CIDER 2014 Summer Program Feedback Survey: *Summary of Data*

SUMMARY: GRADUATE STUDENTS AND POST-DOCTORATE RESEARCHERS

Prepared by Research Group, Lawrence Hall of Science, September 4, 2014

Please indicate your role/position during the CIDER II 2014 Summer Program (Select all that apply):

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Graduate Student	75.0%	30
Post-Doctorate Researcher	25.0%	10
Instructor - Lecture	0.0%	0
Instructor - Tutorial	2.5%	1
Instructor - Research Group	0.0%	0
	Total Responses	**40**
	skipped question	**0**

OVERALL EXPERIENCE

Please share any comments/feedback you have regarding the *overall quality* of the CIDER II Summer Program. *Please note, you will be asked specific questions about the lectures and tutorials at a later point.*
The overall quality of the program is high.
The overall quality of the program was very good and I learnt a lot.
The lectures were very helpful. As a grad student, I have limited experience outside of my field, so the lectures and tutorials were crucial to bringing me up to speed. The research project solidified the quick education with trial by fire. Very helpful.
The overall quality of the CIDER Summer Program was very high. I learned so much and really enjoyed getting to know so many colleagues and their families. It was a very invigorating experience.
CIDER was fantastic overall. The lectures were of an extremely high quality, although a few of them seemed a bit too long for the time slots allotted. I really enjoyed the beach BBQ's and catered group dinners.
The overall quality of the program is great. Barbara runs a tight ship and many perspectives were presented.
The overall quality of the CIDER program is priceless and one of the highlights of my graduate career. I would like to return in two years for the next deep earth program. I met many great students and senior staff for networking and friendships.
The overall lecture is so educative. The topics are broad and in-depth. I love it. Just the tutorials part sometimes are not very clear about what to do for people not in the specific field.
I liked the quality, and especially that CIDER covered an introduction to different topics.
Overall, CIDER II is an amazing opportunity to learn and work to advance the field, and collaborate unlike any other program.
I learned a lot from people in different disciplines, and it is good to have both basic scientific introductions and the latest discoveries. The videos are helpful when I want to review them sometime (but not all of the lectures have videos).
Excellent program, I learned a lot and enjoyed the opportunity to engage in new topics and collaborate/learn with several experts in various fields.
very helpful for learning where the field is at, what tools different fields use, how people approach problems, and what the community is interested in
This program is the best of its kind that I have ever attended. I am exposed to the environment that encourage learning through out the whole periods. The lectures and tutorials are top quality. I would like to thank the organizers for accepting me to the program.
Good.
the program was good in overall quality, especially in the younger scientists. The quality of the senior scientists was mixed.
Excellent program, will highly recommend, hope to return

Impressions about overall quality continued
Really good program
Great!
I think the quality of both the junior and senior participants is overall fairly exceptional.
Generally quite good.
This was my first CIDER, and it was so awesome! What a great experience for a graduate student to be exposed to such a wide range of science and new ideas and techniques. One of my goals for this program was to contact potential postdoc collaborators and I am happy that I had plenty of opportunities to do just that. What's more, I thought up a bunch of ideas for future projects, and now I know a bunch of people in other disciplines to collaborate with!
Overall, CIDER II was in very good shape. The design was very helpful for one to learn a lot of background, and good practices of research. It would have been good to have longer poster sessions. It was hard to visit all the posters that we were interested in within 1 n 1/2 hrs.
Overall, I give CIDER a 10 and I would like to participate again.
The general quality of CIDER is great. The schedule is intensive.
I think it was great
Overall quality of CIDER is excellent. This is a great opportunity to learn about and integrate multidisciplinary techniques and approaches to research that is much-needed in the geosciences.
The overall quality of the Summer Program was exceptional. The senior participants were all friendly, knowledgeable and helpful, and happy to have discussions (even after their presentations!).
the overall quality were very high. the choice of speakers/participant and their willingness to talk new/weird ideas has been highly appreciated
This is great opportunity to joint the CIDER program. I learn a lot from the lectures, and discussion with others.
Very high quality throughout. Broad, interesting and relevant range of topics.
I was only present for the first couple of weeks. Pleasent colleagues, with interested outlook. The meeting on neutrinos was an added bonus.
Excellent

QUALITY OF LECTURE AND TUTORIAL SESSIONS

Did you participate in the lecture and tutorial sessions?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	94.7%	36
No	5.3%	2
	Total responses	**38**
	Skipped question	**2**

Please share your impressions regarding the *content* of the *lectures*. Include any comments regarding the balance between disciplines and the balance between background information and cutting edge research presented.
Most of the lectures are very good. Both background and cutting edge research are introduced. In terms of content, it will be better if some discipline, e.g., mineral physics, be more carefully arranged.
There was a very diverse series of topics that were very informative and compelling.
The content from most lecturers was full of background information and was well-presented. The balance is hard to maintain but
I think the content and background were generally good. There seemed to be a lack of mineral physics lectures.
The best lectures were the ones that started from the basics, and ended at cutting edge. The gradual elevation in level of material with each progressive lecture, in a given discipline, worked just like a class setting. Two great examples are seismic, and geodynamic lectures.
The lectures were outstanding, some of the best research talks I have ever sat through. I really appreciated the interdisciplinary atmosphere defining basic and complexities at a high level and all the questions being asked throughout made for a very interesting discussions.
Content of the lectures was overall very high. There was a good balance between disciplines and between introductory topics and cutting-edge research. A few of the talks were a bit too introductory, but I don't feel like any of the talks were too far above my head as a graduate student who just finished first-year. I greatly enjoyed that the lecturers responded to each other and critically challenged the results shown, but were still cordial.
I thought the geochemistry, geodynamics, and seismology portions were well-structured. As a mineral physicist I felt that the mineral physics lectures were really out of order. While the other fields, started with a basic overview of their fields (derivation of fundamental equations for geodynamics and seismology, and introduction to important isotope and trace element systems for geochemistry), mineral physics starting off with narrow (although interesting for me) talks on creep in olivine. There should have been an overview the mineral physics perspective on the deep earth and the types of techniques various mineral physicists use to interrogate the physical properties of geophysical materials.
The lectures were good for review of important subjects and being exposed to new subjects. However, due to the breakneck schedule, I was feeling very overwhelmed by information.
Well organized. Both the background information and cutting edge information are covered.
I think the balance between disciplines and between background infomation / research talks was fine. I especially liked the tutorials. However, some interesting topics were only covered towards the end of the second week, which made it difficult to include them in the group topics.
The Lectures gave a good overall impression of the fields and motivated the subsequent research.
Background information is well introduced, but maybe more cutting edge researches need to be added.
Well balanced, in general, provided good background in each topic.
good balance of introductory material and new research might be better if there was more discussion about how to include other fields in aim of the research talks
With four major disciplines, I am naturally most familiar with one of them. The background information of the other three, was reasonable to understand but I personally feel that the cutting edge geochemistry research was particularly difficult. This does not imply anything else but my lack of geochemistry background. Knowing this, I will improve myself by reading more research papers of this topic.

