Check for updates

OPINION ARTICLE

The ELIXIR-EXCELERATE Train-the-Trainer pilot programme: empower researchers to deliver high-quality training [version 1; peer review: 2 approved]

Sarah L Morgan ¹, Patricia M Palagi ^{2*}, Pedro L Fernandes ^{3*},
Eija Koperlainen ⁴, Jure Dimec⁵, Diana Marek², Lee Larcombe ⁶,
Gabriella Rustici⁷, Teresa K Attwood⁸, Allegra Via ⁹

¹EMBL-European Bioinformatics Institute, Hinxton, Cambridgeshire, CB10 1SD, UK

²SIB Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics, Quartier Sorge, Genopode, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

³Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciência, R. Q.ta Grande 6, 2780-156 Oeiras, Portugal

⁴CSC - IT Center for Science, Keilaranta 14, 02150 Espoo, Finland

⁵Faculty of Medicine, Institute for Biostatistics and Medical Informatics, University of Ljubljana, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

⁶MRC Human Genetics Unit, The Institute of Genetics and Molecular Medicine, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, EH4 2XU, UK

⁷Department of Genetics, University of Cambridge, Downing Street, Cambridge, CB2 3EH, UK

⁸School of Computer Science, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL, UK

⁹National Research Council of Italy (CNR), Institute of Molecular Biology and Pathology (IBPM), Sapienza University, 00185 Rome, Italy

* Equal contributors

V1 First published: 24 Aug 2017, 6:1557
<https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.12332.1>

Latest published: 24 Aug 2017, 6:1557
<https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.12332.1>

Abstract

One of the main goals of the ELIXIR-EXCELERATE project from the European Union's Horizon 2020 programme is to support a pan-European training programme to increase bioinformatics capacity and competency across ELIXIR Nodes. To this end, a Train-the-Trainer (TtT) programme has been developed by the TtT subtask of EXCELERATE's Training Platform, to try to expose bioinformatics instructors to aspects of pedagogy and evidence-based learning principles, to help them better design, develop and deliver high-quality training in future. As a first step towards such a programme, an ELIXIR-EXCELERATE TtT (EE-TtT) pilot was developed, drawing on existing 'instructor training' models, using input both from experienced instructors and from experts in bioinformatics, the cognitive sciences and educational psychology. This manuscript describes the process of defining the pilot programme, illustrates its goals, structure and contents, and discusses its outcomes. From Jan 2016 to Jan 2017, we carried out seven pilot EE-TtT courses (training more than sixty new instructors), collaboratively drafted the training materials, and started establishing a network of trainers and instructors within the ELIXIR community. The EE-TtT pilot represents an essential step towards the

Open Peer Review

Approval Status

	1	2
version 1		
24 Aug 2017	view	view

1. **Jason J. Williams**, Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, Cold Spring Harbor, USA

2. **Kim T. Gurwitz**, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

Any reports and responses or comments on the article can be found at the end of the article.

development of a sustainable and scalable ELIXIR TtT programme. Indeed, the lessons learned from the pilot, the experience gained, the materials developed, and the analysis of the feedback collected throughout the seven pilot courses have both positioned us to consolidate the programme in the coming years, and contributed to the development of an enthusiastic and expanding ELIXIR community of instructors and trainers.

Keywords

training, Train-the-Trainer, TtT, instructor training, educational psychology, science of learning, EXCELERATE, ELIXIR

This article is included in the **ELIXIR** gateway.

This article is included in the **Bioinformatics** gateway.

This article is included in the **Bioinformatics Education and Training Collection** collection.

Corresponding authors: Sarah L Morgan (sarahm@ebi.ac.uk), Allegra Via (allegra.via@uniroma1.it)

Author roles: **Morgan SL:** Conceptualization, Funding Acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project Administration, Supervision, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing; **Palagi PM:** Conceptualization, Funding Acquisition, Resources, Supervision, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing; **Fernandes PL:** Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Writing – Review & Editing; **Koperlainen E:** Funding Acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Writing – Review & Editing; **Dimec J:** Investigation, Resources, Writing – Review & Editing; **Marek D:** Investigation, Resources, Writing – Review & Editing; **Larcombe L:** Conceptualization, Investigation; **Rustici G:** Conceptualization, Resources; **Attwood TK:** Conceptualization, Data Curation, Investigation, Validation, Writing – Review & Editing; **Via A:** Conceptualization, Funding Acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project Administration, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing

Competing interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Grant information: This work was funded by ELIXIR, the research infrastructure for life-science data. ELIXIR received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (ELIXIR- EXCELERATE, grant agreement no 676559). *The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.*

Copyright: © 2017 Morgan SL *et al.* This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the **Creative Commons Attribution License**, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

