

Question #1: What is your level: graduate student or post-doc?

28 Graduate Students

9 Post-Docs

1. graduate student
2. Graduate student
3. post-doc
4. Graduate Student
5. post-doc
6. graduate
7. graduate student
8. Graduate student
9. Graduate student.
10. Graduate Student
11. Graduate student
12. graduate student
13. graduate student
14. post-doc
15. Post-doc
16. Graduate student
17. grad student
18. graduate students
19. Graduate Student
20. Graduate Student
21. Post-doc
22. Graduate Student
23. graduate student
24. Graduate student
25. post-doc
26. graduate student
27. graduate student
28. Post-Doc
29. graduate student
30. graduate student
31. Graduate Student
32. Graduate Student
33. PostDoc
34. post doc
35. graduate student
36. graduate student
37. graduate student

Question #2: What factors influenced your decision to participate in the CIDER II 2012 summer Institute? (Page 1)

1. 1) diversity of topics which are significantly related to my phd topic, but still so broaden that one does not have enough opportunities to encounter them during regular courses of a phd program 2) lecturers & invited speakers 3) time (dates and duration) & location
2. The interdisciplinary focus as well as the theme.
3. I was interested in the topic, excited to hear presentations by the advertised lecturers, and in general am interested in collaborative research.
4. I heard very positive things about the workshop from a visiting scientist at my university and decided to visit the CIDER website. The theme for the CIDER II 2012 was closely related to my research interests and I thought this would be an excellent opportunity for me to learn more from a more interdisciplinary group. I also hoped this would allow me to interact with people trying to answer the same questions, but from a different approach (e.g. seismology vs. geochemistry).
5. recommendation of my advisor
6. I have never been in a CIDER before. CIDER is famous workshop with many accomplished scholars doing the organizing and lectures and has been commented as successful. My adviser suggested me to attend it. One of my colleague who has attend it before told me that it is great. It is in Santa Barbara, a great place to relax myself from the hot long summer's unfruitful research work.
7. enthusiasm in earth science
8. Interdisciplinary focus; List of faculty participants; Location; Duration
9. interdisciplinary; high quality of speakers and supervisors; the nice venue; that most of the expenses are paid by the CIDER program
10. The topic being relevant to my field of research
11. multidisciplinary collaboration.
12. Students in my department had previously done the program; my advisor was one of the conveners this year.
13. related research
14. My advisor suggested me to go. It was looking promising since the beginning. The thing that I liked the most checking the website to know what was that about was the multidisciplinary approach.

Question #2: What factors influenced your decision to participate in the CIDER II 2012 summer Institute? (Page 2)

15. I thought that it was an ideal opportunity to expand my knowledge of geosciences beyond my own field - in order to both put my own work in context and to better understand which problems are of multi-disciplinary importance. Word-of-mouth reports from the 2010 program indicated that it would be a useful and fun experience. It also seemed to be a good way of making new contacts across a wide range of fields, and potentially starting useful research collaborations.
16. The topic of this year interest me and I want to know more about the deep time.
17. interested in subject matter; people I am working with were present
18. I participated in the Cider 2010 summer workshop. It was a great experience. Not only that I start to feel part of the wider deep Earth community, I also got to see my own research in a broader context and got to work on a new part of the Earth. Aside, from the intellectual benefits, I knew the KITP, Santa Barbara and its canteens are nice to come back to for a month. This experience was the main reason to go again this year.
19. 1. I work on tectonic processes like subduction systems and continental rifts but haven't worked on deep time issues. This was a platform to get introduced to the field of deep Earth and would give me ideas on problems and open questions for future work that I can pursue. 2. Participation of the expert faculty in the field of deep earth was another reason. 3. The interdisciplinary nature of the program was an added incentive to interact with people from other fields
20. It was recommended by a friend, and the research fits my area of interest.
21. I attended the 2010 CIDER program and found it to be greatly beneficial. I particularly enjoyed the research part of the program in 2010, as the work I became involved in ultimately formed a part of my PhD thesis. When deciding to apply for CIDER 2012 my main reasons for attending were to interact with other deep Earth scientists.
22. Great way to learn lots of Earth science not in the vacuum of reading only papers. Networking opportunities!
23. It's a good way to meet people in my field and also in the other fields !
24. 1. Suggestions from a friend. 2. Possible research projects in my future work.
25. meet experts to get help with own work; introduction to different research areas; networking

Question #2: What factors influenced your decision to participate in the CIDER II 2012 summer Institute? (Page 3)

26. I wanted to learn about a topic that was different than my PhD research. I learned more about the CIDER program at the post-AGU workshop, and also another grad student in our department had participated and really liked it. And, there was funding available for me to come.
27. The topic is very related to what I am doing now. So I want to meet with people and exchange ideas and progress of research.
28. Mostly the Topic of CIDER 2012
29. multi-disciplinary communication about the Earth science;
30. Reputation, location. I wanted to make contact with some faculty, show my work and participate to a project relying on different fields.
31. Focus on early Earth evolution and deep time.
32. I was initially informed about the CIDER summer institute by my advisor, and a few other faculty members in my department who are CIDER summer institute alums. They informed me that even though it is meant for senior graduate students & post-docs, it would be a useful workshop to attend in order to learn about varying topics I would not have access to other wise as well as making connections that could be useful in the future.
33. personal invitation by Barbara; possibility for accomodation of spouse
34. My supervisor encouraged me to apply
35. 1. Interdisciplinary research ideas. 2. Opportunity to meet potential research collaborators. 3. Interesting research theme that can lead to new questions and address existing problems with new research perspective. 4. Feedback from previous participants
36. The topic of the institute -- deep time and the early Earth -- is directly relevant to my research. I also participated in the CIDER 2011 summer program, which I found to be a great environment in which to meet and collaborate across disciplines.
37. theme (deep time)

Question #3: Comments: General organization and logistics (Page 1)

