**2018 Iceland Conference Debriefing Meeting, August 10, 2018 at 12.00-13.00**

**Oddi – Hama, University of Iceland**

**Version 2. Updated 9-17-2018**

Roberta Spencer, Chair

In attendance: Munaf Aamir, Jeff Trailer, Erik Pruyt, Donna Johnson, Mark Nelson, David Lounsbury, Allyson Beal, Eliot Rich, Brad Morrison, Harald Sverdrup, Erika Palmer, Martina Curran, John Ansah, Karim Chichakly, Anna Ólafsdóttir, Len Malczynski, Etiënne Rouwette, Mike Breslin, Babak Bahaddin, Bob Eberlein (other missing names)

**Notes:**

It was noted that we were very lucky that the weather was great.

About the live streaming for the public plenary, some people did not know it was happening. We need to advertise more. Raafat noted our conference should have more live streaming. Thanks to Raafat and Angelika for all the effort.

Conference venue (facilities) and location:

* Liked the banquet for mingling. Not stuck at a table. Networking was much better.
* 9 rooms too many sessions at one time, too many good things to show. Donna suggests to repeat sessions.
* Divided plenary sessions was a challenge – one room is better. Split plenary was a “mixed bag.”
* Need 10 minute breaks shown in the schedule, couldn’t start on time
* Scheduling issues – Bob said a solution is to mix WiP and parallel in the same session.
* Gathering spaces, great to have the Hama area
* Technology:
  + Some rooms didn’t have hdmi – old technology.
  + Other spaces did not have wifi.
  + Needed more extension cords.
  + Solve the compatibility problem.
  + Give everyone a thumb drive.
  + Have presentations in one single location.
  + WiP slides in the cloud.
  + Using own computer –there were problems. Suggestion that presenters should bring their own stuff for connecting. Or the conference should invest. Check out in the location, what are the connectors.
* At banquet, poor sound projection. Consider announcements beforehand, not at banquet.
* Generally, more difficult at a university.

Printed materials pre- and during conference:

* Did anyone use the online program? Online version worked well.
* Erik missed the personalized schedule.
* Eliot did not like single filter for online schedule. Couldn’t see what happened across multiple days. Suggestion to use monitors: “this is what is going on now.” Could be downloadable into Excel for customization. Image of map included in online program to show where the session is held would be helpful.
* Mark Nelson suggested the X-CD phone app as a module to review

Reykjavík as the venue:

* Accommodations worked well, get away from conference. This format can work (Brad).
* Lunch was great. Helps with networking. But, six beans didn’t do it. Second two days was better.
* Can have meetings, etc.
* Provide a map. “How to find dinner.”

Scheduling:

* Should be same week in July. In terms of coordinating with other groups helps us chain our events together.
* Change of week – hurt attendance. Maybe doing too much in one conference.
* Change of Su-Th, to M-F. This is a big question, and Colloquium organizers liked having the event on Monday rather than Sunday. Erika said Sunday is harder.
* Don’t schedule over holiday.
* Len – people don’t want to travel on weekends.
* There were volunteer schedule conflicts and issues.
* Poster Symposium
  + Scan on poster. Or photo on poster board.
  + Too congested, need to layout. Needs good lighting. Grouping by thread.
    - Up at one time with threads scheduled at different times.
* Length of day – long.
* Colloquium
  + Erika mentioned that the coordination with Student Colloquium sometimes in the past has had a disconnect, but there have been developments where they feel, much more included.
  + Felt the submission system was easier.
  + Looking forward to building relationship with local chairs and with program chairs.
  + Pleased with things developing. Grow by change in mindset – Monday helped attendance.
  + Eliot asked how many EMSD attended: Erika, they are not sure yet, 30’s tops.
  + May need to include Colloquium in insurance, extend coverage.

Most conference items will be covered a conference survey online.

Bob notes there will be meetings scheduled in September regarding program issues.

By email from Yutaka Takahashi:

Because I cannot be present at the conference debriefing, I would like to send you my comments. (I am leaving Iceland just now.)

1. Feedback sessions' general instruction part sharing

This new style was really instructive.

I joined one of them.

The chairperson gave comments to each work politely and encouragingly, then gave a general guideline to compile a research paper using SD.

I don't know other feedback session has the same structure.

But if so, the latter part (general guideline) should be shared widely in society members and prospective members.

Making PowerPoint file open in the internet or making YouTube video of it would be effective not only to individual papers' improve quality but also collect new members.

