented		5
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>		3
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate		5
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive		4
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks (e.g. handing in a report)</b>		10+h

### Comments:

*The course was very nicely organized, the first week was a theoretical and bioinformatical part on Zoom and the rest of the time consisted of lab work.*

*You work with a supervisor on individual projects that tie into their own projects, so Organization depends on supervisor.*

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent		5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent		4
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable		4.67

### Comments:

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Presentation Report Lab work
--------------------------------------	------------------------------------

### Comments:

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	2.67
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	3.67
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	2.67
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	5

### Comments:

*Our project was very interesting but it required quite some reading about the topic and a bit of chemistry skills.*

*There was a theoretical block in the first week to gain needed knowledge to understand the projects. The rest of the time was wet lab. Weekly lab meetings gave insight into other projects going on in the lab. A lot of time has to be invested to write the report in the end.*

## Biological Chemistry B: New Enzymes from Directed Evolution Experiments

(Answers: 2)

### General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ - Hönggerberg
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – 19:00
<b>Longest day</b>	More than 12h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Lectures
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	4.5
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	4
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	2

<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	5
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	4.5
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	5-10h

**Comments:**

*The theory lectures were really well executed and in general one of the highlights for the course. Working days can take a lot of time ending after the first week between 2000 and 2300. The course was better organized than most of practicals or lectures I had until now.*

*Very good organisation, date and duration of the long days was communicated clearly from the beginning*

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	4.5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	5
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	4.5

**Comments:** *Prof. Kast made the theory lectures stand out with his sense of humor. The lower rating of the atmosphere was only due to one assistant who used unfortunate communication but was otherwise competent and nice. All the other assistants were really nice and competent.*

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Presentation Report Lab work Class participation Lab journal
--------------------------------------	--

**Comments:**

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to acquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	1.5
---	-----

<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	5
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	5

**Comments:** *In this course you learn a lot about basic lab techniques, which can be very handy in future projects.*

## Epigenetics and disease (UZH)

(Answers: 1)

### General

<b>Location(s)</b>	UZH - Irchel
<b>Typical day</b>	08:00 – 17:00
<b>Longest day</b>	9h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Lectures
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	5
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	5
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	2
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	5
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	4
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	10+h

**Comments:**

-

### Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	3
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	5

**Comments:**

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Written exam Report Lab work
--------------------------------------	------------------------------------

### Comments:

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	1
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	4
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	5

### Comments:

## Experimental Food Microbiology for Biologists

(Answers: 1)

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ - Zentrum
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – 16:00
<b>Longest day</b>	8h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Lectures
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	5
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	2
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	Individual work
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	5

<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	4
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	0-5h

**Comments:**

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	4
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	5

**Comments:**

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Written exam Presentation Lab work Lab journal
--------------------------------------	---

**Comments:**

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	1
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	3
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	5

**Comments:**



# Methods in Cellular Biochemistry

(Answers: 1)

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ - Hönggerberg
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – 18:00
<b>Longest day</b>	8h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Lectures Journal Club Insights into other research projects Examining prepared samples Project/experiment proposal Chalk Talk
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	2
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	4
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	2,3
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	5
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	5
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	0-5h

**Comments:** *Sometimes we had nothing to do during the waiting times*

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	2
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	5

**Comments:** *I wished we were less people in my group (we were 3) so that everyone would have got a chance to do everything. Splitting the lab work over 3 people was too much in my opinion*

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Presentation Lab work Lab journal
--------------------------------------	---

### Comments:

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	5
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	3
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	4

### Comments:

## Microbial Community Genomics

(Answers: 2)

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ - Hönggerberg
<b>Typical day</b>	08:00 – 16:00
<b>Longest day</b>	9h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Group projects Lectures
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	4
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	5
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	2
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4.5
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	4
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	10+h

**Comments:** A lot of emphasis is put on understanding of which model to use in statistical analysis. Data analysis is done exclusively using R, so prior skills (Statistik II, PCP) are of huge advantage, but there are very good tutorials/documentation available on the block course website. Most of the time is spent working on the project assignment (2 full weeks). There were two assistants on site who you could ask about any technical or conceptual questions.

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	4
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	5
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	4

### Comments:

Presence on site wasn't mandatory - the work could be also done at home, only lectures and tutorials required attendance. There is a slack channel for the block course, where it is possible to ask questions related to the project.