How to cite this article: Morgan SL, Palagi PM, Fernandes PL *et al.* **The ELIXIR-EXCELERATE Train-the-Trainer pilot programme: empower researchers to deliver high-quality training [version 1; peer review: 2 approved]** F1000Research 2017, 6:1557 <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.12332.1>

First published: 24 Aug 2017, 6:1557 <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.12332.1>

Introduction

ELIXIR (<https://www.elixir-europe.org>) is a distributed research infrastructure with a mission to manage, provide access to and safeguard the increasing volumes of data being generated by European life scientists. It coordinates and sustains bioinformatics resources across its 21 member states, and helps researchers to more easily find, analyse, share and exchange biological data. As thousands of European scientists make use of ELIXIR's databases, tools, services and data, providing the necessary bioinformatics training to help them do so most effectively is a key priority, and one of ELIXIR's main missions (van Gelder *et al.*, 2016).

Bioinformatics seldom forms a core part of formal life-science degree programmes in Europe; therefore, PhD students, postdocs and even PIs seek out focused 'point of need' training to gain the skills they require to fruitfully expedite their research. Across Europe, the availability of bioinformatics training opportunities varies greatly from one country to another, and the number of available courses is not sufficient to meet demand, most notably in subjects such as the analysis of next-generation sequencing data. This high demand is not yet waning, and more courses will need to be brought online as the life sciences extend into new areas. Expanding the provision of training in Europe requires the development not only of new courses and materials, but also of new instructors able to deliver high-quality courses. However, the ability to develop new trainers through the provision of 'instructor training' is not yet available in all countries.

A continual challenge faced by course providers is finding appropriate individuals to deliver training. Bioinformatics is a dynamic, highly practical and evolving field, and is generally best explained by practitioners in the field. But subject specialists often have little or no formal 'instructor training', and hence may be unaware either of learning principles and their application to teaching, of how to tailor sessions to specific audiences, of how to assess whether learning is occurring or has occurred, or of how, ultimately, to design, develop and deliver effective training sessions and materials.

This situation argues for the development of a practical programme to familiarise subject specialists with good training practices (Via *et al.*, 2013; Best Practices in Training, DEPOCEI Report, 2013, http://www.depocei.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/DEPOCEI_Final-report_TRAINING-BEST-PRACTICES.pdf), introducing pedagogical/andragogical theory and methods for course design, delivery and assessment. The idea would not be to try to transform would-be instructors into educationalists, but rather, to help them become responsive, reflective instructors able to provide high-quality training to a variety of audiences, and potentially also able to help others develop their own training skills. Many researcher-instructors (researchers whose career and/or personal interests involve teaching/training) are isolated in their own work settings. Having access to a network or community of practice is therefore important, not just for the support it can

provide, but also for enabling their continued development, by sharing ideas and teaching practices, and exploiting training opportunities that arise.

In 2015, ELIXIR received funding for the EXCELERATE project (<https://www.elixir-europe.org/about-us/how-funded/eu-projects/excelerate>) from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme. One of ELIXIR-EXCELERATE's main goals is to help ELIXIR support a pan-European training programme to increase bioinformatics capacity and competency.

Against this background, the ELIXIR-EXCELERATE Train-The-Trainer (EE-TtT) programme was developed with the following goals in mind:

1. To assemble research-based training materials using reliable, published sources, and use them to compile an EE-TtT package/framework, to be refined/enriched/reviewed during the programme;
2. To run a pilot of at least six EE-TtT courses in the first twelve months, using the initial EE-TtT package;
3. Deliver a technical workshop to learn from experts about the use of clouds and Virtual Machines (VMs) in training, and develop guidelines for integration into the EE-TtT framework accordingly; and
4. Train further instructor trainers in order to better consolidate the ELIXIR training community, and be able to scale up to several ELIXIR Nodes.

This paper describes the EE-TtT pilot, which was designed and delivered between January 2016 and January 2017. It outlines the focus of the pilot, the content, structure and features of the TtT sessions developed in the first year, and the training materials created so far.

The EE-TtT pilot overview and goals

The pilot work involved exploring TtT approaches that were already in use within ELIXIR Nodes and related initiatives, and defining a basic framework and curriculum to deliver appropriate training sessions, fit for the needs of the ELIXIR community of bioinformatics instructors (van Gelder *et al.*, 2016). A 'kick-off' workshop (see [Supplementary Material 1](#)) was held at EMBL-EBI (<http://www.ebi.ac.uk>), which brought together representatives from ELIXIR member states with external experts in educational psychology and TtT design and delivery from the Wellcome Trust, NIH-BD2K and Software Carpentry (SWC, <https://software-carpentry.org>) and Data Carpentry (DC, <http://www.datacarpentry.org>) Foundations. The objectives of the workshop were to:

- Explore the scope of current activities in the areas of impact assessment and TtT;
- List the methods currently being applied to undertake these activities;

- Identify the major requirements/outputs of each activity;
- Produce a basic framework or set of guidelines for initial development of the TtT programme/pilot; and
- Identify an initial group of candidate TtT trainers.