Impressions about content of lectures continued
It didn't seem like there was a lot of "cutting edge" research presented, mostly background talks. The talks in my field were pretty straight-forward and easy to follow, while the subjects outside my field were a bit more difficult. It remains to be seen how much information I actually retained from the latter.
some of the lectures were absolutely great, with a good balance between background information bringing everyone up to speed and cutting edge research presented. Others were terrible, either too basic (with inefficient use of 90 minutes that didn't teach anything) or too technical (lost everyone). I think that future CIDERs should take into account what professors are good teachers. Because there are only 90 minutes for someone to cover enough intro for people not in their subdiscipline (a huge task), it doesn't work if the professor can't deliver.
Excellent lecture content. It was a great opportunity to fill holes in a broad geophysical/geochemical background. Some small improvements could be made in the order of talks, and a few talks strayed too far into specifics too early, but really overall very good.
I would have liked a bit more mineral physics, with both foundational and cutting edge material.
Great!
I think the lectures that are focused on background information could focus more on providing easy ways of understanding the systems. I think Bruce Buffett is an excellent example of this. Bruce was able to characterize the powering of magnetic dynamos simply by thinking about heat fluxes and chemical buoyancy. Similarly, Allen McNamara's explanation discussion of the different types of assumptions that are often used in geodynamic models was helpful, as were the characterizations of moderately and highly siderophile elements.
The lectures where generally quite good. No significant issues.
The lectures were really well done. In particular Ved's Seismology lecture/tutorial, Jessica Irving's normal modes lecture, and Allen McNamara & Jon Arneau's dynamics lectures were outstanding. In general the lectures did a very nice job of introducing the basic ideas, and theoretical framework, and then showing new and exciting results.
Most of the time it was very hard to catch up with the pace of lectures that were out of one's field. Two or three introductory slides containing very basic concepts/definitions/terminology at the very beginning can easily resolve this. That will help us follow the rest of the lecture and understand the new concepts presented. It is hard to even begin to ask a question when a lot of unfamiliar terms are thrown at you while the lecture proceeds assuming that the audience knows the basics.
Content was great - just that geochemistry and especially petrology should have been given more emphasis.
The content of the lectures reflected the most important aspects of different fields. However, I don't think that all field were present in the content, but I beleive that also this is not possible in a two weeks time.
The content is good and informative. The balance of content is good. The speakers usually begin with basic concept of one field and end in their cutting edge research.
The general quality of the lectures and tutorials was very high. I think the seismology ones were the most beneficial for me because both Ved and Jess made sure to include lots of background information, which made them easier to follow - and made it easier for the non specialist to follow subsequent seismology talks. I know this came at the expense of spending more time on cutting edge research in those talks, but I think this was the best way of going about talking to a multidisciplinary audience. I found that the geochemistry lecturers didn't really spend much time on the basics (I mean, the very basics!), so I struggled to follow much of the talks. I thought the geodynamics lectures were fantastic, particularly those by Michael, Jon and Bruce.
Content of the lectures was varied and interesting. I would suggest more background on geochemistry and its applications; while the lectures were great, there was not enough. It would be beneficial in particular to emphasize how it may be combined with other approaches (i.e. seismics and geodynamic modeling) to provide improved cross-constraints to our understanding of the earth system.
Good balance between disciplines. On average, the balance between physical background, motivation and research was good, although there was a reasonable amount of variation from lecture to lecture.
I enjoy the lecture a lot.
The content was of the lectures was really good. For this topic I would have liked to see a few more planetary talks.
Good balance between disciplines and the lectures were generally aimed at the right level. I also enjoyed the research talks during the afternoons.
Well balanced, educational, and up to date

Please share your impressions regarding the *organization, structure, pace, and workload* of the *lectures.* Please include comments about opportunities for interactive discussions, lecture styles that worked well, lecture styles that didn't work well, and the balance between lectures and tutorials.
pace is pretty intense. workload is high but good.
Some of the tutorials did not go as smoothly, but I believe that couldn't have necessarily been avoided.
The lectures could have restricted to the first one and a half weeks and then proceeded with evening talks.
The interactive component is a major reason the lectures were successful.
CIDER is intense. For weeks 3 & 4 during the research projects, having two research talks is a bit much. It really cuts into research time. Perhaps limiting to one 20-30 minute talk.
organization was fine. The schedule seemed like it changed quite a bit, but that was no problem as all the lectures were interesting and well put together. Pace, structure, and workload were all good. Passing of the microphones slowed things down quite a bit. It might be good to have more microphones next year, or possibly a more organized way of distributing them.
I though the organization, structure, pace, and workload of the lectures was good. However, some of the tutorials lost me because they went too fast for those of us who do not spend a significant amount of time working in a unix/linux environment. Also, it was hard to follow tutorials that required background knowledge on a given topic that was not present in the lectures (such as the melting tutorial that assumed significant petrological knowledge).
The pace was way too fast and packed; we need more breaks. The organization, structure and workload were fine. I liked having a tutorial per day. Full appreciation of the lectures and tutorials was impossible with the breakneck pace. I enjoyed the ability to ask questions during the lecture.
The organisation, structure and pace of the lectures were fine, especially that it was so easy to discuss. It was good to have a number of tutorials, however, some of them were difficult to follow.
I wish there had been more time for research, but its tough to say because I found the tutorials and lectures informative. Perhaps, we could form the research groups and begin formulating problems earlier.
The lecture styles worked pretty well. But we miss some videos of the tutorials.
I admired Laurent's attempt at an interactive lecture, but in the end much less content was conveyed - perhaps a more traditional lecture would have worked better. Pace of most lectures was excellent, although Karolina's was much too fast.
some of the excel tutorials had too much time, some of the CIG tutorials had not enough time pace of lectures was good
I'm very happy with everything.
Having all of the talks in the first two weeks was overwhelming. I often was quite drained at the end of the day and had little energy left to work on my own research. Perhaps spacing the lectures and tutorials out more (i.e. start having research group discussions in the second week).
some were slow. others were great. the tutorials that worked best were ones that were accompanied by a detailed description with the commands required. sometimes people fell behind because they were looking at their computers rather than up at the instructor when a command was being typed
Lectures were uniformly well-prepared and at a good level. Lecturers made obvious efforts to hook audience with engaging questions, videos, and analogies to make everything clear and interesting. I've never seen such a friendly environment for asking questions.
The balance was pretty good.
Great!
The organization of the lectures is a bit of a sticking point. It is generally felt that there where too many lectures in too short a time. It would be far better to spread the lectures out over 3 weeks, instead of two, and likewise spread the research to 3 weeks instead of two, with overlap.
Regarding the tutorials, I just want to say that the CIG virtual machines were excellent. The pacing was good. Several of the tutorials had very complicated input files that were poorly commented, and that made it difficult for first-time users. The aspect tutorial and the seismological inversion tutorial were especially well done.
In general most of the lectures were well organized. There were some lectures that did not quite have a nice flow that is easy to follow. I think it should be key to structure good science talks to start at a basic level and build up a flow eventually including more cutting egde results and discussions. Using black board during lectures would be a great idea (eg. the talk by Bruce Buffet). I also think that a lecture in a workshop like this should be significantly different than a conference presentation. i.e. Primary goal being making sure the audience understands the basic concepts and methodologies used in your field of expertise.

