24/07/14

Notes Conference Debriefing Meeting

Posters

* posters in back rooms were not visited enough, because they could not easily be found; most posters were uniformly visited except these corners
* posters in the space next to the Van Hasseltzaal were difficult to see because of bad lighting
* good: keeping up posters throughout conference
* there were many posters, and it was hard to get through; suggestion to split into two sessions; remind participants that they are laid out in themes (indicate which subject where); many people did not use the map; find some additional way of indicating them; maybe have posters in one big room (this is difficult at the Aula)
* don’t mention that 45% of the papers are presented as a poster; just indicate the number of posters
* poster awards were announced late in the conference; judging was not quick enough; prepare judges earlier (as it is quite time consuming); thread chairs can nominate the 3 or 4 best papers to the SIG chairs; judges can then focus on these posters (if the posters are good as well).
* the quality of the posters in some areas was low; some should have been rejected or helped to improve; be bit more explicit about the criteria to improve poster

Program

* some reviews are not helpful; ask thread chair to compile useful reviews and make that visible to the authors
* if a paper is rejected, ask thread chair to add 2 or 3 lines to argue why the paper is rejected; this field in the online system is now not used
* authors welcome feedback
* not all papers are submitted in the appropriate thread (author picks); iSIG chair did not get information systems papers
* new review form? set up a small committee to look at reviewing criteria/reviewing scale; include Pal Davidson, Bob Eberlein, Etiënne Rouwette, Martin Schaffernicht; items that were mentioned: causal loop diagrams (none, not applicable, errors), same for stock-flows and maths; a model should be available at least to reviewers; instead of “use of SD” as a criterion, motivate why it is useful for SD
* re-review of papers is not possible
* model expo sessions positive; there could have been more visitors; some people did not know where it was; model expo should be after presentation of a paper, so that author can point to model expo
* good idea to put summer school before the conference
* maybe bundle registration for summer school and the conference, but home office should not be burdened
* maybe have introduction to System Dynamics at the beginning of the conference or in relation to newcomers’ meeting; intro to SD at business day was also attended by some regular conference participants, but this was on Wednesday
* plenary selection is difficult; UNEP session was good; sessions were also selected according to geographical diversity and most came up through the review process; pay more attention to novices in plenaries who may use wrong concepts; suggestion to review the plenary presentations/slides two months in advance – this gives the program chairs the option to tell plenary presenters ‘if you want to present in a plenary slot, you need to send the slides to the Program Chairs two months in advance and have a discussion on the presentation’

Facilities

* the rooms are very big; not really a problem; in auditorium a part could be blocked off and more lights should be on
* there were some meetings in rooms that were not really suitable for a small meeting; provide rooms with meeting table
* temperature fluctuated in the Aula; on Monday it was too hot and on Wednesday it was too cold
* good: lounge room
* it was good to have the two locations (Aula & TPM), but a long walk; it may be nice to have some parts at the MIT campus next year
* room layout is confusing; Aula building is confusing; introduce “help me staff” – participants who know the building and can assist others; show 3D model or explain in plenary

Food

* either include lunch in the conference fee, or leave out lunch
* food was too heavy
* lines no problem, except for poster buffet (somewhat)
* provide snacks (vegan); not just cookies, and cookies were finished too quickly
* compliments for the boat, but can’t be repeated