Workshop participants experienced with bioinformatics training and/or TtT courses or tutoring were invited to elaborate on and present their experiences, and provide five key features a TtT programme should have. The commonalities from the features they provided can be grouped as follows:

1. How TtT sessions should be delivered: they should be interactive and promote sharing of experiences; encourage reflection and development; provide mentoring of new instructors; promote performance videoing and critiquing; provide reference materials for delivering TtT courses; and provide examples of courses to demonstrate possible developments.
2. What TtT sessions should span: they should span pedagogical skills (ability to listen to learners, observe and analyse), and review main evidence-based research results on how learning works; lesson and material planning and preparation with outcomes/aims/learning objectives; effective teaching techniques - practical tips for applying them effectively; evaluation and assessment/feedback by mentor/trainer/learner (including how to handle negative feedback) (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Bloom & Krathwohl, 1956); identifying skills trainees currently have and what new skills they need to develop and becoming a reflective practitioner.
3. Who should be trained in TtT sessions: the target audience should be current or future committed bioinformatics instructors, in small groups of 20 or fewer participants.
4. What are the challenges of TtT programs: the challenges faced are of sustainability, scalability, building community of practice networks, valuing trainer efforts; continued training opportunities.

A second part of the workshop was dedicated to breakout sessions, inviting all participants to discuss:

- Specific aims of TtT provision across ELIXIR-EXCELERATE;
- Framing an ELIXIR-EXCELERATE TtT course;
- Sources of material for delivery; and
- Who will deliver – how to develop a cohort of TtT trainers.

At the end of the workshop, an outline of the first year of the pilot programme was defined, and individuals to deliver it were identified (intending to train further individuals during the pilot).

In this paper, consistent with the 'instructor' and 'trainer' definitions adopted by the SWC/DC communities, we use the term 'new instructor' to indicate a TtT course completer ('instructor', here,

referring to an individual who teaches bioinformatics) and 'trainers' to refer to those individuals who were, or became, qualified to teach EE-TtT courses.

In April 2016, the initial pool of instructor trainers met at the University of Cambridge, UK, to start collecting materials, and to discuss the content and structure of the pilot courses. Two models were particularly influential in this process: the TtT programme at EMBL-EBI (Watson-Haigh *et al.*, 2013) and the SWC/DC Instructor training (Teal *et al.*, 2015; Wilson, 2016). The former inspired the four core topics that were selected for the EE-TtT pilot courses (see Table 1 and the following section). The initial content of each core topic was based on the EMBL-EBI TtT and Carpentries Instructor training materials (<http://swcarpentry.github.io/instructor-training/>). The EMBL-EBI TtT is the longest running programme (since 2012) and is focused on providing practical guidance for developing and delivering engaging training in any aspect of bioinformatics, building a network of support for new trainers to exchange ideas and encouraging them to reflect on their practice and development. The teaching philosophy of the SWC/DC communities is based on key research findings about how people learn, and how best to teach them. It was also decided to adopt a number of 'challenges' (*i.e.*, practical exercises); from the Carpentries training we use an exercise in which participants, in groups of three, video each other teaching, then watch the videos and give and act upon feedback. This is combined with exercises from EMBL-EBI training on creating appropriate aims and outcomes, which are peer-reviewed within the group, along with sessions focused on the practicalities of running bioinformatics training. EE-TtT materials are being further developed on the basis of additional exploration of educational psychology principles and theories (see, for example, Ambrose *et al.*, 2010; Brown *et al.*, 2014; Dunlosky *et al.*, 2013; Green, 2015; Lang, 2016).

The pilot was delivered in seven EE-TtT courses - each using a slightly different format and focus - and one workshop on 'Using clouds and virtual machines in bioinformatic training'. Teaching materials were progressively accumulated in a freely accessible GitHub repository (<https://github.com/TrainTheTrainer/EXCELERATE-TtT>).

Table 1. Core sessions of the EE-TtT courses. The EE-TtT pilot courses, as well as the training materials, are structured in four main sessions. The four sessions allow for flexibility in the mode of delivery and personalisation from the trainers.

Session #	Element / Subject
Session 1	Principles of learning and how they apply to training
Session 2	Training techniques for enhancing learner engagement and participation
Session 3	Designing engaging sessions, materials and courses
Session 4	Assessment and feedback in training and developing reflective practice

The TtT pilot and training materials are described in more detail below.

EE-TtT pilot delivery and outcomes

The EE-TtT pilot training sessions

As mentioned earlier, the point of the TtT programme is not to produce a new group of educationalists; rather, it is to offer guidance, ideas and tips for training development and delivery based on research-driven educational principles, ultimately aiming to develop a skilled network of instructors able to deliver engaging content in an interactive manner.