1. I have no complains on the general organization, in my opinion everything worked out very well and the over-all impressions are quite positive.
2. I would like to suggest putting many of the introductory lectures online before the start of any conference. This would allow students/postdocs to watch them before hand and not have to spend time during the workshop revisiting what most people already know. We could then spend more time on advanced topics and getting into the more nitty-gritty details of the theme or topic.
3. I thought the workshop was very well organized. I liked that time was budgeted for questions during the talks and we were given breaks after each talk. I also liked that different disciplines were discussed each day, rather than a whole day of mineral physics and separate day for geodynamics.
4. very good
5. The organization is good. Micealee kept us informed with many emails. When I arrived or left St. Barbara, the free shuttle sent by the UCSB helped a lot.
6. perfect!!
7. Excellent. Very easy for me.
8. I think the general organization worked out great. However, there were some issues regarding the insurance. Maybe it would be good the be registered as students during the summer school, so that participants can use the MedCenter at the Campus (espacially foreign participants).
9. It was very nicely organized
10. Good!
11. A little scattered prior to the program. This was a minor problem for people who hadn't participated before. For example, people were confused about the general format of the program--two weeks of lecture/workshop and two weeks of projects. It seemed like there was a choice between staying the full four weeks and leaving after three, so some people stayed only three when their schedules would have permitted them to stay more. Another example, times of when to arrive and when to leave were unclear. It turned out we could arrive any time in a the window of a few days, but we didn't really know that. There was also confusion as to when the program was over. It would have been nice to have been told "we will finish by noon, Friday the 10th" or something like that. Some people were also confused about the poster sessions. It wasn't clear that we were supposed to have the same poster at both. Finally, some details about accommodations were unclear. We are staying in dorms, but do we need to bring our own bedding/towel, etc?

Question #3: Comments: General organization and logistics (Page 2)

12. good

13. Good

14. All aspects of the program seemed well-organized and information was provided well in advance.

15. Good enough

16. well done

17. Everything was great. Barbara and Marc did a good job organizing. The only thing that was too bad, is that so many (senior) people left early.

18. 1. The technical part of the CIDER program was well organized but the tutorial and workshop portions of the program can be improved. 2. Regarding logistics, it would have been nice to have chairs with small tables to work on the laptop especially during the tutorials. 3. Recording all the talks was very useful for future reference. 4. The wiki page is also very useful to maintain updates, even for future.

19. Well organized, and good communication re: details.

20. Things seem to have run very smoothly.

21. None

22. The organization was really good. Too bad we didn't have any BBQ on last week. Everybody is working with his group and interactions between groups could have been more interested with a bbq (or a diner) at this point.

23. Perfect, the 2 week workshop after the lecture time may be too long and not quite efficient.

24. good

25. I really liked the program. The only logistical issue for me was computers. Even though I had all of the previously designated software on my computer ahead of time, I still had trouble getting the programs for the tutorials that were given to us on the first day to run on my computer. But I still liked the tutorials a lot, even if I didn't get to use all of the programs.

26. The organization is very good. I really enjoy it.

27. Honestly, there is nothing to complain about. Everything is very well organized.

28. Good

Question #3: Comments: General organization and logistics (Page 3)

- 29. I believe that things have been organized very well and my only suggestion would be a bit more introduction presentations over the first few days to ensure that everyone is at a level that they can understand the more technical talks.
- 30. Organization and logistics on the whole were dealt with very well. I have had no issues with anything in this regard.
- 31. Very good. Appreciated the dinners and BBQs that were organized.
- 32. Very good
- 33. The lectures during the tutorial section could have been better organized. It was also not always clear that the speaker was aware of what audience their talks were intended for -- a lot of the early talks especially seemed aimed at experts in the various fields without accounting for the fact that many in the audience hailed from different specialties and needed a bit more introduction. Some true introductory material to each field in the first few days would have been helpful. On the whole, though, both the tutorial talks and the research talks were informative and helpful in understanding the current state of the field.
- 34. great

Question #4: Comments: Location, venue, housing and food (Page 1)

1. Location: amazing; Venue: well organized, comfortable (both KITP and UCSB campus); Housing and food: very good
2. UCSB and KITP are great. I would not change anything regarding the location, venue, housing or food.
3. venue, housing and food were all terrific. KITP at UCSB was a great venue.
4. The location was great. I really enjoyed staying at the UCSB campus. The housing was very comfortable and the food was good (many options).
5. KITP at UCSB seems to be an ideal location.
6. Santa Barbara has a wonderful temperature and scenery. The dormitory facing the sea and the dining halls are great! And I particularly like the BBQ and a formal dinner, the food are gorgeous!
7. excellent! couldn't be better!
8. All great for one month. Living so close to KITP and having all meals in the cafeteria saved me so much time, which I spent socializing with the other students and post-docs.
9. Location: probably the best possible:); venue: same; housing: the student dorms were good, however, sometimes the screaming children were a little bit annoying when there was work to do.
10. Very well done.
11. Good!
12. Location and venue is fantastic, no complaints at all. Housing is reasonable for a dorm setting. As students, we definitely preferred not staying in the apartments and being very far and responsible for our own food. The amount that the housekeeping put up with us was also commendable. Food was in general very good. Lots of selection at multiple cafeterias. It did get a bit repetitive after four weeks. The hours of the cafeterias was kind of annoying, especially since they changed every day and we needed to constantly check them. But I guess this is out of our control.
13. good
14. Everything was good, especially the location.

