

Tutorials: How would you rate the tutorials you attended?

	Excellent	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor	I did not attend a tutorial	Rating Average	Response Count
Tutorial rating:	18.6% (24)	31.8% (41)	35.7% (46)	6.2% (8)	0.0% (0)	7.8% (10)	2.60	129

Tutorial comments: 60

answered question	129
skipped question	10

Page 1, Q7. Tutorials: How would you rate the tutorials you attended?

1	These were amazing and very helpful. I just wish the material had been released BEFORE the lectures that way I could have come prepared with questions.	Apr 20, 2011 7:07 AM
2	They should have been more streamlined and thoroughly practiced beforehand.	Apr 14, 2011 5:50 PM
3	All were good except for GiT, it really turned out to be a Gerrit tutorial	Apr 14, 2011 12:14 PM
4	The worst tutorial was the EGit tutorial. Instead of teaching people about it through slides and a presentation the presenters chose to let everyone loose on their giant tutorials. Firstly the setup process took forever and then there were 8 or so exercises with many steps. I would have learned a lot more through a presentation.	Apr 14, 2011 7:45 AM
5	Probably the bst part of EclipseCON.	Apr 14, 2011 1:20 AM
6	The ones I attended were a very mixed bag. While most provided USB keys with pre-configured environments, on one they had hard-coded Windows paths with "\" which didn't work on my Mac. Essentially, if *anything* goes wrong in a tutorial, you are so completely dead in the water that you never recover.	Apr 11, 2011 3:42 PM
7	May be one or two tutorials more, even in parallel of talks would be appreciated.	Apr 7, 2011 4:24 PM
8	The tutorial premises were good but on two of them there were some fairly big bugs that prevented getting things from fully working.	Apr 6, 2011 5:10 PM
9	Basic tutorials.	Apr 6, 2011 1:26 PM

Page 1, Q7. Tutorials: How would you rate the tutorials you attended?

10	I attended to only two tutorials, the EMF tutorial and the ACE in the Cloud tutorial (I attended to the early parts of the Glassfish tutorial). They were both very well prepared for the most part. - About the EMF tutorial: * Unfortunately (I expected it but tried to be optimistic), the tutorial was very basic. You can find the same tutorial on the Web, it's been there for years. Coming from the EMF guys, I was hoping finally for some light on the most obscures usages/options of EMF, or using some modeling projects to do something more than just a view hooked onto a model. Once again, I guess this was just an introduction, but it's one that you can really do easily at home or work, but I understand it's very hard to guess the level of the audience. * The most interesting part was the ignite talks about different modeling projects during the tutorial. More would have been good. Of course, the fact that this tutorial had so many speakers made it very uneven for some of the ignite talks. - About the ACE tutorial Nicely done and interesting, but on Wednesday afternoon I was too tired to take part in it ;). For those two tutorials, I believe that you get 95% of the tutorial just attending it, it barely helps to write the (very basic) code and you get it from the USB key anyway... Instead of those long tutorials, I would have enjoyed extended talks (1h) with the same content, more or less, but in which you can see code and not just text slides. (How about "Show us the code sessions!"). Talks start with and URL (mirrored on an Eclipse Con server) to get the code, some introduction during which attendees who feel like it can import the projects in an Eclipse workspace, and they try to follow... There should still be tutorials, but they should imho be on more complex/technical topics on which people might actually need help from an expert to get started. I think some of the tutorials in this EclipseCon fit in this category but I did not attend them (either because I was busy networking or that I was not interested or already using the technology that the tutorial was presenting).	Apr 6, 2011 11:46 AM
11	The tutorial were in general very well organized and easy to follow. This is clearly an improvement vs previous years.	Apr 6, 2011 9:35 AM
12	Very good but hard or impossible to keep up with the fast pace of presentation. Your brain can't concentrate on what the presenter is saying if you're also trying to follow tutorial instructions or worse still, catch up.	Apr 6, 2011 3:53 AM
13	The EMF tutorial Thursday was not geared to newcomers to the technology and was very confusing.	Apr 5, 2011 11:14 PM
14	I'm assuming this refers to the sessions that were approx. 3 hours in length. I enjoyed all but one of the sessions I attended. The only session I didn't enjoy was because the class was oriented more towards performing a lab the entire time without any instruction. Those running the tutorial were present to answer questions but didn't present anything. I felt at that point the session offered minimal benefit over doing the lab at my home in my pajamas with a beer next to me. Actually -- that perhaps is even more appealing. Bottom line: the tutorials which were a mix of hands-on and presentation were very, excellent, which is why I rated this category excellent.	Apr 5, 2011 3:41 PM
15	Material used for tutorials took too long to get installed. More memotry sticks should be available. Also installation of eclipse plugins took too much time. It should be expected that not all participants have super fast computers	Apr 5, 2011 10:33 AM
16	It would be nice to allow adequate time to try out the tutorials as in some sessions attendees had to rush thru the tutorials due to time constraints.	Apr 5, 2011 9:07 AM
17	Great, although some presenters spent too much time letting people complete	Apr 5, 2011 8:38 AM