During discussions at the kick-off workshop in Cambridge (above), the four main elements listed in [Table 1](#) were identified as the basis for the content and delivery of a course that would meet the original TtT aims.

These four high-level elements were then expanded to create the basis for the content and final structure of the course. The four sessions are built in a flexible / modular manner, so they can be easily delivered according to the needs of the audience. Depending on the type of audience, trainers may decide to emphasise some concepts and activities, while attenuating the relevance of others or even omitting them.

1. **Principles of learning.** This session includes: terms commonly used in the science of learning (albeit often far from standardised); 'learning objectives' and 'learning outcomes', their differences and uses; how learning works; how memory works; Bloom's six categories of cognitive skills (knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation) ([Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001](#); [Bloom & Krathwohl, 1956](#)), how these can generate awareness in teachers, be used to understand the process of learning, and ultimately be applied to develop and deliver a lesson, session or course; most relevant learning theories; learner motivation and demotivation; novices versus experts in learning; the concept of cognitive load; learning methods/activities; active learning and learning-by-doing principles. The seven research-based principles of learning by [Ambrose et al., 2010](#), and their implications for teaching practice, are finally listed.
2. **Training techniques.** This session proposes a number of training techniques that have been observed to effectively enhance learners' engagement and facilitate their learning. Good and bad training practices are explored, and what makes a good teacher/trainer is discussed. In this context, the skills matrix for trainers developed by the TtT taskforce of the Global Organisation for Bioinformatics Learning, Education and Training ([GOBLET](http://mygoblet.org) <http://mygoblet.org>, [Attwood et al., 2015](#)), which provides an overview of the major skills required to be a good trainer, is also introduced. Strategies to motivate learners and promote their engagement, and behaviours that demotivate them are also described, as well as attitudes and activities that can be used to integrate active learning/learning-by-doing strategies in a course. How to create a comfortable and engaging environment for learning is explained; methods for bioinformatics training are also considered.

3. **Designing sessions.** This includes defining the needs of an audience; writing appropriate and realistic learning outcomes using Bloom's taxonomy; practical methods for lesson design, development and delivery, including the use of learning objectives/outcomes and concept maps; and how to create a concept map and develop a lesson plan. From lesson to session and course design; where to find inspiration. Other related topics include: developing, sharing, archiving and making training materials reusable; training material repositories and resources; training rooms for bioinformatics; reproducibility of training environments; preparatory steps for training delivery.
4. **Assessment and feedback.** This covers formative versus summative assessment; formative assessment in class to gauge trainee engagement/learning; monitoring training impact in real-time; how to use questionnaires to promote peer instruction and content delivery; how to design diagnostic questionnaires to assess learners' prior knowledge and mental models (multiple choice questions with distractors), and adapt the training accordingly; using learners' feedback both to assess training quality and instructor performance and as a tool for course development; using feedback as a reflective practitioner; how to gain useful feedback post-course; short- and long-term feedback.

Throughout the course, a balance is struck between theoretical and practical elements, providing an interactive experience where all participants (trainers and instructors) can readily share their thoughts and ideas. All individuals who join the course have some experience of training or teaching - whether it be training / teaching they have delivered, or training / teaching that they have received; this gives everyone a basis for discussion of what training is and is not, or should and should not be. This exchange of thoughts, ideas and experiences makes for a more engaging course, and seeds early network building, and the formation of links that will hopefully endure.

As mentioned previously, the nature of the course, structured in a modular fashion, with an emphasis on interaction and sharing, allows for flexibility in the mode of delivery. This also allows for personalisation from the trainers based on their experience, background and familiarity with learning principles, and the needs, priorities and peculiarities of specific audiences and courses.

During the initial kick-off workshop, two potential models of delivery were identified: stand-alone courses, and courses delivered alongside a training course on a specific subject. These models were implemented in the pilot courses in a variety of different ways ([Table 2](#)), depending on the training opportunities available and the type of learners. The modes of delivery are briefly described below:

One-day course: stand-alone one-day session, focused on providing the theoretical elements listed above, but nevertheless applying an interactive approach (*i.e.*, ensuring that there is still adequate time for discussion/sharing ideas, *etc.*).

Table 2. EE-TtT pilot courses. EE-TtT pilot courses were delivered using two main models: 1) standalone courses lasting one or two days; 2) courses including at least one additional session in which learners sit in on a live training event as observers and/or helpers. Afterwards, trainers and trainees sit together to discuss what they saw in the live classroom and what impact that may have on their own practice.

