Report for 2019 GROWTH PIRE Science Conference Survey

2019 GROWTH Annual Meeting Survey

Response Statistics

	Count
Complete	31
Partial	1
Disqualified	0
Totals	32

1.What is your role as it relates to the GROWTH PIRE Program?

Value		Percent	Count
Principal Investigator/Co-Principal Investigator		6.3%	2
Co-Investigators		21.9%	7
Faculty/Researcher (not a Co-Investigator)		9.4%	3
Postdoctoral Fellow		21.9%	7
Graduate Student		34.4%	11
Other, please specify:		6.3%	2
Totals			32

Other, please specify:	Count
Undergraduate- Growth surf	1
undergraduate student	1
Totals	2

2.Day 1 - Aug 8, 2019

Please rate the usefulness of the following Day 1 sessions on a scale from not at all useful to extremely useful. For sessions you did not attend, please indicate "Did not attend".

	Not at all useful		Slightly useful		Somewhat useful		Very useful		Extremely useful		Did not attend		Responses
	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count
Session 1: Welcome and reflections on the first year [9:00-9:30] (Robert Quimby, Mansi Kasliwal)	0	%	1	3.1%	1	3.1%	19	59.4%	8	25.0%	3	9.4%	32
Session 2: O3 and EMGW Efforts in GROWTH [9:30-12:20] (Michael Coughlin, Igor Andreoni, Ana Sagues Carracedo, Shreya Anand, Chris Copperwheat, Takashi Horiuchi)	0	%	0	%	1	3.1%	12	37.5%	17	53.1%	2	6.3%	32
Session 3 : Supernovae [13:35-15:35] (Daniel Perley, Kirsty Taggart, Christoffer Fremling, Yuhan Yao, Samaporn Tinyanont)	0	%	0	%	3	9.4%	14	43.8%	14	43.8%	1	3.1%	32
Session 4: GROWTH SURF Presentations [16:05-17:15]	0	%	2	6.3%	9	28.1%	11	34.4%	9	28.1%	1	3.1%	32

3.Day 2 - Aug 9, 2019
Please rate the usefulness of the following Day 2 sessions on a scale from not at all useful to extremely useful. For sessions you did not attend, please indicate "Did not attend".

	Not at all useful		Slightly useful		Somewhat useful		Very useful		Extremely useful		Did not attend		Responses
	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count
Session 5: IR Transients [9:00-10:20] (Kishalay De, Matthew Hankins, Katsuhiro Murata)	0	%	0	%	3	9.4%	11	34.4%	16	50.0%	2	6.3%	32
Session 6: Software [10:20-11:00] (Chaoran Zhang, Niwano Masafumi)	1	3.1%	0	%	6	18.8%	15	46.9%	6	18.8%	4	12.5%	32
Session 7: Career Panel [11:30-12:30]	0	%	2	6.3%	5	15.6%	8	25.0%	11	34.4%	6	18.8%	32
Session 8: More Time-Domain Science [13:30-15:10] (Tom Prince, Robert Quimby, Ryo Adachi, David Cook, Bryan Penprase, Quan-zhi Ye)	0	%	0	%	4	12.5%	15	46.9%	9	28.1%	4	12.5%	32

4.For sessions you rated as lower than somewhat useful, what could be done to improve them?

Response
Session 7 was absolutely fine and a good addition to the programme. It just wasn't aimed at me!
Better speaking skills should be cultivated as part of the growth team - science communication matters but many of the speakers were mumbling or talking to their screens or reading

5.For sessions you rated as very useful or extremely useful, what made them effective?

Response

Good people

I thought the content of the sessions were very good. Liked the campfire chats after so we could keep some of the conversation going even after the session ended.

Exposure to knowledgeable experts

Good talks, well delivered.

I marked as extremely useful session7 because it is an extraordinary session that helps and inspire young researchers.

I am interested in finding out what others are doing.

new and scientifically important contents.

They were more relevant to my professional interests.