Impressions about organization and structure continued
Many thanks to CIDER organizers for this excellent summer school. I learned a lot, especially during the tutorial, when I had a chance to learn different tools which I am defenitely going to use in future.
Generally good of the organizations. If we could include more lectures than the tutorial which will be better I think. Since some of the program we will not use if we are not in that specific field.
I think all lecturers did a nice job of answering questions and engaging the audience in discussion. I like a mixture of board work and powerpoint, so enjoyed lectures that included this. Some people had clearly prepared far too many slides and hadn't accounted for how much time they had - this either left them to such through the last part of their talks, which made it difficult to follow, or meant that we didn't see a large portion of the lectures. But the slides are all up online, so those of us who are interested in particular topics can look up the information later. I think the tutorials that had detailed instructions included, like Hiro's excellent Calypso tutorial, worked better because people could follow all of the steps at their own pace - this was particularly important because the poor internet connection did delay some of us when getting started.
Lectures were well-organized and generally structured well. Introductions to most lectures were adequate for those who are less familiar with certain disciplines. The conceptual workload was rather heavy (as expected). Much of that had to do with the back-to-back nature of the lectures. Mental exhaustion was a common complaint among fellow participants, and it would be helpful in the future to find ways to engage participants (where possible) in demonstrations, experiments, and/or more interactive lectures (such as the lectures in which software such as Google Earth/Mars/Moon/Venus were used). Tutorials were sometimes less effective. Some had a poor introduction or explanation, which could leave some participants with little understanding of what had been covered. Some tutorials would have been more useful with an interactive component, where software is not only demonstrated, but group-style parameter variation was included. Active cause-and-effect approaches to some tutorials (perhaps where less computationally intensive) would be valuable. Some cases involved poor introduction and/or unclear instructions/purposes where too much foreknowledge may have been assumed, and it would be valuable in those cases to ensure a fairly thorough background is presented with clear questions and objectives. Thankfully, only 2-3 tutorials explicitly presented with these problems.
I would have liked to see a little more progression through the lecture series, but the pace and workload was good. The tutorials largely revolved around entering values into excel sheets/text documents, with insufficient emphasis on the care and expertise required to a) provide reasonable inputs b) include appropriate physics and c) interpret results. I would have preferred practicals with more critical thinking required, rather than run-throughs of different pieces of software.
I would like to have more lectures and less tutorials. I found it difficult for me to learn something from the tutorial, since what I need to do is just run the code. I feel bad to run the code without understanding what I am doing and why do that. Thought there are some introduction at the beginning about the motivation of the tutorial, some introduction is so good that I feel no need to run the code again to test. In other case when the introduction is not so clear, I will be totally lost.
The lectures were really informative, with a lot of information. However, by the end of every day it became very difficult to continue to absorb all of the information. Having a discussion/synthesis session at 4, rather than additional lectures would have helped. Perhaps have someone volunteer to summarize the day to encourage further discussions?
The lectures all followed a similar style with questions welcome at any time, which I thought worked very well.
Intense and fast-paced, well organized

Were you comfortable asking questions or making comments during the lectures?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	88.9%	32
No	11.1%	4
	Total responses	**36**
	Skipped question	**4**

QUALITY OF RESEARCH GROUP ACTIVITIES

Did you participate in the Research Group activities?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	94.7%	36
No	5.3%	2
	Total responses	**38**
	Skipped question	**2**

Please share your impressions regarding (a) the process of defining the research topics; (b) format of the *research group activities.*
It's good. Everyone can say up and advertise his/her idea.
I think there was a significant amount of wasted time attempting to form the research topics. I think it would be possible to form potential groups at the end of the first week.
It seems like there ended up being more overlap in the topics addressed by different groups, and they could have been designed to be more focused.
The process of defining research topics started off a little chaotic, but organized quickly. Format worked well.
I felt all of the doodle polls was a bit much, seemed a bit tedious but I understand it is necessary to build these over time. Participating in a research project is very good to put all that we have learned into practice and learning how to collaborate across disciplines.
The process of defining the research topics I think was very good. Often in large group discussions, the more timid voices get drowned out by the louder people, even if the timid people have good ideas. The use of the Doodle poll counteracted this to some extent and allowed everybody to voice their opinion. Perhaps it would have been good to pare down the choices earlier, but overall I think the system worked very well.
Everything was great!
(a) defining the research topics was enjoyable and intriguing questions were proposed. (b) the format of activities were great, though I would prefer more tables and comfortable areas for computer work (ie desks).
It is good to have such an opportunity to work with people from other fields. Two weeks' time is a good start for small project. We have enough time to dig into it. However, I want to suggest that when proposing research topics at the very beginning, we should add some topics from the senior participants into the topic pool.
Both were good.
I wish that the groups had been formed earlier and we'd had more time to ruminate over the topics and read before digging into the work load.
The way of defining the topics is a bit confusing. We have seven main topics and several sub-topics, but actually the main topics have little to do with the finally group dividing. Most of the topics are proposed by the students, but not all of them.
This was a bit of a shambles - the method of narrowing things down was not well explained at the beginning. Bill did not do a good job of expressing several of the research ideas, and once they had been distilled to a short bullet point (however pithily) often the content of the particular question had been lost. The doodles worked well, but there were too many rounds, and the benefit of clumping questions was dubious - why entertain questions so particular as "How does the Martian core convect" if you're going to end up with a group investigating "Mars"? It would be better to have broad topics initially, and leave more time within groups for voting on granularization - e.g. on Wednesday of the second week, the "Mars" group of people is decided, and then they meet over the next few days to decide on a more particular research question, leaving the second two weeks for specific research.
Very good idea and structure. It would be nice to keep the senior participants around for the last week, but most of them were responsive by mail and skype even after leaving, so no problem there.
a) hard to know what will actually work as a project b) we figured it out eventually
(a) Selecting topics was a little confusing but fun at the same time. I think the result was good. I'm happy with my research group. I do learn a lot from them. (b) We have great diversity in our research group, despite the fact that we only have one geochemist, but her contribution is significant.