Pilot details	Number of participants	Mode of delivery
Pilot 1: Cambridge, UK 9-10 th May, 2016	9	2 days – 1 day theory, 1 day practical
Pilot 2: Oeiras, PT 9–15 th July, 2016	8	6 days – 1 focused on session 1 and 2, 5 run alongside a live training event; session 3 and 4 were delivered at the end of these days together with discussion sessions to critique the live training course in line with TtT participants' learning.
Pilot 3: Cambridge, UK 11–12 th July, 2016	11	2 days – 1 day theory, 1 day practical
Pilot 4: Rome, IT 24 th October, 2016	8	1 day – focus on theory, but with interactive discussions throughout.
Pilot 5: Ljubljana, SL 28–30 th November, 2016	8	2.5 days - 2 standalone + 0.5 run alongside a live training event.
Pilot 6: Lausanne, CH 16–18 th January, 2017	7	3 days - 2 standalone + 1 run alongside a live training event.
Pilot 7: Oeiras, PT 19–20 th January, 2017	10	2 days – standalone

Two-day course: the first day focuses on theoretical elements, similar to the one-day course, but day two provides trainees with an opportunity to put into practice some of the elements introduced and discussed in day one. This includes delivering a short 'training session' on a topic of their choice and gaining real-time feedback; editing and re-presenting this session to the wider group; working in small groups to expand upon one of their chosen topics to deliver a whole session, including the writing of aims and objectives; drafting requirements to run a course, including computational needs; defining the feedback required both for their practice development and session revision.

Course alongside training course: essentially the same as the other modes, but running alongside a training course on a specific subject. The idea is that observing experienced trainers at work, putting elements of pedagogical theory into practice in a 'live' setting, and then having the chance to discuss their observations with other trainers is a valuable learning experience. Whenever possible, TtT participants are therefore offered the chance to sit in on a training session on a specific bioinformatics/computational subject (Linux shell, Python, RNA-Seq data analysis, *etc.*) as a supplement to the four core TtT sessions, and time is allocated to discuss the experience.

The EE-TtT training materials

The structure, content and presentation of the materials was systematically developed as the pilot progressed, and will continue to be honed and reviewed as the project continues.

Materials include items for running the sessions (session outlines, slides, activities, *etc.*), and a set of supporting items, which provide further reading, greater detail, and reinforcement of concepts (references, articles, videos, *etc.*).

Structure. The structure of the materials for running the sessions follows the four essential elements listed in Table 1.

Content. The content is the result of ideas and materials collected from educational psychology research literature (see, for example, Ambrose *et al.*, 2010; Brown *et al.*, 2014; Green, 2015) and from SWC Instructor Training and EMBL-EBI TtT, and also reports a number of successful strategies drawn from trainers' experiences. Elements of theory are interleaved with activities and practical exercises.

Presentation. Materials have been made publicly available through a Github repository (<https://github.com/TrainTheTrainer/EXCELERATE-TtT>) and Supplementary file 2, Supplementary file 3. Core materials are currently written in Markdown, and used as visual support in some of the EE-TtT courses. Feedback received at the end of EE-TtT courses in which we displayed content directly from the GitHub website, suggested we should use less distracting and crowded visual aids. We are therefore working to re-organise them into smaller chunks, using a Markdown converter to produce a more interactive format for presentation during courses. Moreover, and importantly, we are working in close collaboration with GOBLET to restructure the materials

based on Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable (FAIR) standards (Wilkinson *et al.*, 2016). A set of slides is also available in the GitHub repository and used as visual support in some courses.

Engaging with infrastructures for training set-up

A more technical workshop on using clouds and VMs in bioinformatics training was held at **CSC- IT Center for Science** (FI) in May 2016, in order to bring everybody abreast with the full potential of these technologies (<https://csc.fi/web/training/-/cloud-vm-bioinformatics>). This EE-TtT workshop gathered more than 30 bioinformatics trainers and infrastructure specialists from 13 countries to share their experiences and knowledge on using clouds, VM images and Docker in training.

Bioinformatics analyses typically involve a large amount of software and reference data, making the installation process time-consuming. This problem is aggravated in course settings where every participant needs to have an identical installation, sufficient hardware to run it, and, ideally, access to an identical set-up after the course. VMs and the use of cloud computing can provide solutions to these training challenges. VMs can be run on a laptop, server or cloud (with appropriate virtualisation software), and provide all trainees with an identical software environment in which to work. Additionally, to continue their learning, trainees have the potential to use the VM once a course has ended.

An important element of this workshop was therefore to encourage new instructors to explore and implement the use of VMs and cloud-based systems in their training, and also to provide them with the skills to develop and manage these technologies. The dialogue between bioinformatics instructors and infrastructure providers also allowed the latter to gain valuable knowledge on the special needs that bioinformatics training poses.

All the workshop materials are available in the **GitHub** (<https://github.com/ekorpela/cloud-vm-workshop/>), and the lectures were recorded and made available in **YouTube** (https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLD5Xtevf3yHDQZkvO_1kIYd7ZPlmY8j4). Guidelines on how to use clouds, VM images and Docker in training, and how to access computing infrastructures providing these technologies, will be released alongside EE-TtT materials.