The overview talks of the large time domain experiments were super useful in getting a broad picture of what is happening in the GROWTH project

Speakers who could solicit questions or participation - and who were aware of their audience

Variety of topics. Interesting ideas about undergrad use of small telescopes

Session 1: a broad overview was useful to put everything into perspective session 2,3,5,6,8: It was useful to see the specifics of the accomplishments from all of the groups.

It allowed us to address easy issues which we can fix ie. adding a list of undergoing projects to the marshal

Interesting science, learning about what other collaboration members are doing in cases where I wasn't fully aware of.

This conference is very targeted to relevant science covering big targets for GROWTH, hard to go wrong with that.

They made me aware of all the great work that my colleagues are doing, highlighting the aspects that need new collaborative efforts.

The subject matters discussed were broad enough within those categories that the talks were relevant to my research.

they were interesting and relevant to my research

6.Are you graduate student or a postdoc who presented at the conference?

Value		Percent	Count
Yes		81.8%	9
No		18.2%	2
Totals			11

7.In what ways was presenting during one of these sessions beneficial to you?

Response
O3 and EMGW efforts in GROWTH
It was useful to share my work on a new time domain survey and getting feedback from people on interesting ideas for follow-up and science
GROWTH meeting is a perfect platform to present your work to a smaller group of more general and friendly audience. I found the atmosphere to be much more relaxed than that at a typical conference.
I'm sorry, I can't understand the intent of the question.
I was asked questions about my project that I will need to think critically about in preparation for publication of this work in the future. It was also useful to formally present, rather than informally discuss results; people understood the scope of the project more, were very interested in what could come of it, and offered very useful advice.
It was great to share my work with the collaboration so that everyone was aware of my pipeline and a new feature on the marshal.
I got useful feedbacks from experts and other students. And it's a very good practice for me to talk about science
I was my first time presenting in a conference. This experience helped me get more confident about my work and finding collaborators.
Get my work exposed and practice summarizing a science project.

8.Please identify the conference's effectiveness in achieving the following, from not at all effective to extremely effective.

	Not at all effective		Slightly effective		Somewhat effective		Very effective		Extremely effective		Responses
	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count
Sharing research findings and outcomes across the GROWTH network	0	%	0	%	2	6.3%	18	56.3%	12	37.5%	32
Providing a platform for GROWTH students and postdocs to present	0	%	0	%	3	9.4%	10	31.3%	19	59.4%	32
Stimulating new collaborations and discussions	0	%	0	%	8	25.0%	18	56.3%	6	18.8%	32
Planning for upcoming GROWTH activities	0	%	2	6.3%	8	25.0%	14	43.8%	8	25.0%	32

9. Please rate your satisfaction with the logistical aspects of this meeting from very unsatisfied to very satisfied.

	Very unsatisfied		Unsatisfied		Neither unsatisfied/satisfied		Satisfied		Very satisfied		Responses
	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count
Registration process (pre-conference information, ease of registration)	0	%	0	%	7	21.9%	13	40.6%	12	37.5%	32
Conference agenda (clear purpose, balanced, meaningful, useful)	0	%	0	%	2	6.3%	18	56.3%	12	37.5%	32
Conference session management (focused, well prepared)	0	%	0	%	2	6.3%	17	53.1%	13	40.6%	32
Atmosphere (friendly, supportive, promoted collaboration)	0	%	0	%	0	%	12	37.5%	20	62.5%	32
Accommodations (physical comforts, facilities, safety, location)	0	%	2	6.3%	8	25.0%	14	43.8%	8	25.0%	32
Food (quality, dietary needs, preferences, freshness)	0	%	4	12.5%	13	40.6%	11	34.4%	4	12.5%	32
Organization (sessions started/ended on time, equipment was ready)	0	%	0	%	1	3.1%	14	43.8%	17	53.1%	32

10.Do you like that GROWTH annual meetings take place at different partner institutions each year?

Value		Percent	Count
Yes		96.8%	30
No		3.2%	1
Totals			31

11.Do you feel that the GROWTH conference is a successful forum for project members to communicate among each other?