Impressions about research group activities continued
Should have started earlier with more discussions and less polling.
a) defining research topics was a mess. i hated it. i thought that there was alot of sitting around goofing off .
Could have been chaos, but the Doodle worked! Some groups emerged immediately driven by motivated leaders, others grew more organically. There was almost no structure, and that's just fine.
It was fine. Somewhat scattered, I think, but that is probably unavoidable.
The initiation of research topic is intense.
Defining the projects is actually pretty difficult from a junior participant point of view. Many of the topics were motivated by questions posed in the research talks from the first two weeks (the group looking at why subducting slabs appear to stagnant around 1000 km, for example was motivated by both Adam and Barbara pointing out this observation in the research talks). Other examples include the focus groups on Mercury, Mars, and the Moon. This is fine, and makes sense as they are fresh ideas that all the attendees have been exposed to, but it might be considered when designing research talks. That being said, project design is a difficult aspect of any research venture, and there are many opposing requirements to this difficult task during CIDER. For example, it is 1) difficult to design a project where significant progress can be made in two week period. and 2) difficult to know what the other sub disciplines can contribute to a research project in general and in a short time period. I think the conference would benefit greatly from senior participant input during the project proposal phase of the conference. Project design is a difficult, yet essential part of being a successful scientist and additional guidance from such a broad swatch of the community would be extraordinarily successful.
Worked well, just needed to start earlier than the two week mark.
I had no problems with either the process or format of the research groups.
Awsome!!!
a) I think coming down to a set of few research topics by voting was a neat idea. I had no experience working with the moon before CIDER and I decided to join the lunar research group just so that I will get an opportunity to learn more and diversify my area of interest. I knew exactly what I need to do and what question to address after doing lit review and discussing with our group. b) I loved the room we were given to work (Founder's room) and we had excellent group dynamics. I loved how we came together with a common story working with different fields of expertise. The research group activity was my best part of CIDER.
The process of defining research topics went smoothly. I think next CIDER school should use similar approach with doodle to define the topics.
Generally good in the formation of the group research topic. However, I think if senior member could provide more suggestions that will be even better. Since for the junior members it is not that easy to find a topic which is both interesting and workable.
I think this was a long process in our group, but we got there in the end.
Defining the research topics began as a somewhat clunky affair, although once we decided on a format for narrowing and refining topics, it improved significantly. In the future, it would be beneficial to promote discussion of topics among participants earlier in the conference (although not necessarily as a formal listing), and encourage active discussion/development of questions, motivations, discipline-based contributions, etc. within topics prior to finalization of groups. While evolution will certainly continue after formation of groups as is necessary, some defined goals would aid selecting topics to work on.
(a) I'm told that the evolution of research topics was a little less natural than most years, with more pressure from select members of the junior participants. Nevertheless, I liked the open discussions preceding the final decisions. (b) A little more time (maybe 3-4 days) of research time would have been good, or at least moving the afternoon lectures to the beginning of the afternoon (or later) - the afternoon was a little broken up for my work style!
(a) seemed almost random to me, but that may be the only way to deal with such a question (b)nothing to say, that was ok
The process of defining research topics is very very efficient.
a) Breaking into groups a little earlier (sometime in week 2) may have been useful for better defining the research topics.
a. The process was straightforward using the doodle poll and discussions. b. The lack of defined structure is good - in terms of each group being able to decide what structure works best for them.

Please share your impressions regarding the *group work styles or dynamics* of your research group. Include comments regarding (a) the organization within the group and (b) the level of interactive discussions and opportunities to participate in the discussions.
It's very good. The members are very brilliant and go through problems and look for solutions in a high-efficiency way.
Being in too large of a group led to a very high degree of fragmentation and the group was not as cohesive as I had hoped.
I can't speak for other groups, but my group worked well. We have, a continuing, dynamic group.
I have really enjoyed our research group. All of the junior members participate in discussions and enjoy good collaboration. The senior members have been supportive, however, most have been very hands off with our group and it may have been nice to have a little more input from them.
I feel like my group was slightly too large and disjointed to work extremely well together, and even after two weeks I'm not 100% sure what some of the members are doing. However, I think we were all able to pull our work together into a cohesive whole and show some interesting results, which is extremely exciting.
Our group organization worked well. One person coordinated group discussions in the morning, and in the afternoon, individual group members worked on various projects alone or in small groups. We had many dynamic interactive discussions with all group members, bother junior and senior.
For organization, we should have spent a few days on a literature review, with presentations rather than meandering discussions which can be dominated by large personalities. The active discussions were very interesting but suffered by a more robust literature review. The rotating senior staff was very helpful on helping to steer our group to appropriate topics and to provide a reality check.
I think it is good to discuss every morning on the stuff we did in previous day. And work in other hours. But in the afternoon, I thought we'd better also sit together, working. In case we have some questions, we can immediately talk about it.
We had a good organization within our research group, with different subgroups working on subtopics and regularly discussing and connecting the results.
The organization of our group was very organic and developed quite nicely.
Our group is small and it's easy to participate in the discussions. But it seems that the students would be more confined in their own disciplines when their advisors are in the same group and the research project tends to be less student-driven.
My research group worked very well. Early on we divided up the tasks and then worked efficiently and collaboratively from then.
Great group, learned a lot and a nice atmosphere.
a) we found a way to work independently but circulate our findings to the other groups so that they can use our info
(a) Our group is very active. The organization is good, but I am a little bit worried that the main corresponding person might spend significant amount of time doing logistical stuffs. I appreciate the role of this person. (b) We are extremely interactive. Our senior participants who stay until the end of the program are very helpful to us.
It definitely helps to have a central meeting/work spot for the groups and a table around which we can work. If the space is too large, with no central table or a table that is not large enough for everyone to work on, there is less communication which retards the progress of the project.
a) it was fine b) it was great
Having a group office for work and daily meetings was very helpful.
Pretty good, though a bit more support from senior participants would have been nice.
Great!
Once the research projects were underway, our group did a fine job of self-organization and included discussions when appropriate.
There were plenty of interactive conversations, which was a lot of fun. The research group portion of the workshop felt like a science sprint, which was a lot of fun (though also exhausting!).
Organization went well given the short time scale. Pretty good amount of discussions and good effective progress
a) Our point person was Heidi and was very happy with the way she was managing our activities. we all came together with our own expertise and it worked out really well. I have learned a lot and I know how to pursue this in future. I have also made great friends here.
My group has a good organization. At the beginning, we set our goals and decided who is going what depending on our skills. We, however, interact a lot during the work and we had a short meeting every morning when each of us reported the work progress.

Impressions about research groups continued
I think the group work style is good. I think it could be better if we have more smaller groups. More activities will be intrigued within the groups.
I think the group worked well together. There were only a few of us and we all contributed to discussions and work plans. I do think we would have benefitted from a senior participant though (both of ours left partway through the first week of the project)
The research group I am participating in has an equitable, multidisciplinary structure with roles evenly divided. There are no problems with interactive discussions or participation.
(a) The organisation within the group was very good - all members had clearly defined tasks (b) We held group meetings once every two days, and had a range of interdisciplinary discussions throughout the research time. All members of the group participated actively to the work and too discussions.
everyone was eager to communicate/share/progress. and the amount of pluridisciplinarity is highly satisfying.
I like the style of group discussion.
We seemed to develop a hierarchical structure in our group, which was not what I had anticipated. I wish that we would have talked more within the group earlier on, but eventually that corrected itself.
a. My group was very organised with each member having different activities to work on. b. We had discussions every day and everyone was encouraged to join in.

Do you have a clear understanding of your role and contribution to the project, at this point in time?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	94.3%	33
No	5.7%	2
	Total responses	**35**
	Skipped question	**5**

Please explain if you wish to.
I was able to help, but it was when needed, and someone else could have done it if there was enough time
Maybe
Most of my time at CIDER was spent testing some simple ideas about slabs in the mantle, which turned out to be wrong (d'oh!). I also spent some time working with dynamicists making figures and visualizations for presentation. I also helped write the abstract, and after CIDER I'll be continuing to iterate simple models in order to test some ideas about how slabs fall through the mantle.
I will do numerical modeling to test the ideas and assumptions.