As Nacho said in conference speech, our new, non-veteran membership is not increasing recently.

"How to do" would encourage people to join us.

2. Feedback sessions' individual comments

My friend joined another feedback session and let me know the chairperson actively discuss original authors.

My room was rather lecture style (no dialog).

Maybe the former style would more instructive.

If we ask it to all chairpersons, maybe the number of papers in one session need to be decreased due to time limitation and chairperson’s workload.

3. WIP sessions

This new style was also exciting.

One of possible improvement points is presenter instruction in advance.

Some, not a few, presenters talked very fast because they feel five minutes is too short to talk sufficiently.

(My neighbor English native speaker also said so!)

This session's great point is that authors can obtain a next step with audience.

So, "rushing to the final slide" style presentation would suffer the attractiveness of WIP sessions.

It can be said that this is a presentation training matter.

But, I believe in-advance-instruction can make them better.

In addition to PowerPoint contents instruction, how about give presenters the information about what to talk and what to omit.

I feel the latter is important because I found presenters who looked to try to put the full paper content in 3 page slides presentations.

By email from Steve Peterson:

1. Can you please share this note with Birgit and with the program chairs for this year and next year? I don’t have their emails. Thanks.
2. Overall, I very much appreciated this year’s program. The inclusion of practitioner project powerpoints (without formal academic papers) is a great thing, as is the work-in-process category.
3. Re work-in-in-process, I think that the format for the sessions could be improved considerably. Ideas:ho
   1. 5 rather than 6 presentations per session. I think that 6 may be too many!
   2. 3-slide format works well. Consider encouraging people to present ESSENCE of approach/DH on slide 2.
   3. I think that it is REALLY important in the WIP sessions to apply some simple facilitation principles to create the “space” for productive discussion of the work presented. My students, and a few others, indicated to me that the sessions they attended were not very good/effective/useful. On the other hand, the session that I chaired seemed to go VERY well (you should cross-check this with Birgit and Inge, who attended this session). This apparent success may be in part the result of some simple facilitation approaches:

I introduced myself to each person as they came in the room.

I asked participants to help me to re-configure the room so that everyone could see one another. We ended up clustered around two rows of tables, with people facing one another.

At the beginning of the session, I asked people to introduce themselves

Rather than be the time-keeper, I handed people my phone with its timer set to 5 minutes, and asked them to keep control of time. I then advanced slides as they directed.

After each presentation, I facilitated a very brief discussion of the topic (guidance on this was ambiguous, but I think that waiting until the end of the session might create too large of a cognitive load for people. With a smaller number of presentations, it should be possible to conclude the session with a brief discussion of “big themes” that emerged from the presentations while still having discussions after each presentation)

At the end of the session, I thanked each person for their participation, acknowledging that people took a risk to present work that was not complete (Ideally I would have done this acknowledgement at the outset of the session)

1. The education day poster session was a bit of a disappointment
   1. The location was too far away from the beaten path
   2. The session coincided with a break, so conference attendees had competing demands on their time
   3. As a result, we have very few interactions for my students, who in many cases spent their own money to come to the conference. They deserved better, and the two students who participated in the large poster session had a MUCH better and more productive experience.
2. Consider an education theme that runs across the days of the conference rather than a single education day.
3. The parallel-plenaries on Thursday AM were a disappointment, and defeated the idea of education day to some extent. I would have loved to hear Paich speak, and I think that everybody would have benefitted from the talks in the “education” plenary.

Added 9-17-2018

By email from Douglas McKelvie:

I completed the evaluation form, but had one important comment that did not fit easily …

I think that the approach taken at the Work in Progress session I attended (excellently facilitated by David Lane, who had obviously given some thought to how to manage the process) would also work for a Parallel session. In the WiP session, there were five presenters, each got five minutes, and then there was a general discussion. We therefore had an extended discussion, and some cross-fertilisation of ideas between the different papers presented. This was much more engaging than a typical Parallel session where, of necessity, there is a very strict routine of a 15 minute talk followed by 5 minutes of questions, and each paper is discussed separately. I know that that is because some people like to move in and out of sessions, but it makes for quite a stultifying discussion.

Probably five presenters of ‘parallel standard’ papers would be too many, but I would like someone to look at the parallel format and consider how there could be a richer discussion.

All in all, one of the best conferences we have had. Congratulations.

**Douglas McKelvie** [douglas@symmetriclab.com](mailto:douglas@symmetriclab.com)