Page 1, Q7. Tutorials: How would you rate the tutorials you attended?

the exercise without really explaining what was being achieved.

18	There is a lot of variation in the level of technical prep and understanding needed for the talks. It would help a lot to better indicate that, and to show the preparation and learning path so that someone can fill in the background for herself if she weren't already prepared. Most of the tutorials lacked a larger context to understand where they fit in, or even why they exist in the first place. Some tutorials require conflicting system configs. It would be great to have a simple framework to note the expected config, and then test your system for compliance. The usb drives helped a lot, but tutorial leaders could use better guidance on what to provide, and the slide 0, up on the screen as the students arrive, makes a critical difference in how effectively the tutorial gets off the ground. I have more notes that I'd love to propose as a student project for ongoing development to support the tutorials.	Apr 5, 2011 7:48 AM
19	Very good especially for Xtext	Apr 5, 2011 7:19 AM
20	Same comment as above...if the tutorial code was self-contained then things went well. Kudos for having enough power...for all the laptops.	Apr 5, 2011 7:14 AM
21	In general, the information provided was quite interesting, but instructions for performing the hands-on exercises were poor.	Apr 5, 2011 7:05 AM
22	A few tutorials were excellent. Some were good. There were also poor ones. The excellent ones came from the E4 team. Excellent preparation. All lessons prepared as Eclipse projects - excellent. All slides as PDF! 2/3 of the time for preparation and description what is expected during the lessons. 1/3 of the time to actually work with the well prepared projects. These guys deserve an extra price!! What about an extra price for the best tutorials next EclipseCon 2012?? Tutorials should have tighter guidelines following basically what I mentioned above.	Apr 5, 2011 7:04 AM
23	Tutorials have improved over the years. While I personally am not too fond of the concept of doing tutorials i large groups, the experience has improved. The handouts have become more detailed, which is excellent, and presenters spend the time more wisely. I'd still like to see one day of even longer, more specialized tutorials, though.	Apr 5, 2011 5:43 AM
24	very tricky kind of course I think	Apr 5, 2011 4:48 AM
25	Some Tutorial tried to pack too much content into the relatively short time frame.	Apr 5, 2011 3:09 AM
26	some tutorials did not prepare enough for scarce network availability and time was lost setting up the exercises. The virgo/gemini tutorial tried to cover too many topics in the given time. the glassfish tutorial lost time in setup and did not get a consistent message across with respect to OSGi services dependency injection.	Apr 5, 2011 1:44 AM
27	Labs needs to be prepared more. It took to long installing the software. Supply a VirtualBox with all setup and then the labs can be done in ease.	Apr 5, 2011 1:33 AM
28	Out of time orwithout much content (git/gerriit) --> I can do the tutorials at home as well	Apr 5, 2011 12:51 AM
29	It's nice having more tutorials. Most of them were really good, others not so good.	Apr 4, 2011 11:09 PM

Page 1, Q7. Tutorials: How would you rate the tutorials you attended?