Question #4: Comments: Location, venue, housing and food (Page 2)

15. The location is ideal for this kind of program since the campus is somewhat disconnected from the city, meaning that the group became more cohesive than might otherwise be the case. Facilities in KITP were good - and it was nice to have an office in the building. The housing was comfortable, and facilities were good (easy access to laundry, etc.). The food, both in the dining halls and in the catered dinners, was of good quality. The dining halls were often a bit overcrowded and noisy due to large numbers of other groups, and the hours for breakfast were a bit short in the nearby dining hall (only 8-9am).
16. Santa Barbara is a nice place and the place where I live is also excellent. While, the food is fine, more reason is because having similar food in one month.
17. well done
18. The location is a great. KITP works well for this program. For a campus canteen, the food is great. It was too bad that there were no common dinners in the last week to add a bit more variety.
19. 1. The location, venue, housing and food arrangements were excellent.
20. Food/housing/venue were all very nice.
21. UCSB's campus seems to be ideal for CIDER, as everyone gets to know each other very quickly due to the lack of distractions and dorm living. Being able to eat in either dining hall was nice as it added variety to meal times, and the food was always good.
It would have been nice for there to be a kitchen with clearly designated drinking water in the dorms.
22. My dorm room was pretty infested with ants for most of the summer and it seemed nothing was ever done about it.
23. very good.
24. Perfect
25. excellent
26. The housing was really nice, the location was very comfortable. The food was good, but it was a little stressful trying to make it to the dining hall hours sometimes.
27. All are very good. Excellent place!
28. Same thing here.
The Location is Ideal, easy to reach by many different type of transportation. The housing and dinning halls are just perfectly adequate to this event.

Question #4: Comments: Location, venue, housing and food (Page 3)

29. excellent, this is almost the best place for holding CIDER
30. That was the bad part of my experience of CIDER. USBC campus is really big and far away for everything. it has a nice view but there is NOTHING to do there, you need at least a bike, or a car to go around. We can go to Santa Barbara (that's ok you just need a bus ride) but there are not many things to see and do. We had to be organized to go hiking or to site seeing (and it did not work out).
I was happy to come to California, but I did not expect everything to be so far apart. I needed 3 or 4 days off in a row to do some tourism. But we had only one, once a week.
Food: too much food! We were fed every 1:30 hours! The dinners were way too early and too close to lunch (5:45pm, and we had lunch at 1:00 pm) so I skipped many of them and had dinner in Isla Vista with other CIDER students.
31. I think it would be great to have the participants all stay together somewhere so that there could be even more interaction between senior and junior members.
32. The location of the housing and KITP have been a huge part in enjoying this institute. The food has been good, however the dining schedule limits the work/lecture hours and there have been some days where I had to choose to eat in the dining hall versus working a bit longer. That is less of a complaint, more of an observation as the dining hall hours are set by the school and not a CIDER issue.
33. excellent, very good, very good, excellent
there seem to be small issues regarding the available space for each focus group. We are able to deal with, but I believe however that one or two offices could be turned into meeting rooms if we squeeze a little bit (2 researches in each office)
34. The possibility to come with your family and stay in a family apartments was greatly appreciated
35. Very good
36. The location is hard to beat. Both the UCSB campus and KITP are a great venue for the Institute. I have no complaints about the housing or food. The barbeques and catered dinners are a good idea and seem to foster a lot of faculty/junior participant interaction.
37. great

Question #5: Comments: Schedule (Page 1)

1. It might be worth re-organizing 2 intensive weeks of lectures 9am-5pm. At the end of the second week we felt a bit stressed that we did not have any time for ourselves, to do our own work and to "process" such amount of new information
2. The schedule was fine. Not sure how one would be able to improve.
3. the schedule was very packed, but in a good way. i appreciated that we did preliminary work the first couple weeks forming our research groups so that we could get started right away week 3 in meeting with our group.
4. I thought the schedule was put together nicely. I liked that were were given breaks between talks to allow for time to interact with other participants. I think the lunch was a bit long and could be shorted to allow us to finish a little earlier in the day. I thought the time for some of the tutorials was too short. We might have benefited from an additional 30 minutes.
5. appropriate
6. 4 weeks are a little bit long. But CIDER workshop worth the time.
Lectures are well scheduled. BBQs and catered dinners are good opportunities to know each other. Daily schedule is just good, not too stressful and not too relaxed.
I like the organization of the lectures and tutorial part of the CIDER. Two lectures divided by a half hour coffee break is both efficient and relaxing.
7. OK, the two weeks scientific tutorials is good, but the research weeks after is a little bit rush!
8. Too much eating.
9. -was perfect as it was. not too much and not too less. Of course the group work could have go on for more weeks, but there would probably never be an end.
10. Just about right (3 weeks would have been too short).
11. Efficient.
12. Saturday morning lectures was too much. The schedule was pretty packed--even though we didn't go very late into the afternoon, paying attention to a lot of lectures every day is draining. I needed the weekend to recover and sleep in, which I didn't get to do until Sunday.
13. good.
14. Generally good, maybe it would have been better to have at least one afternoon off to be able to get some work done. I understand that there are many things to do, but I would rather stay the other week days until 6pm and have one afternoon during the week off than staying until 5 and basically not being able to have more than one hour or so to work.

Question #5: Comments: Schedule (Page 2)

15. The schedule in the tutorial part of the program seemed about right - there were sufficient breaks between lectures, tutorials and other activities. However, one possible alteration to try could be to have a short break in the middle of the lectures - 1 1/2 hours is a fairly long slot and a chance to stop and refocus might have been useful.
16. Compact and not nervous
17. well done
18. The schedule is fine, and not overloaded. The only thing that went wrong (and also did so in 2010) is that the ice breaker is organized during the dining common hours, so people have to run off after half an hour to get dinner. Possibly this could start an hour earlier, or after dinner.
19. It would be better to keep the entire CIDER program for three weeks, instead of 4 weeks but distribute the talks, tutorials and the workshop over the three week time period. A big group of participants (both faculty and students) left after 3 weeks so I think its better to keep it to 3 weeks.
20. Well schedules, long enough sessions to get somewhat in-depth information, and plenty of time for questions.
21. I am out of the habit of attending Saturday morning lectures so I found the schedule quite tiring initially. Having 2 weeks for research was great, as it allowed us to define the problem, write an AGU abstract and get some original research done!
22. Perhaps intersperse lectures throughout the 4 weeks rather than a solid two weeks at the beginning. This way we can begin to think of our projects earlier.
23. Diner were too early for me, but it seems to be an american habit.
But for the lectures and other stuff it was ok. Most of the time we were in time.
24. Good.
25. good
26. I liked the schedule.
27. This is OK for me.
28. Considering the amount of things that have been scheduled, the timing and organization was well prepared. No comment on the schedule.
29. all right

