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New York City, USA

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/NPT2R85
Survey Questions

• What was your overall impression of MICRO?
• What was your impression of the MICRO Workshops?
• What was your impression of the MICRO tutorials?
• What is your impression of the Westin Times-Square venue for MICRO?
• What is your impression of the food served at MICRO?
• What is your impression of the organization of MICRO?
• How well did the Program Committee do in selecting papers?
• For submitting authors: How was the quality of reviews that you received?
• PC members should be allowed to submit papers to MICRO.
• Please provide any other comments.
What was your overall impression of MICRO?

- Excellent: 45
- Good: 47
- Fair: 7
- Poor: 1
What was your impression of the MICRO Workshops?

- Excellent: 26
- Good: 33
- Fair: 11
- Poor: 1

Year: 2008
What was your impression of the MICRO tutorials?

- Excellent: 27
- Good: 17
- Fair: 8
- Poor: 0

(Additional data: 2008, Excellent: 4, Good: 7, Fair: 5, Poor: 1)
Impression of Westin Times Square Hotel venue for MICRO?

What is your impression of this Lake Como venue for MICRO?

2008
What is your impression of the food served at MICRO?

Excellent: 18
Good: 41
Fair: 33
Poor: 8
What is your impression of the organization of MICRO?

- Excellent: 52%
- Good: 33%
- Fair: 11%
- Poor: 2%

(2008 data: 17 Excellent, 6 Good, 2 Fair, 2 Poor)
How well did the Program Committee do in selecting papers?

- Excellent: 21
- Good: 56
- Fair: 20
- Poor: 2

In 2008:
- Excellent: 5
- Good: 16
- Fair: 2
- Poor: 3
For submitting authors: How was the quality of reviews that you received?

- **Excellent**: 11
- **Good**: 21
- **Fair**: 9
- **Poor**: 2

**Graph 2008:**
- **Excellent**: 2
- **Good**: 5
- **Fair**: 1
- **Poor**: 2
PC members should be allowed to submit papers to MICRO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Authors should be allowed to write rebuttals to reviews.

2008
Comments – Overall Quality

1. Thank you to all the organizers for all of your hard work! Yet another excellent MICRO experience. By far my favorite conference.
   • Excellent Overall Rating

2. Thanks for the excellent job! This was my first MICRO, and I enjoyed both the technical sessions and the interactions with people.
   • Excellent Overall Rating

3. Thanks for a well run conference.
   • Excellent Overall Rating
Comments – Best Paper / Paper Quality

4. The best paper award could be done after the conference, possibly at next year's event. The ballots could be collected online after the conference is over so that people have a chance to see all of the presentations and, for the ones that interest them, they could read the papers too. Also, having opening remarks, followed by a keynote, followed by a four-paper session is a bit too much to sit through.

   • Good Overall Rating

5. Best paper award selection process is plain ridiculous! We seem to be going from bad to worse. We might as well have a random number generator that selects one from 50+ papers.

   • Poor Overall Rating

6. To be frank the quality of paper really degraded over the years. Bunch of papers, 5 to 6, in Micro-42 were purely incremental and it was hard to imagine that on what basis they were selected.

   • Excellent Overall Rating

7. Too many papers accepted

   • Good Overall Rating
Comments – Session Organization & Infrastructure

8. I like having parallel sessions. However, many sessions that I was interested in were in parallel. Maybe schedule the sessions differently?
   • Excellent Overall Rating

   • Good Overall Rating

10. Many of the paper presentations were either not well structured or well delivered. I realize the organizer have little control over this, but the quality of many of the presentation seemed worse than other conferences. I'm not sure if this was just an anomaly of this year or influenced by the reduction from 25 to 20 minutes presentation. The 20 minutes presentation are nice in the sense that it allows more papers to be accepted, which generally seems like a good thing. Key note by Mark Horowitz was excellent.
   • Good-Excellent Overall Rating

11. The audio quality was awful and the noise from outside the room was intolerable. I only attended a couple of talks each day due to this issue; this made $ / talk high.
   • Fair Overall Rating