Discussion and future directions

This paper describes the Train-the-Trainer pilot project that was designed, developed and carried out in the context of ELIXIR-EXCELERATE. The EE-TtT pilot represents an essential step towards a sustainable and scalable ELIXIR TtT programme, and the development of a network of trainers and instructors within the ELIXIR community. We ran seven courses, trained more than sixty new instructors and started training three new TtT trainers. We also developed - and have already used - a first draft of supporting materials, and have started structuring them according to the FAIR principles. Most importantly, we have gained further insight into both the potential and challenges of delivering such a programme in the ELIXIR context.

Participant feedback collected at the end of each course has given strong, positive indications of the perceived utility of the programme, but the longer-term impact of the training on the individuals who received it needs to be reviewed. To this end, we will shortly invite all participants to complete a long-term feedback survey, providing us with a more concrete view of the impact this training has had on their own practice. Expectation sessions run during a number of the courses suggested that participants did gain a number of ‘take away’ lessons, and we need to determine whether these were actually put into practice and how this affected the training they delivered.

Another important issue is how to increase the number of TtT trainers who are able to deliver courses independently. The approach taken to date has been to develop interested trainers by having them initially attend a TtT course as a learner, then attend a second course as an assistant. However, the few new candidate TtT trainers who have undertaken this process, despite long-standing experience in bioinformatics training / teaching, felt that, after attending just one or two EE-TtT courses, they were neither knowledgeable nor experienced enough in the pedagogical elements of the course to teach it themselves.

Given that most trainers have had no formal training in education theory, it will be essential to get this balance right, if the programme is to scale. We therefore need to learn from this as the course matures, and capitalise on existing experience. This could include identifying opportunities to work with experienced instructors: for example, becoming a SWC/DC instructor trainer is a quite demanding and compelling process, requiring learners to meet once a week for eight weeks to engage in discussions around teaching pedagogy. New instructors then shadow a teaching demonstration and part of an online instructor training event and attend regular meetings of the trainer community. Their training is completed after delivering two instructor-training workshops (ideally, one in person and one online). To remain an active trainer, a new trainer **commits to teach at least two instructor training events per year**, among the other things (see <https://github.com/carpentries/policies/blob/master/trainer-agreement.md>). Furthermore, the availability of very detailed and consistent training materials is an extremely helpful support, especially for new instructors; and the presence of an experienced community of trainers, who meet at least twice a month, is key to sharing experiences and hence developing new trainers’ self-confidence.

Another example from which valuable lessons may be drawn is a recent course run by the EMBL-EBI Node as part of an ongoing collaboration with Australian trainers, in which a group that had previously been participants in a TtT course, with significant training experience, were remotely coached to deliver a very successful TtT session. Their critical feedback will be instrumental in understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the current programme, and the opportunities that may exist to evolve and improve the course, ultimately to create more, and more confident, trainers.

As part of the ongoing, rigorous process of assessment, we put the outcomes of the EE-TtT pilot programme under a microscope, one year after it started. This was done using a Degrees of Freedom Analysis (Tractenberg, 2017) of the features of the EE-TtT pilot courses, in terms of their utility, feasibility, sustainability of learning, and scalability, with the aim of bringing out strengths and weaknesses of the programme. The results of this detailed analysis are presented in a separate paper (Via *et al.*, 2017).

Thanks to the enthusiastic work of a group of individuals involved in the EE-TtT activities, we designed, developed and reviewed a new TtT pilot programme tailored to the training needs of the ELIXIR community. We are now ready to move forward and consolidate the EE-TtT programme for the remainder of the EXCELERATE period and beyond.

Author contributions

EK, LL, SLM, PMP and AV co-wrote the EE-TtT subtask proposal. SLM and AV co-led the EE-TtT subtask. PF, SLM, AV were the

key people in organising and delivery of EE-TtT courses and in the writing of the materials. PF, JD, DM, GR, PMP and AV were also the local host of one or more EE-TtT courses. JD, LL, DM, PMP and GR were also training assistant in EE-TtT courses. GR & LL were also involved in the initial material preparation. EK was local host and organiser of the workshop on VMs & Cloud in Training. TKA is involved in the restructuring of the materials based on FAIR standards. SLM, PMP and AV co-wrote the manuscript, with all authors critically reviewing it.

Competing interests

No competing interests were disclosed.

Grant information

This work was funded by ELIXIR, the research infrastructure for life-science data. ELIXIR received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (ELIXIR- EXCELERATE, grant agreement no 676559).