Sometimes supervisors did not agree on what is the right approach/decision, which was a bit tedious

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Written exam Presentation Report
--------------------------------------	--

### Comments:

1/3 presentation about the project (progress by the end of the block course) 1/3 scientific report (on the assigned project topic) In the exam, we were asked to define and differentiate 16S data from MAGs, as well as point out the uses, strengths and weaknesses of metaG/metaT/metaB.

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	2.5
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	4.5
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3.5
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	4

**Comments:**

*There is little to no theory, most of the theory was a repetition of the Bioinformatics concept course material about Metagenomics - so most of the block course is direct work on the given data, but it is quite a lot of work. Much digging online was necessary to find out how exactly to use statistical functions on the given data.*

*Very interesting, was cool to work with real data (although it was ofc not given to find any results and also the data was not as pretty as if prepared ofc)*

## Phytopathology

(Answers: 2)

### General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ - Zentrum
<b>Typical day</b>	08:00 – 17:00
<b>Longest day</b>	10h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Lectures
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	5
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	4.5
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	3,4
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	5
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	5-10h

**Comments:**

-

### Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	3
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	5

**Comments:**

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Presentation Lab work Lab journal Poster
--------------------------------------	---

### Comments:

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	2.5
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	3
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3.5
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	5

### Comments:

## Biology of Mosses and Ferns

(Answers: 1)

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ - Zentrum
<b>Typical day</b>	08:00 – 16:00
<b>Longest day</b>	8h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Lectures Examining prepared samples Excursions
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	5
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	3
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	Changing group sizes during the course
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4

<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	4
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	0-5h

**Comments:**

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	3
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	5

**Comments:**

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Class participation Poster
--------------------------------------	-------------------------------

**Comments:**

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	2
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	2
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	5

**Comments:**

## Growth control and aging

(Answers: 3)

### General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ - Hönggerberg
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – 18:00
<b>Longest day</b>	12h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Group projects Lectures Journal Club Project/experiment proposal
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	4.33
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	3.67
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	2,3
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4.67
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	4.33
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	none

### Comments:

*You work on individual group projects with supervisors based on their research, so Organization depends on supervisor. Some groups had much longer days than others.*

*Is a collaboration of three different labs: Neurohr-lab, Peter-lab (represented by Reinhard Dechant) and Stocker-lab at two different institutes: Inst. f. Molekulare Systembiologie and Institute of Biochemistry*

-

### Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	3.67
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	4.67

**Comments:** *Our assistant was very nice, helped in the lab but also with the presentations we had to prepare :)*

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Oral exam Presentation Lab work Class participation
--------------------------------------	--

### Comments:

*50 % oral exam (usually written), 25 % lab work/participation, 25 % all presentations together (project proposal, journal club and results)*

*We were supposed to have a written exam of 90 mins in top of 2 presentations and a journal club. Because of a COVID-infection in the course, the written exam was switched to a 30 min oral discussion with the supervisors*

*the exam makes 50% of the grade three different presentations: introduction, journal club and results a written exam was planned but due to covid it was changed to an oral one*

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	3
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	3.67
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	2.67
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	4.67

### Comments:

*Quite a lot of time needed to prepare 3 presentations and study for exam during the course but no additional work after. Exam makes up a bit too much of final grade in comparison to presentations. Quite research-based, working in small groups with a supervisor on current topics.*

*For me there were too many lectures and too little time in the lab*



# Imaging bacteria cells in a native state by electron cryotomography

(Answers: 1)

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ - Höggerberg	
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – 16:00	
<b>Longest day</b>	9h	
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Lab meetings Journal Club	
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times		4
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented		4
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>		3
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate		
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive		5
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)		5-10h

### Comments:

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent		4
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent		2
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable		4

### Comments:

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Presentation Report Lab work
--------------------------------------	------------------------------------

### Comments:

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	2
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	2
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	4

### Comments:

## In vivo cryo-em of dynein motor proteins

(Answers: 1)

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ - PSI
<b>Typical day</b>	10:00 – 17:00
<b>Longest day</b>	<8h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis)
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	1
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	4
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	All course participants together
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	3
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	3
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	5-10h