12. I didn't 100% like the separation of the "hallway chat area" from where the talks were being given because it made it a lot harder to time when to go attend a talk mid-session (esp. with the talks not timed for 30 minutes a piece). I certainly understand the need to move the noise away from the area where the talks are being given, and I actually do very much like the shorter talk format (just makes it hard to figure out when things are starting). Having more aggressive notification of the start of a session on the fourth floor would have been nice (it happened sometimes, but not consistently), and even cooler would be to have a Grand Central Station/MetroNorth-like board on the 4th floor showing what the current talks going on were with extra "now boarding" messages flashing when each talk is about to start, but I certainly understand that that's taking things to a whole other level...). Overall, a great time was had.
   • Excellent Overall Rating
Comments – Tutorials, PC Submissions

13. It was disappointing not to have a paper version of the tutorial proceedings. Also, would be nice to be able to download keynotes’ slides. PC members should be allowed to submit papers to MICRO, but they should be obviously excluded from the review process of their own papers.
   • Good Overall Rating

14. You already choose the top members of architecture community as PC members. Why would you block very good papers just because they are authored by PC members?
   • Good Overall Rating
Comments – New York City

15. I hate NYC, so I voted "poor" for venue, but it was nothing to do with the hotel itself.
   –  Good Overall Rating

16. Times Square was fun but I'd suggest cheaper venues are generally easier.
   –  Good Overall Rating

17. I don't think the times square is good place. Maybe next time, MICRO should choose a right and suitable place, so that you can save some money for other proposes, such as better food.
   –  Excellent Overall Rating

18. Great location and events. had a great time.
    also i wish there was a break between keynote and 1st session.
   –  Excellent Overall Rating
Comments – Westin Hotel

19. The hotel was terrible. I understand that $275/night (tax included) is not expensive by NYC standards, but the quality of the service left a lot to be desired. There were at least a half dozen instances where I personally saw a lack of quality of service at a hotel chain known for its quality. Very disappointing.
   • *Fair Overall Rating*

20. The wifi connection at Westin Hotel was bumping and with a limited bandwidth. I was disappointed by the fact that lunches were not included on Sat. and Sunday.
   • *Good Overall Rating*

21. Room for workshop on 9th floor was bad--low ceiling, low screen, could not see the projection.
   • *Excellent Overall Rating*

22. Running out of hotel rooms at the conference before the early registration deadline is unacceptable.
   • *Good Overall Rating*

23. Answer to question 4 [Westin Times-Square Poor Venue] motivated by the lack of enough rooms for the attendees. First time the Conference hotel does not accept us! Banquet had a deceiving quality and of course the $90 cost of an extra ticket was completely unreasonable.
   • *Good Overall Rating*
Comments – Hotel Food

24. Lack of coffee except at very specific narrow times was annoying.
   • Excellent Overall Rating

25. For food, I was very pleased with breakfast on the last day (nice selection of fresh fruit) and the banquet was quite nice. Lunch on the second day was alright, but not great, however, I heard many of my vegetarian friends complaining about it. Lunch meat sandwiches but skip the lunch meat is not really a vegetarian option.
   Overall, I think the organizers did an excellent job. I'm especially impressed with what I've seen of Anne Bracy's handling of student travel grants. She seems to have it much better organized than I've seen for prior conference (both MICRO, as well as others), and has indicated plans for a very fast turn around on them. If she manages to get them turned around as quickly as she has indicated, that will be wonderful for those of us receiving them.
   • Good Overall Rating
26. The banquet was the best ever. Good food and plenty of it. Enough wait staff. Open bar. Plenty of room. No long bus ride to get there. People could come and go as they pleased, but most chose to stay. Also no stupid trinket that I leave at the registration, throw away in my hotel room, or haul back home only to throw away once I unpack.
   • Excellent Overall Rating

27. The reception/outing/dinner at the local restaurant was great: plenty of space (for standing or sitting), lots of food and drink, and waitstaff to bring more drinks, too. Several others I talked with also thought such an outing was really great.
   • Excellent Overall Rating

28. The banquet was especially enjoyable
   • Excellent Overall Rating

29. NYC is indeed expensive!
    i enjoyed the outing to the pizza place, though. they had great foods.
   • Good Overall Rating

30. No presents or excursion :( 
    • Excellent Overall Rating
Comments – Gifts and Miscellaneous

31. No gift?? Come on!
   • *Excellent Overall Rating*

32. No bags, or T-shirts or even pencils and paper block to take note! This was a poor MICRO.
   • *Good Overall Rating*

33. I wish there were 5 (or even 6) options to rate things, rather than just 4.
   • *Excellent Overall Rating*