Question #5: Comments: Schedule (Page 3)

30. no lecture on saturday would be better. I know that we have to stay and work together, but with only 1 day off, there is nothing you can do because of the californian distances.
The daily scheduled was different from what I am used to. I would prefer to have more things in the afternoon and less in the morning. It was the other way around, we finished very early, but if we wanted to have dinner in the dining commons, we could not go to work after Cider. I guess it is just a habit to have.
31. Great! Long but plenty of breaks.
32. The schedule was very well paced. Personally I would have liked moving the 2-3 lectures on Saturday mornings to portions of the week (maybe have 2 or 3 days a week go 45 min longer). That is however a small issue.
33. In my personal opinion it's a little bit on the tight side, particularly since I currently have a lot of other stuff to do. But I realize that there is not much that we can do about it.
34. more time should had been allocated to posters
35. The scheduling of lectures and tutorials was generally good.
36. The schedule is overall good. The first two weeks were a bit grueling, and towards the end of the second week my attention and that of many others I noticed was flagging. The tutorial talks being concentrated into the first two weeks makes sense but perhaps some of the research talks could have been moved to weeks 3-4?
37. great

Question #6: Comments: Lecture content, level, pace, workload, balance between lectures and tutorials (Page 1)

1. lecture content: in most cases, lecturers were starting with basics, giving us a good background, and then they presented up to date research in their respective fields.
balance: maybe it would be worth having less diverse tutorials, but therefore longer practicing time. maybe even have separate days for tutorials. also, it is maybe good to have a possibility to choose a few among several tutorials and spend a bit more time on those where you actually can learn what you want to know.
2. This gets back to 3. Again, put as much of the introductory lessons online and not have it during the real workshop times. More tutorials!!! I got the most out of the tutorials. Not sure everyone feels the same as I do, but they were great and many of the tools learned in the tutorials I will continue to use and improve upon.
3. the lectures were generally very high quality, and the schedule was well organized. the research talks were also good, especially in weeks 3-4 where it was our only group gathering. having research talks in weeks one and two was less useful, since they usually came after an already full day. that could be one way to relax the schedule. it might be useful, time permitting, to have some sort of review/synthesis activity the last afternoon (in lieu of a tutorial) which reviews the highlights of the 2 weeks of lecture.
4. The lectures were very good. The lectures outside of my field were a bit high level, but some speakers provided adequate background information. I think it might be beneficial to have the first few lectures in each discipline be a bit more basic, just to bring everyone up to speed, and then have the subsequent lectures be of a higher level. The workload was reasonable. It was a bit difficult toward the end of the workshop to get a research done with limited time and required some additional late night work, particularly in preparing for the presentation. The tutorials were good, but as a person without a programming experience, they were difficult to keep up with. I, along with several other geochemistry students, did not know how to work in terminal or virtual box and often felt like a nuisance to other students/postdocs during the tutorial. It would have been great to have one additional, maybe optional, tutorial in the very beginning for students who need some instruction on writing command codes, etc.
5. I found all lectures/tutorials informative and useful.
6. Lectures are good. Most of the content are fundamental and illustrative, easy for non-experts to follow. Lectures are about different disciplines, which broadens my horizon and raises interest. Workload and pace are fine, I feel relaxed during the lecture part, yet learned a lot. The overall effect to me is very exciting and motivating.
7. it's excellent!

Question #6: Comments: Lecture content, level, pace, workload, balance between lectures and tutorials (Page 2)

8. Great content and appropriate level for me in most lectures. But the pace varied a lot among the geochemistry lectures, which was very frustrating. The tutorials were mostly useless for me. Only the geodynamics tutorial and Sujoy's geochemistry tutorial made any impression. They were both simple, reached a point where we input our own parameters to test something and could report back to the group what we had found.
9. The level of the lectures was usually OK, with some exceptions, where there was a missing introductory part. Some seismology lectures, especially Gabi Laskes, were hard to understand for non-seismologists. But most of the other lecturers tried to keep it as simple as possible, or really explained the physics behind it (not just saying "you should know that all, and it is very easy").
In my opinion there should be more tutorials and it should be better organized. It happened several times that the tutorial was before the actual lecture about the particular topic...
10. Each group except the seismologists did a nice job. They appeared to be talking mostly to themselves rather than the other groups.
11. Good!
12. Most lectures were excellent. Some were a little too detailed, for example, there seemed to be a planning breakdown with the seismology sequence. We needed the introductory lectures and inverse theory before the normal modes lecture and the inverse theory tutorial. The research talks were also in general interesting, but sometimes I would have rather had an additional introductory or background lecture instead, especially when it was a research talk in a field that I knew nothing about.
Most tutorials were pretty good, although some seemed a little pointless. It was nice to actually see the tools that people use in the fields, although in many cases it was more just going through the motions whereas I would have preferred to learn more about how the tools worked and not just make pretty maps I didn't understand.
All tutorials should be able to run out of the box. Installing software is ok but should not be excessive nor require knowledge of UNIX or shell scripting.
In all, many tutorials needed to be simplified in terms of the technical aspects as well as the subject matter.
13. Too much talks and tuition. Graduate students have no much time to talk with seniors, or people from other principle. Lack of basic introduction from different fields. Lots of lectures are like research reports. About tutorials, students working on seismology may feel it is kinda of too easy on seismologic tutorial, but get little or even no feeling/understanding from tutorials on mineralogy/aerodynamics. Maybe it is better to prepare more handout materials on introduction, why it is important and examples.