Were you able to make significant progress on your project while at CIDER II?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	88.9%	32
No	11.1%	4
	Total Responses	**36**
	Skipped question	**4**

What do you think would help make this process smoother?
Not having to work on a part of the project completely in isolation.
Making sure the groups have enough input from senior participants from the onset.
We could use more time during Weeks 3 & 4.
Perhaps smaller groups with a more defined goal.
I thought everything went great.
We need less meandering discussions and more time to simply work and perform literature reviews. Less talking and more quiet working times. The early dinners (5:30 pm) also cut into possible working time. I don't like working too late at night and usually work efficiently during the day, which was difficult during CIDER.
More time :)
Perhaps we could begin the discussion much earlier in the program.
fewer talks
We had to do a lot of background work to get everyone near the same knowledge level for the project, leaving less time to get actual work done. Most of the background was not covered in the lectures (which were more Earth-focused despite the general topic of Planetary dynamics). Perhaps starting the group discussions and background/literature searches earlier would allow the groups to get more work done (and have at least preliminary results) by the end of two weeks.
The research talks in the afternoons often had the unfortunate side effect of breaking up the day when we were just starting to make progress. Maybe putting them at a different time, or on alternating days would have been useful.
Start the research in the 2 week, overlapping with the lecturers.
Maybe selecting a more narrowly defined project :P
Cut the Saturday lectures, have 1.5 weeks of lecture and 2.5 weeks of research group activity.
More detailed research plan or goal. More defined goal of the project.
We didn't really produce any results but we did come up with lots of interesting ideas and plans for each of us to work on after the program. We are all keen to continue the project, so the two weeks were really useful in terms of defining our research questions and dividing the work up according to interests and expertise of group members.
Dedicated workspaces.
A little more time.
Better internet connection.

Given your other research commitments at your home institution, will you be able to continue working on this project?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	35
No	0.0%	0
	Total responses	**35**
	Skipped question	**5**

Please explain if you wish to.
In all honesty, it will be tough to continue to work on CIDER research and my other commitments. However, my CIDER topic is interesting, and it is worth while to continue. I'll just have to work hard.
I think I will continue working on my code, and my group will most likely apply for funding to continue work on the project in the future. I don't think we're ready to submit an AGU abstract though.
I will keep this topic in mind during my thesis and subsequent literature search.
I found this project is so informative. As a seismologist, I used to focus all my attention on the how to have the snapshot of the earth. In doing this project, I found it very fascinating to think of this snapshot in geochemical and geodynamical view. I would like to continue working on the project and wish to contribute my efforts in the project.
Will try to as much as possible.
although the AGU deadline priximity is pretty harsh
Hopefully, if it can be justified with a CIDER grant it will be more likely to continue. If not, it may be prohibitively expensive money- and time-wise.
It's always nice to have another thing to think about when you are stuck.
That's more information related to my thesis.
Of course, I've got my own research to work on, but I'm excited about our work at CIDER and I want to continue to collaborate on this project.
I move on to a postdoc position early next year, so I will continue with the project then.
I would like to continue working on project. We plan to submit an abstract to AGU this year. And we also agree on contuing the project in future.
I will be able to make time for this project, although it will not be a major time commitment for the remainder of the fall as I anticipate gathering a large dataset for a separate research project. I do expect to make continuing contributions to this project in the long-term.
It will be much easier for me to use the computing resources once I go back.

Please share your impressions on the connections and network opportunities with graduate students/postdocs/faculty. Please discuss the connections that you made at CIDER II, and those that you plan to follow up with in the future.
There are a lot of opportunities here. I built connections with my group members and some other participant for doing future potential projects.
This was probably the best opportunity a student could have to make connections.
I look forward to continuing the work on my CIDER project with both the other grad students and the faculty.
I have really enjoyed the unique warm and inclusive atmosphere here at CIDER. I have found all of the CIDER members (junior and senior) interested in getting to know me and hear about my research. Meeting the children, spouses, and families present makes the environment feel very communal and supportive.
I feel like the coffee breaks, group dinners, and lunches were all great networking opportunities.
I met many senior and junior participants outside my area of expertise who I now feel comfortable asking scientific and career advice from in the future.

Impressions about networking continued
The connections are priceless, especially with associated bonding activities during CIDER. In the future, I will contact many people for advice and science questions.
I met people those I used to heard of only in textbooks. I would like to keep in touch with people in the same field and also in other fields.
Networking opportunities were fine. Especially within the smaller group for the project this was very group, and we plan to stay in contact and continue to work on the project.
Rather than just meet fellow graduate student post doc and professors I was able to WORK with them , which was a great opportunity.
I met lots of people working at different disciplines, and learned a lot from them. I also have many interactions with faculty members who stay there for a longer time. They are pretty easy-going and it would be nice to see them again as friends and copartners.
Met several people, but don't feel like I will keep in touch with many of them. Will make for more friendly faces at conferences, and I would feel comfortable approaching faculty based on the foundation of meeting them at CIDER
Great opportunity for this. Made contact to many senior researchers in my field and even got invitations to talks / possible postdoc positions.
met and discussed science lots of people and am planning to work on project with a few professors unrelated to the CIDER project
I am exposed to several possible collaboration opportunities. This will definitely help shaping up my career. I am happy to meet and get to know my peers.
i made many new friends, and am thrilled to have met many of the professors.
Started new collaboration through the group project which I expect to last at least a year
It is great to meet other researchers in the field, both within your subfield and outside of it.
That is very good connection building opportunity
Excellent.
There were plenty of opportunities for networking. In fact one reason I wanted to come to CIDER was to meet potential collaborators and post-doc advisors. I'm happy to say I accomplished both those goals!
Made a good network of connections that will probably keep in touch/collaborate with
I made connections with some graduate students and postdocs with whom I can collaborate in future. I had some good discussions with some faculty as well.
I plan to colaborate with the people I met at CIDER in the future.
It is great. We have a great time social networking with fellow graduate students and senior faculties during this one month program. For the future program, I think the organizer could come up more activities within the students community.
Excellent, though few people from my field were actually here. It was still useful to meet people from other fields though.
I have established new friendships and potential working relationships with some of the graduate students and postdocs. This has facilitated ample discussion of concepts and allowed many of us to form new perspectives on our research. I have discussed formation of a side project with a future colleague, and as well feel that this may have opened a door or two for potential postdoctoral positions with senior participants.
The networking opportunities were excellent. I had many interesting discussions with geodynamicists, seismologists and mineral physicists. I have definite plans to meet up with some of the geodynamicists and seismologists at the meeting in the near future to discuss potential research proposals. Additionally, our research group will continue working on our project. Finally, I have a much better knowledge of current research interests within the group of senior participants, which has helped to shape ideas for future job/research applications.
i made connections with professors and junior participants with scientific collaboration on -my own research -their research -the CIDER research project this is very positive
I get know most of the people in this program.
Good connections, particularly within the research group. The research group will be presenting at AGU so I foresee that several of us will continue to collaborate.
I was only there for the first two weeks (my choice) so missed many networking opportunities. However, I got the research done that I had intended, and met some new people (and through the neutrino workshop, some old friends), so it was very good for networking in this respect.
great opportunities to meet people and carry out in-depth discussions

Did the connections you made in the CIDER II summer program help you in generating new ideas for research?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	94.7%	36
No	5.3%	2
	Total responses	**38**
	Skipped question	**2**

Please explain is you wish to.
Extraterrestrial seismology!
The group stage project is related to my research and could only be shaped by people from different disciplines working together.
I have two additional project collaborations formed in addition to the group project with researchers from other universities.
I plan to continue doing the research that started here when I go back to my institution. I am hopeful that this will result in publication.
Knowing the different disciplines toward my PhD project related information.
Yes, but it also might be helpful to know (in some elegant way) which senior participants are looking for post-docs and which senior participants have full labs.
I thought up about a dozen ideas for future projects! CIDER was great for getting new ideas!
I had few ideas for my next research projects. Acctually, at CIDER I learned the tools which can help me to realize these ideas.
Only for my cider project
I got a lot new ideas from the random discussion with people. I always think what I can do to make a progress on the research group.
Close work with Bruce Buffett,

Do you plan on pursuing new areas of research or going in some different directions in your research as a result of your participation in the CIDER II Summer Program?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	86.8%	33
No	13.2%	5
	Total responses	**38**
	Skipped question	**2**

Please explain if you wish to.
I would like to integrate more geodynamic simulations into my research.
This is both yes and no. I see new avenues for my current research.
I like the work that I have been doing at CIDER. It is similar to the work that I was working on before CIDER, but takes it in a slightly different direction, which I am excited about.
Planetary geophysics become an addition to my research interest now.
i am hooked on planetary science
One thing that CIDER helped me realize was that it's very beneficial to walk outside one's area of expertise, after CIDER I will definitely be trying to extend my research in new directions that I wouldn't have considered before.
My first step in to planetary domain was at this CIDER.
Maybe :)
Focus on the redox state of the Earth, other planets, explore more about the physical parameters of the Earth
It drove forward my main research as was intended, in a way that would not have been possible without my presence at cider.

