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Some Observations

1. 68 responses to survey.
2. Overall satisfaction was good, but down from Micro-56 in Chicago.
3. Lowered views of the hotel, the registration cost, food, wifi, and outing seemed to contribute to the decreased satisfaction.
4. But except for cost and wifi, all areas had positive comments.
5. Several concerns were raised about organization of the poster sessions.
6. Almost 80% think Micro has the right number of awards.
7. Of the remaining 20%, 2x want more awards rather than fewer.
8. Two-thirds view at least one award as within reach over their career.
1. Overall Impression of Micro

**2023 Micro**
- Excellent: 33.8%
- Good: 54.4%
- Fair: 10.3%
- Poor: 1.5%

**2022 Micro**
- Excellent: 44.7%
- Good: 42.1%
- Fair: 13.2%
2. View of Toronto as city for Micro-56

**2023 Micro**
- Excellent: 50%
- Good: 35.3%
- Fair: 13.2%
- Poor: 1.5%

**2022 Micro**
- Excellent: 55.3%
- Good: 36.8%
- Fair: 5.3%
- Poor: 5%
3. View of Marriott Harbour as hotel for Micro-56?

**2023 Micro**
- Excellent: 17.6%
- Good: 45.6%
- Fair: 27.9%
- Poor: 8.8%

**2022 Micro**
- Excellent: 31.6%
- Good: 44.7%
- Fair: 21.1%
- Poor: 31.6%
4. View of outing and banquet at Art Gallery of Ontario

- **2023 Micro**
  - Excellent: 19.7%
  - Fair: 28.8%
  - Good: 27.3%
  - Poor: 24.2%

- **2022 Micro**
  - Excellent: 33.3%
  - Good: 38.9%
  - Fair: 22.2%
  - Poor: 5.6%
5. View of other food and beverages at Micro-56?

![2023 Micro](image1)

- Excellent: 7.4%
- Good: 30.9%
- Fair: 36.8%
- Poor: 25.0%

![2022 Micro](image2)

- Excellent: 7.9%
- Good: 44.7%
- Fair: 26.3%
- Poor: 21.1%
6. View of the Poster Sessions

- Excellent: 13.4%
- Good: 56.7%
- Fair: 23.9%
- Poor: 6.0%
7. View of Workshops and Tutorials?

**2023 Micro**
- **Not Applicable**: 41.8%
- **Excellent**: 23.9%
- **Good**: 20.9%
- **Poor**: 3.0%
- **Fair**: 10.4%

**2022 Micro**
- **Not Applicable**: 26.3%
- **Excellent**: 34.2%
- **Good**: 28.9%
- **Poor**: 7.9%
- **Fair**: 10.4%
8. View of Number of Awards Given

- Too Many
  - 7.4%
- Too Few
  - 13.2%
- Just Right
  - 79.4%
9. If you work hard and do well, do you view at least one of the awards as achievable?

- Yes: 67.6%
- No: 32.4%
Technical Program Comments

1. The quality of the research is generally pretty poor.

2. I think the number of accepted papers was a little too high and stresses time limits. I would favor fewer papers if we can increase the quality.
Wifi Comments

1. Internet connectivity was very poor, but otherwise a perfect conference
2. Hotel wifi was unstable for whole duration, both at the conference room and the hotel room. The conference organizers could (should) ask for some refund.
3. Wifi in the conference was very bad!
4. Wifi connection was very bad at the hotel and conference. Food was below expectation
5. Wifi and heater were a disaster
1. Thanks to the organizing committee and volunteers for a great job!
2. Hotel was comfortable both as a place to stay and as a conference venue but the wi-fi was abysmal. Other than that, excellent conference - great job organizers!
3. Most expensive conference, cheapest services!!!!!
4. Registration fee and the hotel was too expensive.
5. The conference is too expensive to the services, food, and hotel that we are in.
6. I would prefer a warmer and cheaper place.
7. The hotel air conditioning system was too poor.
8. MICRO was scheduled on top of Halloween, and I was unable to attend. I feel like this was a major oversight -- others who attended had to miss events with their families, and I'm sure many skipped like me.
The total cost of attending micro [hotels + registration] was quite high. From my view, this means that it becomes very difficult for phd students who are often self sponsored to attend such event. I personally know at least 4 phd students at 3 different universities (among the top5 of US) who expressed their intention to come to micro but were unable to due to cost concerns. Also in my opinion, choice of hotel was not the best. While I understand the organizers had the best intentions and worked very hard to organize this. Still, the prime location of the hotel was not of a major use. Most attendees preferred to stay in the hotel during and after the conference. Maybe a slightly cheaper hotel not in the downtown would have been better. Also could have been an opportunity to leverage the proximity to UoT and maybe used some college halls as venue, which might have been much cheaper. At last, excursion can also be made optional with that would mean 10-20% reduction in registration costs. I hope, the organizers don’t find my comments offensive. I am just trying to express the frustration of many of my phd colleagues regarding the cost. Otherwise, organizers did a fantastic job with running everything so smoothly, and i thank them very much.
10. The conference venue was FREEZEING. School buses were gross. The museum only had two galleries open: what’s the point of going if you can’t look at anything?? Overall it was a great conference, but either pick an excursion that is actually interesting or just save everyone the hassle and have a nice dinner in the hotel.