The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Supplementary material

Supplementary file 1 - EXCELERATE Train-the-trainer and Training Impact workshop report – This is a document reporting the objectives, agenda, participants, outcomes, and future directions of the EE-TtT ‘kick-off’ workshop described in the manuscript.

[Click here to access the data.](#)

References

- Ambrose SA, Bridges MW, Dipietro M, *et al.*: **How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching**. 2010; ISBN: 978-0-470-48410-4. [Reference Source](#)
- Anderson LW, Krathwohl DR: **A taxonomy for learning, teaching and assessing: A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of educational objectives: Complete edition**. New York: Longman. 2001. [Reference Source](#)
- Attwood TK, Bongcam-Rudloff E, Brazas ME, *et al.*: **GOBLET: the Global Organisation for Bioinformatics Learning, Education and Training**. *PLoS Comput Biol*. 2015; 11(4): e1004143. [PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Bloom BS, Krathwohl DR: **Taxonomy of educational objectives: the classification of educational goals, by a committee of college and university examiners. Handbook 1: Cognitive domain**. New York: Longman. 1956. [Reference Source](#)
- Brown PC, Roediger HL, McDaniel MA: **Make it stick**. Harvard University Press, 2014; ISBN 978-0674729018. [Reference Source](#)
- Dunlosky J, Rawon K, Marsh E, *et al.*: **What Works, What Doesn't**. The Scientific American Mind (mind.scientificamerican.com). 2013. [Reference Source](#)
- Green E: **Building a Better Teacher: How Teaching Works**. W W Norton & Co Inc. 2015; ISBN 978-0-393-35108-8. [Reference Source](#)
- Lang JM: **Small Teaching: Everyday Lessons from the Science of Learning**. ISBN: 978-1-118-94449-3. 2016. [Reference Source](#)
- Teal TK, Cranston KA, Lapp H, *et al.*: **Data Carpentry: Workshops to Increase Data Literacy for Researchers**. *International Journal of Digital Curation*. 2015; 10(1): 135–143. [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Tractenberg RE: **Degrees of Freedom Analysis in educational research and decision-making: Leveraging qualitative and survey data to promote excellence in bioinformatics training and education**. *Brief Bioinform*. In press, 2017.
- van Gelder C, Morgan S, Via A, *et al.*: **Report on the training needs identified across the ELIXIR community**. *Zenodo*. 2016. [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Via A, Attwood TK, Fernandes PL, *et al.*: **A new pan-European Train-the-Trainer Programme for bioinformatics: Pilot results on feasibility, utility and sustainability of learning**. *Brief Bioinform*. Under review, 2017.
- Via A, Blicher T, Bongcam-Rudloff E, *et al.*: **Best practices in bioinformatics training for life scientists**. *Brief Bioinform*. 2013; 14(5): 528–37. [PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Watson-Haigh NS, Shang CA, Haimel M, *et al.*: **Next-generation sequencing: a challenge to meet the increasing demand for training workshops in Australia**. *Brief Bioinform*. 2013; 14(5): 563–74. [PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Wilkinson MD, Dumontier M, Aalbersberg IJ, *et al.*: **The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship**. *Sci Data*. 2016; 3: 160018. [PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Wilson G: **Software Carpentry: lessons learned [version 2; referees: 3 approved]**. *F1000Res*. 2016; 3: 62. [PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)

Open Peer Review

Current Peer Review Status:

Version 1

Reviewer Report 12 September 2017

<https://doi.org/10.5256/f1000research.13350.r25363>

© 2017 Gurwitz K. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Kim T. Gurwitz

H3ABioNet - the pan African bioinformatics network; Computational Biology Division, Department of Integrative Biomedical Sciences, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

This is a well-written, clear, and concise article describing the conceptualization, development, and implementation of the Elixir Excelerate train-the-trainer pilot programme (2016-2017). The article highlights best practices for training bioinformatics trainers in how to deliver bioinformatics training to others. The article itself, together with the programme's freely available materials (links provided within the article), comprise an excellent resource for those interested in learning about, and/or running, a train-the-trainer programme themselves.

I have 5 additional comments, for consideration:

1. Paragraph 2 and 3 of the Introduction outline the current state of bioinformatics training in Europe. While these statements might be widely accepted in Europe, it is suggested that citations are added, where possible, for a non-European audience.
2. In paragraph 2 of the Introduction, the authors state that 'Bioinformatics seldom forms a core part of formal life-science degree programmes in Europe'. Perhaps slightly outside the scope of this article, however, it would be interesting to spend one or two more sentences explaining the interplay between formal degree programmes and 'point of need' training courses in Europe. In doing so, one might contextualize some of the challenges that bioinformatics trainers encounter as well as the level, and type, of training that they would be expected to deliver against a backdrop of increasing demand for bioinformatics training. Further, it would be interesting to hear the authors' opinion on why bioinformatics has not been formally incorporated into formal life-science degree programmes in Europe, especially given its increasing importance in the sciences.
3. Page 4 para. 9 – there should be two separate hyperlinks to 'EMBL-EBI TtT' and 'Carpentry Instructors', respectively. Currently, it is formatted as one long hyperlink with no clear distinction. Further, the full url is only provided for the Carpentries website and not for the EMBL-EBI website.