Would you recommend CIDER II to other graduate students and post-doctorates?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	38
No	0.0%	0
Please explain.		20
	Total responses	**38**
	Skipped question	**2**

Please explain.
It is an invaluable experience to be able to learn so many different topics in such a short amount of time from the leaders in the field.
As a grad student, this was my first exposure to a new research project that integrated this range of disciplines, and how to integrate them.
Absolutely. Time well spent.
It was a fantastic experience. I feel like I learned more and accomplished more at CIDER than during most of my first year of graduate school.
I would love to come back!
For the opportunity to know people and cooperate with people in other fields, which really help in understanding your own research.
It is a nice environment to get new ideas for research and get to know people in the field.
It's not only enlightening but also entertaining.
Good learning experience and opportunity to collaborate and do research outside of one's field.
it's a great way to learn about the field
I will tell them the truth that this program is the best in the world for someone who is interested in these four major research disciplines in Earth sciences.
It is a great way to break out of research bubbles that you might find yourself in.
broaden horizon in research.
Yes, but with the caveat that they understand the full time commitment involved in attending.
CIDER was amazing. How can I not recommend it to other students!??!?!?!
I strongly recomment CIDER to other students and post-docs.
CIDER II has been an excellent opportunity to learn about other disciplines, and discuss the forefronts of science with open minded academics who are interested in a wide range of interconnected processes.
long but worth it. a lot of discussion/meeting allowed by the size and the design of the program. provocative ideas explored during the research program, with the help of senior participants.
good place, learn a lot, and new ideas almost everyday.
The best workshop/conference to meet other graduate students and post-docs who work on any topics related to geophysics. Also the best workshop for developing collaborations, particularly multidisciplinary projects.

Senior Participants ONLY: Would you recommend the CIDER II program to other colleagues?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	3
No	0.0%	0
Please explain.		1
	Total responses	**3**
	Skipped question	**37**

Please explain.
Particularly to jaded UK academics who like me spend too much time filling in pieces of paper and aiming for targets. It was very refreshing to be again in an environment with clever people who were just interested in stuff, whether or not it drove forward their own efforts for the next 24 hours.

Please share your final thoughts about how you view the benefits and/or drawbacks of participating in the CIDER II 2014 Summer Program.
I'm glad I came.
I would have liked to hear from a senior member of the Electromagnetics community. Electrical conductivity kept coming up in various talks and would have been helpful to have more representation at CIDER.
It is a big time commitment, but it was incredibly worth it. UCSB hosts a great campus, and although I worked extremely hard and accomplished quite a bit, it has felt like I have been on summer vacation for the past month.
Many benefits, no drawbacks
We need more free time to relax and process the new information AND WORK ON OUR PERSONAL RESEARCH. It was very difficult to find time to both REST and continue our own research. The breakneck pace of the lectures left us really tired. Dinner is too early. However the networking and scientific discussion are priceless. It was great to have everyone in the same dorms so networking and bonding was easy.
Benefits: find motivation to do research; know people; better understanding how the earth functioning. Drawbacks: no.
We met lots of friends during this programs and learned from different disciplines, which may enrich our research in the future. Now I would view the earth in a new angle, and know that we still have lots of unknows about the nature.
benefits: networking, learning drawbacks: time commitment, AGU stress
Benefits: networking, exploring different disciplines (learning how to communicate with different disciplines) Drawbacks: takes away a summer month from research
I fell somewhat behind on my other projects while here, and would have to consider seriously my workload when deciding to attend again.
Great for learning new things, meeting other researchers, forming collaborations.
Benefits - learn new things, forge new collaborations, make friends. Drawback - Intense schedule, so not much work (from home institute) done over the entire month.
It is generally a good program. It helps us to broaden our horizon in research and build up our own connections in academia. We have build up possible future collaborators during the program. However, I still think that for some research projects, it is not easy to get everyone involved.
See Q19 for benefits :D. There were no noticeable drawbacks for me so far (though maybe there'll be a lot of catchup work to do when I return to my department!)
i learned stuff from other disciplines that i can actually implement in my own research. this is something i don't do during 'normal' conferences for obvious reasons (i just stick with my community, as more or less everyone)
CIDER will greatly enlarge the vision of the graduate students.
CIDER II was a great opportunity to learn how to communicate with people in different disciplines. That was a major part of the learning experience for me. I has helped me better understand science that was previously outside my area of interest and helped me communicate my science better to others. The only drawback was that the schedule was so demanding that I was not able to work on my research while participating.
Benefits only. Drawbacks only that I wasn't on personal grounds able to attend the main meeting.
The schedule is intense and long.

Please share any final comments and suggestions you have to help improve the CIDER II program.
Maybe MagnetoTelluric discipline could be represented in future CIDERs.
I really enjoyed the tutorials and hands on virtual machine. I am sure that took a lot of efforts to get all of that stream lined and prepared. It would have helped if all of the tutorial files were put in the same location. Some were on the wiki agenda, some on the wiki tutorial page, some were preloaded on the virtual machine, and some on the CIDER thumb drive. This was not always clear when the instructor began and lead to a lot of confusion. It would have been nice to have our names on the doors in the dorms. Better wifi availability at KITP.
Keep it at UCSB, continue drawing great lecturers, and keep supporting great research. Oh, and fix the wireless internet.
Most of CIDER is wonderful though some improvements could include: - a dorm in a more quiet part of campus so we can sleep better - more personal breaks to rest - we recommend a program-wide trip to a local geology feature such as the Channel Islands for a bonding and learning activity.
I would recommend to organize a field trip of the program. It would be exiting to see some features of real rocks and we would have some ideas too. It's also a good way to interact with other people. Besides, I hope the air-condition can be turned down a little bit...
more time to take this survey?
Thanks!
Better WIFI in the auditorium, faster internet connections.
More activities within the science community might be a good idea. In addition to the group research projects, if possibly each of us present a short presentation on our own work would be more practical.
(1) It would have been good to know computational requirements prior to the meeting (esp. disk space required). (2) The virtualbox was a great idea. For Linux users, it would have been good to have had a list of open-source software to preinstall, to enable slightly more efficient processing! On a related note, octave would have been a suitable open-source alternative to matlab. (3) Answers to previous questions cover suggestions for scheduling and lecture structure. CIDER II has been fantastic! A huge thank you to Barbara and the rest of the organising committee for producing such an excellent program.
I think it may be better if we can speeding 2 days rounding different research groups that we are interested in, and then determine which one we want to join.
Providing attendees with clear concise directions for how to get to CIDER. Such as when is the earliest time to leave/arrive and when is the latest. As well as sending maps of campus, with key locations marked in advance. It was a wonderful learning experience and I think has made a better scientist. Thank you for the opportunity to participate.
Better internet connection at KITP. I kept getting "no IP address" issues, like a lot of other people. Possibly quieter dorms (if that's possible).
A little more information on incoming - for example, had I realised that I could walk from the airport to the venue, I could have started everything a half day earlier. Also, the excellent bus that ran from the airport regularly right to where was needed - the valet transportation was nice, but had I arrived later in the evening this would have been an excellent option. Finally, because I have a UK phone, I wasn't able to call, and was worried whether I'd be able to set this up at the airport - only to find a free local calls phone at the airport - again, knowing about this would have reduced my incoming stress!