**Comments:**

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	4
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	2
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	5

**Comments:**

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Presentation Report
--------------------------------------	------------------------

**Comments:**

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	2
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	2
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	2

**Comments:**

## Parallels between tissue repair and cancer

(Answers: 2)

## General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ - Hönggerberg
--------------------	--------------------

<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – 17:00
<b>Longest day</b>	9h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Group projects Lectures Insights into other research projects Project/experiment proposal
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	3.5
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	3
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	2,3
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	2.5
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	5
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks (e.g. handing in a report)</b>	5-10h

**Comments:** *Some things were not clear in regards of what was asked in the Examination*

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	4.5
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	5

**Comments:** *Many supervisors were so excited to have us*

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Written exam Presentation Lab work
--------------------------------------	--

**Comments:**

*What was in the exam was not clear at all-*

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	2.5
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	4.5
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	2.5
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	4

### Comments:

*So nice that we got the chance to see 2 labs instead of only one*

## Plant sensing (UZH)

(Answers: 1)

### General

<b>Location(s)</b>	UZH - Botanical Garden
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – 17:00
<b>Longest day</b>	9h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Lectures
<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	4
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	5
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	Individual work
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	4
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks</b> (e.g. handing in a report)	5-10h

### Comments:

-

### Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	5
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	5

<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	5
---	---

**Comments:**

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Presentation Lab work Lab journal
--------------------------------------	---

**Comments:** 50% presentation, 25% lab work, 25% lab journal

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	1
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	4
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	5

**Comments:** Best block-course of the semester, very different technique used and very cool assistant. Every student had an individual assistant.

## RNA-Biology

(Answers: 3)

### General

<b>Location(s)</b>	ETHZ - Hönggerberg, University of Zürich - Irchel, Online
<b>Typical day</b>	09:00 – 17:00
<b>Longest day</b>	10h
<b>Block course composition</b>	Wet lab (= in the lab, at the bench, observation studies, etc.) Dry lab (= e.g. computer analysis) Lectures Journal Club Project/experiment proposal

<b>Structure and waiting times</b> 1: little structure, long waiting times 5: well-structured, no unnecessary waiting times	3.33
<b>Research-orientation</b> 1: not research-oriented // 5: very research-oriented	4.67
<b>Size of project group(s)</b>	Changing group sizes during the course Individual work 3
<b>Accuracy of course description</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4
<b>Comprehensiveness with knowledge from bachelor lectures</b> 1: incomprehensive // 5: very comprehensive	3.33
<b>Additional work after the corresponding block course weeks (e.g. handing in a report)</b>	0-5h

**Comments:**

*We were given 2 days off for the 10 or so hours of presentation preparation.*

*Lots of waiting time this year. As I understood it however, this is usually not the case, as students are normally distributed in groups of 2 (not 4) and in that configuration things should go much more smoothly.*

-

## Supervision

<b>Technical quality of supervision</b> 1: not competent // very competent	4.67
<b>Independence</b> 1: very dependent // 5: very independent	5
<b>Atmosphere</b> 1: very uncomfortable // 5: very comfortable	3

**Comments:**

*Very patient and kind. Provided good explanations.*

*Very motivated and friendly supervisors. We had nice discussions with them on current research topics in their field.*

-

## Grading

<b>Elements relevant for grading</b>	Written exam Presentation Lab work
--------------------------------------	--

**Comments:** *It would be nice to perhaps have small Tests after each theory part to get a feeling for what sort of questions to expect in the exam.*

-

## Total impression

<b>"The ratio of invested time to aquired knowledge was proportionate."</b> 1: not accurate // 5: very accurate	4.67
<b>Compared to other block courses, this course was...</b> 1: much less work // 5: much more work	2.67
<b>The block course was...</b> 1: too theoretical // 3: just right // 5: too practical	3.33
I would recommend this block course. 1: No way! // 5: Definitely!	4

### Comments:

*Anyone who wants an accurate picture regarding work in a real research lab and was thinking of pursuing this line of research has much to gain from this course.*

*The Blockcourse was well-organized, with a good insight on current research of our lab. The papers and lectures given by the different professors gave us an idea of the work of other labs as well. Maybe as a precision, the repartition into the different labs was decided between the students themselves at the beginning of the Blockcourse.*