Response
Yes
Yes, certainly.
Yes
Yes
yes
Yes.
Yes
Yes, it gives us a rare opportunity to collaborate in person (especially being from a non caltech related institution)
yes
Yes
Yes, since it is a small group, a large fraction of attendees are able to present. Communication in between sessions is very good.
Yes
Yes
Yes, its great to get everyone in one place to talk about new research results and plan for the future. While some of this can be done via calls and/or emails it always seems to be much easier doing these things in person.
Absolutely. Meeting in person is much more effective, even compared to telecons.
yes
Definitely yes!
Yes.
Yes
Yes

11. Do you feel that the GROWTH conference is a successful forum for project members to communicate among each other?

Response
Yes
Yes, especially with the discussion panels / campfire sessions.
Yes
Yes, absolutely! This is certainly one of my favorite conferences because of the degree of collaboration amongst the members.

12.Do you have suggestions as to how we can improve this communication?

Response
n/a
nope.
Perhaps some time should be allocated for breakout sessions?
I think it works pretty well. More people on the slack could be useful, but not really necessary.
Some more facilities for communications, in particular, updates for the latest discussion on EM observation plans for the participants in different time zones, such as resumee of the current situation written.
No
Slack improved our internal communication, the next step is having everyone actively using it.
No.
no
Get everyone on slack. Also, the campfire sessions could be made more fun, perhaps could also allow for more critical thinking and get everyone's voices heard.
It would be nice to have larger partner representation, but cost is a major barrier to that.
No
No
having breakout sessions like the campfire sessions could be helpful. Perhaps in smaller groups pertaining to a specific scientific problem.

13.After this conference, do you feel like you want to increase your participation in the project? If yes, please describe how and what you would like do.

Response

Yes.

Yes. We start think about collaborating with new projects (e.g. Gattini-IR) and our projects in Japan

Yes. I'll continue to collaborate with people in this GROWTH project.

Not clear how Growth will continue

I do not have time to do this additional project. However it has sparked my interest.

Yes, start new collaborations on existing topics

Yes, it's wonderful to get access to resources in the telescope network

Yes, but I am participating at a high rate now, so I'm not sure if that is possible.

no

Send more students around.

Yes. I have several ideas for following up transients discovered in optical and ir with radio telescopes.

Yes, made some new contacts. Possible new collaborations

Yes - make radio observations a bigger part of GROWTH

Yes, I had not attended a meeting since the first one and I feel better informed about activities beyond my institution and Caltech.

Yes, Happy to work with more GROWTH exchange students, and GEOWTH Surf summer students

Yes, I'd like to find ways to link up with other small telescope projects that were presented. I think there are great opportunities for coordinated observations between facilities, but there is some logistics issues to sort out in order for this to become a reality.

I am inspired after the meeting to collaborate closely with people within the collaboration. There is a lot of expertise in GROWTH which interests I discovered during this meeting. The face to face communication has helped a lot to take this initiative.

Yes. I'm a departing postdoc but I'd love to stay connected (yet to figure out how).

Yes, I learned more about activities in different institutions, and even some in the same institution! This will help me plan my future career as a postdoc.

I feel that my role is winding down as we get to the last year.

13.After this conference, do you feel like you want to increase your participation in the project? If yes, please describe how and what you would like do.

Response
Yes, I would like to involve more people's skills and expertise in my papers and visit more partner institutions.
I would like to increase participation by serving as a tutor for one of the sessions next year in the summer school. I'd also like to continue being involved in the development for the GROWTH ToO marshal and participate actively in follow-ups of gravitational wave events in the next few years.

14. Do you have any suggestions for how to further involve undergraduate and graduate students in the meeting?

Response

Perhaps more advertisement would be useful.

no

Let them organize one session (half a morning) each, i.e. one by graduate students and one by undergrads

Require students to ask questions. Hold student debriefing sessions at the end of each day to discuss major science in a less-stressful situation. Hold more formal discussions of things like mental health, career balance, ...