Please share your impressions regarding the *logistics* of the CIDER II Summer Program, including *(a) location, (b) venue, (c) housing and food, and (d) the schedule*.
Everything is so fantastic.
a) The location was amazing. b) the venue was great, but the internet connection was virtually non-existent during the lectures c) housing and food was nice, the timing of meals in the evening was too early though d) the schedule was very rigorous, but fun
The location and venue were appropriate for the level of interaction in the workshop. There were some ant infested dorms but they were quickly taken care of, by the administration. The poster sessions were too far (a week) apart, and for a short period of time.
The lack of reliable internet in KITP made it difficult to work at times. It would have been preferable to have dinner closer to the residence hall.
The location, venue, housing, and food were great! I stayed in Santa Ynez with my family. It would be nice to have all weekends off to spend time with the family, though.

Impressions about logistics continued
I really enjoyed CIDER at UCSB. This is my first time at CIDER. The schedule was very intense and very full. The Saturday lectures seemed to be a bit much to me. If it is possible, eating two meals a day at the same cafeteria is a bit much. De la Guerra Dinner Hall has pretty much the same types of food for lunch and dinner. It would be great if we could eat at either cafeteria (de la guerra or Carillo) to allow for some variety. The dorms at Manzanita Hall were really nice. The location is great to be close to the beach and able to walk to so many nice places. However, the noise is a problem especially since the family camps and other camps for children bring large groups of high energy. Since the dorms do not have air conditioning all the windows are open and it is impossible to get away from the noise. De la guerra dinning hall was TOO crowded at times. I really liked the barbecues at the beach.
a) location is fantastic. Directions to the dorms on the first day could have been a bit better, as I found them hard to find. Otherwise great! b) KITP is great overall, but had a few issues: 1. the internet was mostly unusable throughout the lecture series. 2. The lack of offices during the work sessions was not ideal. c) housing was great, food was great. d) schedule was good. The coffee breaks were absolutely necessary and should be kept.
(a)/(b) The location is great! The main issue that could be fixed in the future is slow and inconsistent internet. (c) The dorms were nice and right next to the beach, and the food was acceptable. (d) The schedule the first two weeks was really exhausting. I would suggest eliminating the research talks at 4pm for the first two weeks, and having more free time, or starting the program later in the morning.
(a) the location is really nice and near the beach. (b) the venue is really nice and I hope to visit again. (c) The dorms are nice and clean, but noise is a problem. A major downside is the noise from the summer programs, often lasting until past midnight. There is often loud dance music in the building next door and boisterous activities on the lawn areas on both sides of the dorms. The food is good though sometimes repetitive. (d) The schedule needs more breaks. I was getting overwhelmed with information but there were no breaks for a quiet walk. The talks often spilled over into breaks so breaks were short. The format with lectures for two weeks followed by research discussion was wonderful. I learned a lot and participated in very useful and interesting discussions.
The location is very good. Here we have very good weather and scenery. The housing is god. The food is buffet, sometimes making people eating more than usual. The schedule is overall perfect. I like the group dinner and group BBQ. There's just one think I want to suggest that we could have a hiking together into the surrounding mountains.
(a) I really liked the location, however, the transport from the goleta airbus top to the housing could have been planned a bit better. The housing and food were fine, however, it sometimes was quite noisy outside of the dorms in the evening. I especially liked the KITP dinners and the barbecues.
a) The location is absolutely fantastic. b) The KITP is perfect for this type of meeting. c) The housing is great. d) The schedule of the second week is a little rough. The work day gets broken up by lunch at 12 and then again at 4, and its hard to have much time to think.
The program is pretty well organized, with very nice location, venue and housing. I hope we could have more choices of dining rooms, especially at weekends. Because most people stay at the dorm but we can't eat at the closest dining room.
a) Good location b) Good venue, but internet at KITP was inexcusably poor, and really hampered ability to work. c) Excellent food d) Good schedule except not enough time given to some tutorials
Good location, food and schedule
a) good b) good c) would be nice to have a fridge d) maybe two days of lecture a week for the last two weeks would allow for more focus on the projects
I am impressed with the overall aspects/components (a-d) of the CIDER program. Everything supports me to learn science of the Earth and planetary's interiors. I'm very happy.
(c) Having housing that is not near yelling kids and seemingly all night dance parties would be preferred. It made it hard to focus between 7 and 12 PM on many nights. Also, there were no refrigerators in the rooms or even a common refrigerator to share, which causes dependence on the dining halls which are not open most of the day. It limits the kinds of foods that we can eat (no milk because no fridge) particularly for those with food allergies. Less meals in the dining hall would be preferred, or at least being able to eat more meals in the closer dining hall (particularly on the weekends) rather than having to walk all the way across campus. Perhaps a small per diem for the weekends to be used in Isla Vista or at the grocery store? (d) Overwhelming and tiresome (see #8)
a) location can't be beat. ucsb is great b) the room where we had all the talks was a bit difficult to take notes in. i would have preferred tables for us to have a place to write in notebooks rather than laps. c) The summer program was totally great.
a) Santa Barbara is a lovely place to get away for a month. Bike rides on campus are highlights of each day. b) It was nice to have group office at KITP for our project, especially after losing our offices midway through. The internet in the main classroom was terrible and the major failing of the venue. c) Santa Ynez apartments quite adequate for a family, though required some baby-proofing for our 18-month-old. Lunches at the cafeteria were surprisingly good. We enjoyed the group dinners and barbecues

though logistics for producing the right amount of food at the beach were sometimes a challenge. d) Heavy schedule in the first two weeks but very worthwhile program