30	Well prepared.	Apr 4, 2011 6:40 PM
31	I liked having tutorials spread out through out the days of the conference, I would have liked to have seen more of them.	Apr 4, 2011 5:16 PM
32	I was very happy with the longer tutorials I attended. My only complaint (attending the conference alone) was that there were some tutorials scheduled on the same day at the same time and not repeated on another day which meant I had to miss them. I think it would have been better to repeat some of the tutorials a second day mixed in with the shorter talks etc.	Apr 4, 2011 4:46 PM
33	The C/C++ guys had a USB stick with a pre-configured VirtualBox VM, the slides and the examples. That's definitely the way to do things.	Apr 4, 2011 3:24 PM
34	-Tutorials can always be improved. Sometimes they reveal bugs starting right from installation. Due to the variety of environments everyone has, it is difficult to get it going flawlessly for everyone. Nature of the beast and it's hard to be ready for all OS that are so diifferent: Mac OSX, Ubuntu, XP, Win 7 32 /64. But I think lit's OK to have everyone try it on his /her own machine: that's why they came to learn that thing.	Apr 4, 2011 2:39 PM
35	The tutorial format works, though it might be bit on the long side. They are given by seasoned folks, well thought out and seemed to manage well the difficult task of helping novices get up to speed while not boring others.	Apr 4, 2011 2:34 PM
36	The 3 I attended were actually quite good in that most made sure that you could get to the next step without having successfully completed the previous step. A tricky thing to do sometimes.	Apr 4, 2011 2:14 PM
37	Some tutorials as noted above were very good (i.e. tycho) and some had just way too much content (virgo/gemini).	Apr 4, 2011 3:27 AM
38	I attended both very good and very poor tutorials. Some wasted a lot of time with download / installation instructions. Ask Dave Orm and Patrick Paulin how to do it right. I like seeing a real world's problem solved during a tutorial, even if I won't face the same problem during my work. Having to deal with some abstract issues to explain something does not help to understand where to make use of the actual project / product / tool presented. I prefer hands-on tutorials over "presentational" tutorials, so I'd like to have it mentioned in the description of the tutorial if there is going to be some hands-on or if the presenter is just presenting for 2 / 2.5 hours.	Apr 2, 2011 5:17 PM
39	A couple of the tutorials were very well done, while a few others were lacking. One of the tutorials essentially provided little to no benefit from being "live" - I could just of easily done it from a web site at home. Another tutorial was way too complicated for the time given. Overall, I love the tutorial idea and with a little better planning/polishing on the part of the presenters, I think they will be perfect.	Apr 2, 2011 10:32 AM
40	All the tutorials suffered from the same issue of the 1st 20 mins. is wasted passing around flash drives and getting Eclipse versions right etc. Next year, how about developing an RCP that can pull down and verify the software needed for a tutorial. And make this app available before the tutorial.	Apr 1, 2011 9:12 AM
41	Some were better than others - the biggest hinderance was the reliance on USB sticks. I think if there were requirements for attendees ahead of time, we could have been better prepared and the tutorials would have been able to run as	Apr 1, 2011 6:44 AM

Page 1, Q7. Tutorials: How would you rate the tutorials you attended?