There're not too many undergraduates represented and I think financial support or online participation might be a good way to involve them.

I'd like to see more undergraduates at the meeting. Its understandable that they can't all make it, but the presenting experience is good for them and the opportunities for interactions with other researchers are very valuable.

No

I think that involvement is quite good already.

Keep the social sessions (banquet, encouraging people to go play pole games, etc)

More short presentations by students at the conference.

Devote more funding to their travel, but I know this is hard to do.

nope.

Special students-only session/dinner?

Favor opportunity to seat in small groups (over lunch?) to talk about science and career in a more friendly manner.

For the 'town hall' sessions, one suggestion is to have the younger students be given preference to speak first, before the older members of the community pitch in. Also, having a short session for undergrads and grads to meet each other, maybe learn about each others' research, would help.

15.Did you feel comfortable participating in the meeting, such as sharing comments?

Value		Percent	Count
Yes		100.0%	11
Totals			11

16. Is there anything that project leads could do to improve this next time?

Note: Participants were only shown this question if they responded no to the previous question (indicating that they did not feel comfortable participating in the meeting). No participants indicated "no".

17.Were you able to meet new research colleagues at this meeting?

Value		Percent	Count
Yes		100.0%	11
Totals			11

18.Do you have any suggestions for how project leads could help to facilitate networking at future meetings?

Response
It would be nice to have a separate networking / socializing sessions for the young people (grad students / postdocs) in the meeting
None
Ask each participant (or those who actually have an idea) to present in 1minute a new project idea they may have been thinking about but not had the time/manpower to start. Then students and others could express their interest and get things going
Small group discussions with 1 faculty and many students
Define a special common project to accomplish in the following months
no
n/a
Perhaps have a cocktail reception along with a more sit down dinner where chatting with different people is not as easy.
Try to make sure there are researchers present from all partner institutions. It seems like some partner institutions did not have any representatives at this conference.
It may be worthwhile having 'break-out sessions' with different rooms or areas designated for people collaborating on different subtopics (i.e. EMGW, supernovae, IR transients/Gattini, and Machine Learning/Software/Asteroids), both to meet people working on similar subjects, and to work in person together on different projects.
Some sort of "resource presentation" session perhaps, or some poster-like session to motivate focused discussions.
No
No suggestion
Continue having the conference at different locations.
I think the current method is fairly effective.

19. Do you have any suggestions for how to improve the conference for next year?

Response
No
I understand that it was quite beyond the organizers' control, but the venue was not ideal and the catering was poor.
The conference was great
Some mixing activities of people at lunch time.
nope.
Label the food.   Pronoun stickers.
Continuing to expand the scope of the discussion times.
Many are very busy with their own work during the presentations Like checking emails or working on their projects. The talks can be shorter and maybe give people the time to work on their work in. Between that way it encourages the presenters and do a better job
no
No suggestion
More information beforehand about scheduling, timeslots, location, transportation info would have been helpful.
Hotels closer to conference venue?
We had some 'fun' activities planned during the GROWTH conference at IIT-B; it would be wonderful to have an optional 'fun' activity planned in the evenings. I really liked the escape rooms; it was a great team-building exercise. Minor comment: The lunches were ok but not great, and they were the same as the lunches we were given at the summer school. Also because of dietary restrictions I was not able to eat any of the pastries offered for breakfast/coffee breaks, and I didn't get any breakfast at my hotel. It would be nice if alternative options could be offered even for the coffee breaks, though of course not strictly necessary.
If its possible to host the meeting at a more easily accessible location. The campus and building at SDSU was quite confusing and I managed to get lost on a few occasions.

20. Is there anything else you would like to share with the project administration or coordinators of the conference?

Response
no
No
I like the balance between students and more senior participation.
Thanks a lot for making the conference a success in spite of the last-minute challenges!
n/a
No
A big thank you all!
No. Overall I think things went very well!
Great conference, I really enjoyed it!
Good job!