Impressions about logistics continued
a) Excellent b) Excellent c) The meal schedule was a bit rigid, but I realize that the have a lot of groups that they need to schedule d) Good
So far, I feel comfortable with all schedules. One change might consider is that, to make the second weekend one day long. The third weekend one day short. All final presentation could be on Thursday afternoon and night. Some members leave on Friday morning and miss some talks.
The one thing I would suggest regarding logistics is that the scheduled events be lessened. Being at CIDER is a rewarding, exciting experience and it's very fun to participate and contribute to all the events. However, the tight scheduling of the lectures, from 9am-5:30pm M-F and 9am-12:30pm Saturday, makes it extraordinarily difficult to continue fulfilling other responsibilities and duties from our home institutions (including thesis research for graduate students). After a full day of research activities and lectures, it is difficult to find the motivation to work on one's own research in the evenings, and evenings are a prime time to socialize and network among students, or spend time with visiting family members. After 4 weeks of conference attendance, duties from the home institution do tend to build up substantially, especially for senior graduate students who are getting close to defending (which is the stated target audience of the conference). The senior participants method of dealing with this situation (skipping lectures, tutorials, and research group meetings) is expressively discouraged for the junior participants by the conference organizers. I would suggest providing 1-2 afternoons without lectures or tutorials in the first two weeks of the conference, and I would leave Saturday mornings free for the junior participants to keep up with their own research, as promised in the conference advertisements. In the last two weeks I found it easier to set aside sufficient time to try to keep up with home duties, largely due to more personal control over scheduling (Saturday morning being a reasonable time to catchup for example).
Generally, holding Cider at UCSB has been a fine experience. There are however a few sticking points. The first is the food options through the cafeteria. There were multiple occasions within a week in which UCSB overbooked the dinning halls, leading the cafeteria to A) open later than it was scheduled too, and b) leading to upwards of a 30 minute wait to eat. When we were able to enter, many of the food options were depleted. The food options themselves were also a bit of an issue. If you suffer from a nut allergy, or are vegan, you may eat with few problems. However, if you suffer from any other form of food intolerance (i.e. diabetic, gluten intolerance, etc…), you would often be left with one or two options: A) eat the same foodstuff for at least 2 meals a day, 7 days a week, or eat nothing. It would be more helpful if cider provided a food allowance that may be used in the cafeterias, or in other places on/off campus, perhaps in the form of prepaid debit cards? The second major issue is the noise level around the dorms. The youth camps often held outdoor parties and events around the dorms, and having 30+ children and counselors with vuvuzelas sounding from 7-9:30 most nights is not conducive to a good working environment. Additionally, many of the bikes that were rented by Cider participants were parked within this area of the quad. Nearly all the bikes suffered some form of damage over the last month due to inattentive counselors and wild children.
a) The location was fantastic! KITP and UCSB are both great places to stay for a month. The dorms in particular were very nice, although there were some problems with ants. However, I shouldn't complain because the proximity of the beach more than makes up for it :) b) KITP was a nice place to be. There were plenty of places to chat with colleagues, and the daily teatimes were ideal for just such opportunities. However, the internet connection was not very good. Connection issues were very common in the main auditorium, and when I could get a connection it was slow. This was particularly frustrating for those of us who need to connect to remote computers as part of our research. c) Can't complain about 3 square meals a day for free! d) Schedule was nice, however, the walk from the dorms to KITP was rather long, and I found myself rushed through breakfast most morning in order to be punctual.
(a) Excellent (b) Excellent (c) Housing was good/comfortable. Food was ok too. (d) Schedule is ok
Location and venue - is great for both the residence halls and KITP - 20 min away from each other. My one complaint about the residence hall location is that some visitors on campus play loud music through 11 at night. Housing and Food - Same menu for lunch and dinner at La Guerra was very annoying towards the end. There should be flexibility of which dining hall we can avail for lunch and/or dinner. Schedule - 2 weeks of continuous lecture was a tad too much - by the end of second week, I was exhausted and saturated. The phase with research projects and collaborative work was the best time at CIDER.
Good choice of location, Santa Barbara was very convinient location for me. Climate is perfect. I really enjoyed the time here. Housing and food are great. The schedule was preatty intense in the first two weeks. If possible, I will shorten the lectures part, at least having Saturdays free too.
The infrastructure for CIDER in UCSB is fantastic. It provides a great opportunity for the deep earth science community to share their research ideas. Personally I am totally satisfied with the lodging and food.

I thought the program was very well organised, both before it started and during the program itself. a) The location was great b) KITP was really nice. The internet connection was terrible for the first three weeks though, which was quite disruptive to the start of our research projects c) Manzanita was lovely and in a brilliant location d) The schedule was quite intensive during the first two weeks - I would have preferred to have Saturday morning off so I could both work on my own research and have some time to relax

Impressions about logistics continued
A. Location Fine location for the workshop. UCSB is an ideal location. B. Venue KITP is an excellent venue. The only improvement to suggest is a more stable building wireless network. It is not equipped to handle conference-level traffic. C. Housing and food Housing was overall comfortable, clean, and reasonably well-kept. There is a significant ant infestation in the Manzanita Village housing that should be addressed before future CIDER programs are hosted here again. The proximity to the Family Center and being housed with other programs meant that evenings and nights were often plagued with excessive noise, which often became a distraction when trying to work in the evenings. Food quality was fine, although variety was severely limited with regards to dietary restrictions. Multiple participants required a gluten-free option, and often that resulting in eating the same items (and navigating an unbalanced diet) for most meals. It has come to my attention that this is actually in violation with ADA regulations and the cafeteria system should be better equipped to handle a range of food intolerances/sensitivities. D. Schedule Intensive schedule is welcomed, although I was somewhat disappointed in the relative lack of time to work on other research projects as had been promised. I was anticipating having entire weekends and possibly even parts of weekday afternoons for this.
a) The UCSB campus is a great location for CIDER. A minor irritation is the noise from the summer camps/orientation. b) KITP is an excellent venue. c) Housing at Manzanita is good, with the exception of the ant infestations (especially on the ground floor). d) The schedule was excellent. My only complaint is that despite being told that arriving late on the 4th July would not be a problem for check-in (and having arranged a time with Micaelee), there was no-one on the front desk. This is very understandable, but having been told that someone would be there it would have been nice to have received some communication before reaching UCSB!
Santa Barabara is awesome and pleasant KITP is very practical, I like the fact that we had offices (during 2 weeks for junior participants) nothing to say about housing and food, that was ok. The barbecues and KITP dinner were more than fine schedule was BUSY the two first weeks. no need for saturday morning lectures, it contributes to overload more than clarify.
a, the location is perfect. b, venue is good for me c, housing is very convenient, food is very goood d, schedule is very good
The directions given for getting to CIDER was confusing. An example is that several people thought they were taking the airbus to Santa Barbara rather than Goletta. One person actually got off the bus at Santa Barbara. The schedule for two weeks of lectures was also very dense. I would have preferred to have a little more research time and a little few lectures.
a. Location is good - straightforward to travel to. b. Venus is great - beautiful campus. c. The accommodation itself is fine, however the atmosphere around Manzanita Village is not entirely suitable for a workshop due to the proximity to a holiday camp. Loud music until at least 11pm on several weeknights, with noise continuing later. Additionally during the day at weekends. The children's camp frequently used the courtyard outside the halls for loud games. This made it difficult to work in the evenings. The food is good, although I probably ate less than 2/3 of the meals available (due to not eating breakfast and also going out for dinner at times). d. The schedule is very well planned with a good amount of time for discussion allowed.
a) Location excellent - particularly the chance to go swimming in the sea in the early afternoon- sounds tounge in cheek, but substantially improved my productivity. b) Nice environment, desk, internet connection - what else would I need?! c) Perhaps overly nice! A little far from the venue for the first couple of weeks, but nonetheless very pleasant. Once I got myself aclimatised to commons food, was very good - it took me a little too long to find the commons in hear the village, so a little more information might have been useful. d) Not really applicable as I was only there the first two weeks.
Excellent

###