Question #6: Comments: Lecture content, level, pace, workload, balance between lectures and tutorials (Page 3)

14. I liked most of lectures. I think that in general the lecture contents were interesting. I really have a positive opinion on the first two weeks of CIDER.
I really enjoyed some tutorials, it is a good opportunity to learn the actual tools that are used by researcher that are not particularly in my field.
Just one "negative" thins about the tutorials: some tutorials were before the actual lecture on the same subject (seismology - the inver problem - for example), so it wasn't trivial to follow it.
15. The lecture program content covered a broad range of fields, which I think matched the aims of CIDER well. I did find that in fields well outside my sphere of expertise, the lectures went at what seemed like too fast a pace and did not necessarily provide enough lower level background material. However, it's clear that the length of the program isn't the same as that of a graduate course, so I think that it was necessary for the material to be covered quickly and there's probably not that much that can be done to make this aspect better! It was still a valuable experience to be exposed to the methods and ideas used in the various fields, even if not completely understanding them at the time, and since the lectures are available online, the archive will be a great resource to come back to later, after having read a bit more background material and gained a better grounding in these topics.
On the whole the tutorials were less useful than the lectures - there were a few computer issues with a number of them, which might perhaps have been resolved by more extensive use of the virtual machine environment. Some of the tutorials could have done with more comprehensive documentation. The tutorials that worked best were those that were focussed on a very particular problem (e.g. the mantle convection tutorial - this also had the advantage of being spread over two sessions).
Designing a useful tutorial for the time-slot available is of course a hard problem - so perhaps the alternative would be to provide more 'soft-skills' tutorials: focusing on skills such as grant and paper writing, careers advice, etc.
16. lecture part are very good, easier to follow, the lectures and tutorials connect well with each other, but some tutorials, which are not from my own field, are kind of off the lectures and which a little bit hard to follow.
17. well done
18. Some lectures are great, others went too fast, or where too much of a research talk. I think the first two days should start with talks like 'geodynamics for dummies', 'seismology for dummies' etc. where the talk itself should be boring for members of the disciplines. I think the lecturers should be (better) instructed to aim at people outside their field, and not go into discussions with their colleagues in the field. These arguments sometimes left little room for basic questions (this occurred mostly during geochemistry lectures).
The amount of tutorials are fine and went better than two years ago. More improvement can be made by making more use of the Virtual Box.

Question #6: Comments: Lecture content, level, pace, workload, balance between lectures and tutorials (Page 4)

19. 1. The lecture content, level and pace was very good. 2. I felt it difficult to cope up with the seismology talks and specially the tutorials but that maybe because I work in a different field. Maybe Some time can be spent with some basic seismology. 3. I think the tutorials can be separated for geochemists, seismologist and numerical modelers. i.e. It would be useful to have separate but longer tutorials at the same time in geochemistry, seismology and geodynamics and the option can be given to students to decide which one they would like to attend. That way, students can learn more in their respective fields. 4. Maybe we should have a maximum of 4 talks each day, moving the research talks during the workshop component.
20. 20. One suggestion is to have a little more background information available on the tutorials prior to the tutorials themselves (maybe some suggested reading, more info on what we're trying to accomplish, etc.) Also, alternating lectures and tutorials (rather than lectures only in the morning, and tutorials in the afternoon) might help break up the day a little more.
21. I found the geochemistry lectures hardest to follow, although I enjoyed Sujoy's tutorial and Rick and Bill's tutorials quite a lot, as I felt they linked well to the lectures. The geodynamics tutorials ran very well.
22. Just fine.
23. It's hard to say.
The first seismic lectures was too hard for non seismologist, and maybe it would have been better to do a "seismology for dummies" before it.
It was good to have the tutorials after the lectures, and the use of the virtual box was really helpful because compiling and installing all the sources are time consuming.
24. The lectures are perfect. Some tutorials are not necessary.
Learning the simulation, XRD processing may be helpful for us to understand, but as a seismologist, I would rather corporate with some experts if I need to, but do it myself. From the point of learning, reading some paper to learn the basic idea may be more helpful than learn the programs.
The seismology related tutorial is even more useless to me.
25. more tutorials; less general lectures; more connection between lectures; intro lectures should start more basic
26. Content was good, there were a few things outside of my field that I didn't understand, but I expected that. The workload wasn't too demanding. I thought the balance between lectures and tutorials was good.

Question #6: Comments: Lecture content, level, pace, workload, balance between lectures and tutorials (Page 5)

27. A very wide range of topics of lecture. However, I found that for things related to my research, the lecture is too easy, while that not very related is very difficult to understand. Sometimes, I just can not read the figures (e.g., the axis, error bars). I was totally lost when seeing some figures. What about using more interesting cartoons to explain ideas, not the very professional figure? The big picture is more important and interesting than details for non-specializer. For tutorials, I think these are very good. I at least have some idea of what people normally do everyday.
28. Lecture content:
Very good and appropriate. From good introduction to the field, through summaries of the state of the problems, to the next level of research in the area, the Lectures have covered a wide range of level and allow anybody to bring something home, even without being specialist in the field
Although days were long I think that the Pace was good, and the shift between fields of research was appropriate. The amount of Lectures vs tutorial was well balanced
29. Excellent
30. 2 weeks of lectures and tutorial is too much. We don't have time to learn. I found the project part much more interesting.
Even if I did not fully understood what I was doing during the tutorial, I think they have their importance: now I know some of the tools I can use. If one day I am interested in doing a particular thing, I know what method/software/parameter I can rely on and who I can contact to get further understanding (or for help!).
31. The first few days were a bit rough, as some of the talks were a bit too technical for the general audience. However after that initial few days, the lectures were very interesting and well presented. The workload seems to be ideal, and the lecture tutorial balance was perfect.
32. the lectures were great. The tutorials are a great idea, but sometimes I felt the approach should be such that downloading and installing software does not take so much time. The tutorials that only relied on excel tables and such I think were the most useful ones. I cannot say anything about the geodynamics tutorials though (I did not attend because I am a geodynamicist).
33. The lectures should have been more simple.
This is a multidisciplinary workshop. Geochemists don't know anything about seismology and vice versa.