4. Page 8 para. 6 ('presentation') – mentions supplementary files 2 and 3, but links to these are not included at the end of the article?
5. From the text it is apparent that the 'infrastructure for training set up' workshop was run as a separate event to the train-the-trainer workshops. Could one argue that infrastructure requirements are integral to teaching bioinformatics as they speak to the learning environment? Perhaps one might consider incorporating an element of this into the core train-the-trainer curriculum, if not already included?

Is the topic of the opinion article discussed accurately in the context of the current literature?

Yes

Are all factual statements correct and adequately supported by citations?

Partly

Are arguments sufficiently supported by evidence from the published literature?

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn balanced and justified on the basis of the presented arguments?

Yes

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard.

Reviewer Report 12 September 2017

<https://doi.org/10.5256/f1000research.13350.r25365>

© 2017 Williams J. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Jason J. Williams

DNA Learning Center, Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, Cold Spring Harbor, NY, USA

This article is an important contribution to the global effort of improving bioinformatics training. Nearly everywhere in the life sciences, institutions, laboratories, and individuals are seeking out bioinformatics training and expertise to advance their research. There are lots of solutions, but none have emerged as a clear standard.

The authors informatively describe the ELIXIR-EXCELERATE train-the-trainers (TtT) pilot as an effort that anyone interested in bioinformatics training will want to pay attention to. The merit of the the ELIXIR TtT approach to not to train on domain science/expertise, but to educate instructors on

pedagogical best practices - borrowing from Software/Data Carpentry instructor training and previous EMBL-EBI training efforts.

The audience trainers will reach is a common one (the biggest? most critical?); researchers who are seeking 'point of need' training. As bioinformatics becomes more skilled at putting tools in researchers hands (Docker, HPC, easy(er)-to-use software), we must also be concerned about users (who may not have bioinformatics/statistical expertise) and their ability to understand the proper use and functionalities of these tools. Importantly therefore, TtT aims to get these domain bioinformatician-trainers to be aware of educational practice - with the goal of helping them better design learning materials and evaluate if they are successfully engaging their audience in learning.

Overall - the article is very well written. I don't want to change the focus of the report, but I do offer a few comments that might be improvements or prompt the authors to elaborate:

1. On the "commonalities for the features" provided (my page 4 - PDF); Item 1 speaks about "examples of courses to demonstrate possible developments." I was not sure at all what was meant. Should TtT training provide examples of courses where TtT skills are implemented? Something else?
2. (my page 4) you introduce the SWC/DC community trainer definitions. Someone with no knowledge of SWC/DC might not know what this means or why it's important. In the next paragraph you introduce SWC/DC comprehensively, so maybe integrate this with the paragraph below?
3. (my page 5) When you introduce the modes of delivery, I was slightly confused. You said two modes were proposed, but are there three in practice: standalone one-day, stand-alone two-day, and a mixed mode with the one/two-day course held next to a science workshop? Minor, but was confused here.
4. In the Discussion and future directions section (my page 7) you mention the challenges of delivering your program in ELIXIR context? Might you elaborate on one/some of the special challenges of ELIXIR? This would be especially relevant if you could compare to other programs that might have similar challenges in some ways (H3ABioNet Africa?).
5. In the same section as item my 4, you mention SWC/DC instructor training as 8-weeks, they now have a two-day in-person/online version.
6. If I could ask a "follow up" question of this paper, it would be to see some type of summary/profile of the learners who attended the TtT workshops? How many of them had teaching experience? Gender ratios? Just whatever metrics you could provide. I would be curious about how many bioinformaticians that might not see themselves as trainers might see themselves in this cohort.

Thanks for this work.

Is the topic of the opinion article discussed accurately in the context of the current literature?

Yes

Are all factual statements correct and adequately supported by citations?

Yes

Are arguments sufficiently supported by evidence from the published literature?

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn balanced and justified on the basis of the presented arguments?

Yes

Competing Interests: I attended (virtually) a portion of a workshop involved in the initial conception of the training program. I however have had no input, contribution, or collaboration with any of the authors on the development and/or implementation of the project since my attendance at that January 2016 meeting.

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard.

The benefits of publishing with F1000Research:

- Your article is published within days, with no editorial bias
- You can publish traditional articles, null/negative results, case reports, data notes and more
- The peer review process is transparent and collaborative
- Your article is indexed in PubMed after passing peer review
- Dedicated customer support at every stage

For pre-submission enquiries, contact research@f1000.com

F1000Research