	intended.	
42	I'd like to see an actual Git tutorial and a *separate* Gerrit tutorial; mixing the two is confusing for those new to git.	Apr 1, 2011 5:53 AM
43	It can be rather difficult to figure out whether a specific tutorial is at the right level prior to the start of the tutorial itself. Maybe it could be a good idea to let all tutorials have a mandatory break after 15-20 minutes, which would allow all participants to change "tracks" before it is too late...	Apr 1, 2011 1:47 AM
44	EMF Tutorial was very well prepared as well as Alex's Jubula Tutorial. The Git tutorial could have used some more guidance.	Apr 1, 2011 1:18 AM
45	The tutorials are good. Of course setup is always a pain, and I've seen this from both sides (presenter and attendee).	Mar 31, 2011 9:02 PM
46	Tutorials should prepare a virtual machine image and distribute it together with the virtual machine player on USB sticks to remove the installation nightmare required to run the tutorial. If the image is a cdrom image, then one can not even screw up the tutorial as one can always reboot and start from zero. P.S. Virtualbox is free and owned by one of the gold sponsors (Oracle)	Mar 31, 2011 8:32 PM
47	Some tutorials (Effective Git) gave no actual explanation before exercises and were poorer for this.	Mar 31, 2011 7:23 PM
48	Lots of material. Again, If they would provide ALL the class material before hand that would have been better. That way I could have come to the lectures with questions in hand.	Mar 31, 2011 6:36 PM
49	I always think three hours would be too long but the C/C++ one could have gone another hour. Andrew did a great job and Bernard gave some insight into some different things even I hadn't seen before.	Mar 31, 2011 3:55 PM
50	Getting the audience set up was as always the most painful part of the tutorials. PW	Mar 31, 2011 8:01 AM
51	Hands on tutorials are always dangerous because you can spend too much time helping people keep up with the presentation. Someone should write an article about how to do an effective hands-on talk, and proposed talks should try to follow the pattern. I didn't attend the Monday tutorials, but the talks later in the week suffered from not enough checkpointing so the stuck people could keep up, and not enough interactivity and too much 'do this, then this, then this and you're done!'	Mar 30, 2011 2:09 PM
52	Only could attend to one tutorial which was too packed.	Mar 30, 2011 1:42 PM
53	The tutorials I have participated were very interesting, but in both the material was too much and the time was not enough for executing all the steps.	Mar 30, 2011 7:10 AM
54	Installing and configuring Eclipse is always an exercise in a random sequence of critical options that are impossible to configure with precise, written instructions. One session was 100% self paced exercises, with no presentation what so ever. Since the exercise was on the web I couldn't understand why I'd paid \$1200 to fly all the way to Santa Clara just to have someone say: here are some exercises, have at it. The one I'm referring to was on Git.	Mar 26, 2011 10:32 PM

Page 1, Q7. Tutorials: How would you rate the tutorials you attended?

55	Sadly most tutorials I attended (4-5) suffered from setup and preparation issues. The use of students was great but there were still problems. These included - missing files on disk/memory stick - incomplete or unclear instructions - too complex a setup - too much material to cover. Many people in the audiences were frustrated trying to get things working while others gave up and got bored waiting for problems to be solved. Tutorial setup is always a problem but with so much of the program time devoted to tutorials, perhaps the program committee should take steps to drive improved quality.	Mar 26, 2011 7:25 PM
56	EMF, BIRT and Scout tutorials were very good. Having the runtime environments available on USB for all OS's was good. XText was interesting BUT the writeup conveyed that participants would build a DSL in 2 1/2 hours - only when we arrived they said "If you aren't familiar with our toolset, you should just watch." That sort of defeated the intent of the tutorial.	Mar 26, 2011 6:15 PM
57	Good: When the presenters were prepared with both tutorial instructions and required downloads posted ahead of time. EMF guys were stellar in this regard. High props! Also liked spreading them out over the week. Easier on the mind. Bad: When (ahem GWT tutorial) you spend the first hour and a half muddling through thumb drives and provisioning on the network. Could've been good, but royally SUCKED!!	Mar 26, 2011 10:57 AM
58	Technical difficulties on some - please do not depend too much on USB sticks and WIFI. Perhaps present the exact versions of plugins needed and an initial way to check that you are up and running to be able to follow the tutorial.	Mar 26, 2011 12:26 AM
59	Some tutorials were good, but some lacked organisation and structure. I would be good to put setup instructions and downloadable materials online before the Con (some tutorials did not have that, some did).	Mar 25, 2011 10:16 PM
60	- The average quality of the tutorials has increased dramatically. - Two of three tutorials I attended (Effective Git and OSGi apps in Glassfish) were perfectly prepared and the best is that they provided detailed documentation for offline/home work. - The third tutorial (xtext) was not exactly bad, but it was overloaded for the assigned time slot and finishing/going over it again at home is not possible because no material is provided.	Mar 25, 2011 8:22 PM