11. Name tags were way too long and the letter size of affiliation was tiny. It became difficult to socialize as on-job-market students had to go around and meet people based on their industry/academic affiliations. And honestly, it seemed a little creepy to go around looking down at people. - Food everywhere except the museum was straight up bad, and not at all filling.

12. In terms of the arrangements, I think the hotel was really well placed (close to Union) & the harborfront area was very beautiful. In my view, I think MICRO team also did a great job in minimizing the visa-related cancellations compared to prior conferences in Canada. Also, I really appreciated that the breakfast/coffee was not taken away the moment the times were over, unlike some prior conferences. Unfortunately, the excursion fell well below expectations. Most of the art exhibits were off limits. The food at the excursion was also very limited. And the atrium was quite small for the number of people. It felt a bit less impressive compared to previous the excursions at comparable cities: NYC (ISCA) - boat cruise, Cambridge (MICRO) - aquarium, etc.. The food also felt less impressive compared to recent conferences in Canada (e.g. HPCA Montreal).
13. In the survey we filled before the conference, we were asked about dietary restrictions and indicated halal. However, there was no halal option served in any of the meals. This should not have been the case given the percentage of people indicating that preference which should not be negligible at all.

14. Feel like ISCA and MICRO should have switched their city this year;) it’s better to have the conference in Florida in winter while have it in Toronto in summer.

15. The event was great overall. Some points that I feel could be improved: * Lack of room-temp/warm drinking water throughout the event * Inter-session snacks were extremely unhealthy, and this is especially bad because the snacks are a big source of daily food given that breakfast ends very early and dinner is typically absent * The food was generally very meat-focused, lacking hearty plant-based main dishes * Important sessions (e.g., Ph.D. forum) were poorly-attended because of being co-scheduled with other events * Poster session was dense and crowded, not enough room to walk between posters * The company representatives were mostly absent from their desks, and it was unclear how to track them down.
1. Prefer sit-down style meal for banquet dinner.

2. At the art gallery event, they ran out of some of the vegetarian food. That's kind of a travesty. The last year's event at Chicago Field Museum had a better food line, it was a buffet and you can choose what you want. This time it was harder to track down the servers that were wandering around with various appetizers but not any entrees. We should have had more places to sit.
1. Posters in the same room as sessions was distracting. Break alignment with coffee was not always good. It seemed like skipping sessions was the best way to get refreshments.

2. The poster session mixed with the presentations, so it was a bit problematic (noise, no spacial separation of the two). Would have been better if the posters were placed outside, where people anyway talk and mingle.

3. I have multiple complaints about the poster sessions. Poster sessions were too short (under an hour). I didn't even realize for the second poster session that it was split across multiple rooms. Having the poster sessions in the same rooms as talks meant that poster discussions couldn't continue after the official time ended (or people would keep talking and disrupt the paper presentations). Food was overall pretty disappointing. Very minimal breakfasts. I think there was always only one meat and one vegetarian option for main meals. And there was no sit-down dinner/banquet at the excursion. Excursion location was alright, but the main socializing room was way too small for the number of people. It was difficult to even walk through the crowd. Number of papers per session was very inconsistent. I prefer 3 papers per session with small breaks. Sessions had anywhere between 3-5 papers though.
4. The poster session was a bit short. I particularly enjoyed the Hot Baked Chips sessions. This was new to me in MICRO and I had a lot of fun talking to students/researchers. Toronto is a nice city, but a bit cold and expensive. Food in the hotel was not very good. In contrast, the banquet was great.

5. For the poster session, I believe most of the authors, especially the ones who were not first timers didn't actually participate. Also the way the boards were set up was very disadvantageous for people facing away towards one of the walls as most people walked in from the center and only observed the middle posters. For how expensive it was to print the poster at the event, it was a complete waste of time because too few people came and looked at the posters during the session. Food was fine at the award luncheon but not at the excursion or the welcome reception. I like AGO but I feel like if you are traveling to another country for the conf, the excursion should be something more specific to that city. The most interesting parts of AGO were not even open for the excursion, we just got to see some European art.
Other comments

- The awards must be reasonably open about the criteria so others can aim for those objectives.