Question #6: Comments: Lecture content, level, pace, workload, balance between lectures and tutorials (Page 6)

34. The lecture content and the level were fairly good although a few lectures could have been more specific to a certain topic. I think that more tutorials would be a better way to enable better understanding of few concepts. Also, it would be nice to make sure that everyone has access to all the softwares (made for pc/mac or different constructions) beforehand or systematically group the people to ensure everyone gets to understand those softwares and hence the tutorials.
35. Lectures: The lectures during the tutorial section could have been better organized. It was also not always clear that the speaker was aware of what audience their talks were intended for -- a lot of the early talks especially seemed aimed at experts in the various fields without accounting for the fact that many in the audience hailed from different specialties and needed a bit more introduction. Some true introductory material to each field in the first few days would have been helpful. On the whole, though, both the tutorial talks and the research talks were informative and helpful in understanding the current state of the field.
Tutorials: I found these helpful in understanding the various fields represented. Perhaps more advanced warning on the software requirements (some of them we ended up downloading programs the day before or the day of) would have been helpful.
36. excellent
Most of the time, lecture content was easy enough to follow even for people outside the field. Also, I like that a lot of researchers tried to point to uncertainties and weak points of their own research field.

Question #7: Comments: Lecture styles that worked well/ lecture styles that did not work well (Page 1)

1. some of tutorials where we spend a lot of time installing the software and practicing how to use it, did not work out well, in my opinion.
i liked best those where lecturers explained how does the whole process - obtaining raw data, analysing them, comparing them with previous results - look like (eg. lecture and tutorial of Razvan Caracas).
2. The were fine.
3. I really appreciated lectures that had a few slides of background information before jumping into the details of the talk. Not everyone had clear labels on the figures/graphs on their slides (although many did) and it made it difficult to understand what I was looking at.
4. Work well for me: logic; from easy to hard, spend more time on the easy but fundamental part; illustrations.
didn't work well for me: jump here and there; too hard, too detailed, and too frontier-ed.
5. Lectures are great! Maybe tutorial session may need to be improved
6. Lectures with a single conceptual focus seemed to work very well. The geochemistry lectures that focused on time periods were very hard to follow because rather than explaining any of their methods in a clear way, they assumed we would understand and trust a variety of methods that are used to study one time period. Lectures that gave a sense of the full breadth of research in an area were better than those that described primarily the speaker's research.
7. I think most of the lecture styles worked out well, just the ones with the missing introductory part were not working well.
8. Good!
9. Broad introductory talks worked better than focused research talks. I liked talks of the theme "what do we know and what do we not know about topic X". I also liked talks of the theme "what are the cool things we can do with tool X and what are the limitations of tool X". These are good ways to introduce subjects and specific areas of investigation to students. It also means speakers have to be able to objectively assess their field, as opposed to stating something as dogma where the students have no context to assess the claims.
10. A series of lectures with basic introduction, problems, and progress worked better for me.
11. I think all the lectures worked fine. Of course some of them were more difficult to follow, but only because was not my field, but still I could get the general sense of the problem.

Question #7: Comments: Lecture styles that worked well/ lecture styles that did not work well (Page 2)

12. The lecture program content covered a broad range of fields, which I think matched the aims of CIDER well. I did find that in fields well outside my sphere of expertise, the lectures went at what seemed like too fast a pace and did not necessarily provide enough lower level background material. However, it's clear that the length of the program isn't the same as that of a graduate course, so I think that it was necessary for the material to be covered quickly and there's probably not that much that can be done to make this aspect better! It was still a valuable experience to be exposed to the methods and ideas used in the various fields, even if not completely understanding them at the time, and since the lectures are available online, the archive will be a great resource to come back to later, after having read a bit more background material and gained a better grounding in these topics.
On the whole the tutorials were less useful than the lectures - there were a few computer issues with a number of them, which might perhaps have been resolved by more extensive use of the virtual machine environment. Some of the tutorials could have done with more comprehensive documentation. The tutorials that worked best were those that were focussed on a very particular problem (e.g. the mantle convection tutorial - this also had the advantage of being spread over two sessions).
Designing a useful tutorial for the time-slot available is of course a hard problem - so perhaps the alternative would be to provide more 'soft-skills' tutorials: focusing on skills such as grant and paper writing, careers advice, etc. Perhaps the tutorial format was not as successful as the lectures. Generally I felt that all the lectures were well presented.
13. most lecture styles are easy to follow, which is good for the students.
14. well done
15. The more introductory the better. Including the history of the field is good. Ending with current questions and debates is good too, but giving a research talk on current stuff was usually confusing (and led to subsequent, more confusing, high-end discussion).
16. I think most of the lectures were well designed. One way to improve would be to provide a relevant review paper to students ahead of the lecture so that the talks are easier to follow.
17. Most of the lecturers were very interesting and good presenters. In general, whether I found a presentation interesting had more to do with the subject matter than the presenter himself, so don't want to criticize based solely on whether or not I personally found something interesting. However, I do have to say that Ed Garnero's style of presentation was particularly good and well-aimed at an interdisciplinary audience.
18. The relaxed nature of the lecturers, who were all open to questions and interruptions meant that I learnt things from all of the tutorials and lectures.

Question #7: Comments: Lecture styles that worked well/ lecture styles that did not work well (Page 3)

19. Maybe people should have focus on the topic of this CIDER, because for most of the lectures, I was thinking that it wasn't really focused on it. The firsts lectures focused on the formation from small planetary bodies, but then I didn't really get the point of how the Earth evolved. And I think that's maybe why research group didn't really focused on deep time either...
Let say per field : one first lectures for general background, and then 2 lectures on some more focused points useful for the deep earth, that should be great.
20. Perfect
21. - please to not offer tutorials where there was nothing to do as a participant
22. I think that the best lectures were the ones that presented a lot of clear images, outlined the topics to be discussed very clearly, and discussed not just results or favorite interpretations but also how the research is done, the drawbacks, how it can be interpreted, etc. Talking for more than a couple minutes on each slide was generally not a good idea, white slides with just words generally was not good. For some reason, although the order of the lectures appeared somewhat logical on paper, the progression wasn't always apparent to me from the lectures themselves. But, I think there were several really good lectures - overall I think at least 75% of the lectures were very good and clear.
23. Some terms are hard to understand instantly, such as equations I am not very familiar with. And also some figures are difficult to understand. It takes me some time to figure out what is shown in the figure. However, the speaker can not wait every one to understand. So, for some lecture, I am totally lost.
24. Very difficult to emphasis, since it is strongly person related, and also field of research related. Nonetheless, I found the Lectures to be in general of high quality.
25. the lectures starting from the very basic concepts/methods are appreiated
26. Many field had 2 lecture to give, the first one was possible to understand for people not working in this field, the second one never was. That is why I thought one week of lecture was enough.
27. Lectures that were interactive and acknowledged upfront that there were members in the audience who might not know anything about a certain field were always the most enjoyable. Having a short introduction to whatever lecture topic was on tap was helpful on more than a few occasions.
28. I think it's really important to gear the lecture towards the audience (multi-disciplinary, mant students). It never hurts to give an extensive introduction, explain/define the jargon, and to remain rather too low-level than too high-level. This is not the place to shine by showing off.

Question #7: Comments: Lecture styles that worked well/ lecture styles that did not work well (Page 4)

29. Very simple lectures worked well because everybody could understand.
More technical and detailed lectures did not work well.
30. Lectures that work well are the ones that systematically address a particular problem or give a general introduction to the specific research area.
31. I loved convection tutorial by S. Zhong, L. Kellog and B. Buffet and also the seismic one done by E. Garnero.
Also, geochemistry tutorials were great.
The first tutorial done by G. Laske was hard to follow.

Question #8: Were you comfortable asking questions or making comments during the lectures? (Page 1)

Yes - 70.3%

No - 29.7%

1. The atmosphere was generally relaxed and it was clear that we were beginners in at least 75% of the topics. That made me feel comfortable to ask basic questions.
2. I felt at ease asking questions.
3. In general, I was not very comfortable asking questions during the lectures. While everyone seemed very nice, it was a bit intimidating to ask questions at some points. I felt most comfortable asking questions in my research area.
4. I am not confident about my background and understanding and am afraid that I will ask silly questions and be looked down upon by seniors.
My English is poor, I don't know how to organize my question and express it precisely and fluently.
Sometimes I am not able to organize my questions quickly enough to raise it at the right time of the lecture.
5. Unfortunately. Even though the talks were geared to people like me in principle, it is still intimidating to ask questions in front of a lot of professors (including my advisor) in an unfamiliar field, for fear of a question sounding dumb. I know people always say that "there are no dumb questions" or "the students are encouraged to ask questions", but that doesn't really help. A few speakers and moderators specifically solicited questions from the students. If more had done this, maybe it would have made me more comfortable. Some senior participants would often interrupt or interject questions or comments that would either push their own agenda or distract from the speaker's main point, or ask about subjects that were clearly not the speakers' expertise. These also made me feel less inclined to ask basic "dumb" questions.
6. There are too many questions to the different fields and sometimes totally lost in what lecturers are talking about.
7. I'm not a question person, I usually need time to process the lectures before being able to understand that there's something I want to ask. The point is, I haven't actually asked any question, but I'm still answering "yes" because the atmosphere during the lectures was good and the seniors were willing to let students talk without problems.
8. There was a friendly and non-aggressive environment throughout the whole program - questions and discussions were always encouraged. Though perhaps sometimes the high level of some of the discussions made it seem more intimidating to ask a basic question out of one's field.
9. the atmosphere for asking questions is relaxing

Question #8: Were you comfortable asking questions or making comments during the lectures? (Page 2)

10. And here I mean, not 'all' lectures. It basically depended on the lecturer and their pitch and if I felt their intention was to have me understand everything.
11. I was able to ask questions during the talks. The faculty were very responsive and patient to take question between the talk.
12. Most of the commenting seemed to be dominated by the senior members, my reluctance stemmed mostly from not wanting to ask a "dumb" question.
13. Due to the large number of questions etc. being asked in questions I was happy to ask questions. However, I would have liked a very simple glossary for each topic, so that I didn't worry about asking REALLY simple questions.
14. Environment of collegiality was made very early on.
15. I'm not completely fluent in english, and especially in that cases.
16. I may be the student with too many questions
17. I just don't feel comfortable speaking up in front of so many people. But I did ask a lot of questions of speakers or other people who research those fields individually later after the lectures, and I learned a lot from those discussions. I loved the chalkboards all over KITP!
18. For some questions, I would rather think myself than asking during the lecture. That is because there is not enough time for discussion of certain problems. And the answer from speakers is not always satisfied, simply because of limitation of time.
19. Really comfortable environment for asking questions
20. Speakers did a great job of allowing for interruptions and explanations.
21. Within the lectures itself it seemed a bit intimidating to ask questions (especially being a younger graduate student). However, I never had any issues with going up to the speaker right after their lecture/research talk and ask any questions I had. All of the speakers were extremely willing to answer any questions I had.
22. I asked a lot of questions, and did not feel intimidated to do so, since some of the faculty from other fields also asked "stupid" questions
23. Only professors were making comments, and arguing between each other over difficult questions that remained obscure to students.
In this context, students and postdoc were afraid to ask "silly questions"

Question #8: Were you comfortable asking questions or making comments during the lectures? (Page 3)

24. We were encouraged to ask questions, which helped me to be more forward in asking questions.

25. In such a small meeting it's always easier to ask questions and we were also encouraged by senior researchers to ask.

Question #9: Comments: Research Group Workshop format and organization (Page 1)

1. In my opinion, it is maybe better to start organizing groups even earlier during lecture period, so that students can start literature research before the lectures are over. One could then have a focus during lectures and benefit more from them.
2. This was fine.
3. i was happy with the interaction between senior participants and the students/postdocs.
4. I think we would have benefited from a little more structure in the Research group workshop. I liked that we were given tasks such as the "statement of the problem" paper, 5 minute update on progress, and final presentation. It would have been better if we were told to meet for a set number of hours. Instead, we split up to work individually at some points and it wasn't clear that we were all staying on the same task.
5. I don't like the research project part, particular when the team is not well organized, you don't know what to do to contribute to the team better. Most of the seniors, including faculties and post-doctors, left at the end of the third week, as well as most graduate students in our group. The only few that were remaining for the forth week are confused and struggling. I think at the forth week, the whole team is lost controlled of and the result are disappointing.
6. a little disappointing, but I don't have any better suggestion.
7. Great organization given the time constraints.
8. I think the finding of the topics worked out very well. I like the idea that everybody can write down there topics anonymously. However, there were some flaws in the decision of which projects will be really worked on. It doesn't make sense that senior people take influence on that and then will not be there in the time the research groups are working. This resulted in Research groups having 4 students and 4 seniors; and others with just 8 students...
9. The way the topics were selected was sub optimal. It would have been better if people had to volunteer a question rather than anonymously suggest topics
10. Good!

Question #9: Comments: Research Group Workshop format and organization (Page 2)

11. For the most part very good. A negative point: most of the faculty left by the end of the workshop, so it left some groups somewhat stranded. It also was less fulfilling to give final presentations that were only seen by a few people. We got good feedback a week into the projects when some were still around, but I would have also liked it at the end of two weeks when we'd really done some serious work on the project.
In terms of the makeup of the group, which I get more into in the next question, there seemed to be an overzealous effort to make the groups the same size and composition. I thought this was unnecessary. I thought it would be perfectly fine if a group only comprised two specialties; you don't need all four for any given problem. This is how some groups ended up anyway, so I don't think it should have been discouraged in the beginning.
Also, introduce the research group things earlier, so students can start talking to each other about things they might find interesting. I talked to a few other students at the poster sessions and the like about little things I've been wanting to do, and some of these could have made good projects. I don't think the projects should be limited to large groups trying to tackle large issues; they could be a series of small projects with fewer people, stemming from specific informal discussions.
12. Good.
13. I think that the idea of the research groups is good. I found maybe difficult choosing which I group I wanted to work in, since the subjects were really general at the beginning, basically the whole range of problems the community is working on right now. It was probably a consequences to the idea of writing the topics on the sticky instead of talking about it. That was a good way to let everyone propose something, but at the same time there was no discussion on what/why/how the topic was good.
14. 14. It was good that we started thinking about the possible projects and ideas well ahead of the start of the research group workshop which I think gave rise to a number of good questions. Once the research projects had started, I think perhaps there were too many fixed mileposts (e.g. written statement of problem, preliminary presentation - I don't think both were necessary) which may have meant that time was spent preparing these things instead of thinking further about the problem and doing research. It was also unfortunate this year that the AGU deadline fell in the middle of the second week of the research program. Many participants left at the end of the first week, which left some of the groups much smaller. I guess this is perhaps inevitable, but it would be great if people could stay longer. I found that during the research part of the program, the days were a bit fragmented by having the research talks at 4pm. I think I would have preferred having the talks at 5pm - but kept closer to 1/2 hour than they were, and perhaps only having two a week.
15. I can find what I want to do in the big version
16. well done

Question #9: Comments: Research Group Workshop format and organization (Page 3)

17. Getting into research groups was a bit messy at the time (and seemed to work better two years ago). But everything worked out in the end. The major downside were the (senior) people leaving after one week of research.
18. I think the research group workshop format is an excellent idea as it gives us a platform to meet people with similar interests who can continue their work even after the CIDER workshop. It is obviously very difficult to come up with some definite results in one or two weeks but the work can continue later as well.
One suggestion would be to start forming the research groups in the first week itself so that people have more time to suit their interests. That will give us more time to understand what is best according to our interests and we can give more time to the work during the last 1 or 2 weeks and probable get more work done.
19. Seemed to work well.
20. Due to the broad nature of the theme of this meeting (Deep Time) it was difficult to precisely form a research question that was manageable in 2 weeks. I am part of the inner core research group, and the inner core has so many puzzling features that may have originated at some point in Earth's history that it was hard to choose just one. I didn't enjoy the frequent deadlines in the early stage of research, although I imagine they helped us to formulate a more precise research question, but producing documents and talks also took time away from the actual research.
21. Fine.
22. Good.
23. Organization and format is conceptually very well.
24. I thought the organization was pretty good, I like the "deadlines" because it forced us to commit to a topic/subject/problem. I like that we didn't have to commit to something right away but were free to look into other groups as well.
25. I am interested in several groups. But I can only choose one. If I know what I am going to do previously in the group, I will choose another group instead. That is, I need to consider what I really need to do when choosing a group. One way is to switch group freely for the first few days, then determine which group to join.
26. So far I find it successful. I wondered how could that be organized, and I have to say that it worked very well. The group has a good size and has auto-organized itself pretty quickly in a good manner.

Question #9: Comments: Research Group Workshop format and organization (Page 4)

27. not easy at the beginning be cause of the imposed format "we want 4 groups of 10 persons", the organiser changed their mind (or let people do?) and it was ok.
i think we were asked too early to chose a group, without really knowing what were the questions the groups wanted to tackle. I went to see 2 groups during the first group meeting, and made my mind at the end of it.
28. I was initially hesitant about the research group workshop, but as it is (still) progressing I am finding it more and more helpful and insightful to how research could (and maybe should more often) work. Organization of the groups was a bit confusing, but it all worked out in the end so I do not have any issues or complaints about it.
29. I'm actually quite excited about working colloboratively in cross-disciplinary groups, developing ideas together, and sketch a research plan for a project within a couple of days. I learn a lot.
30. did not attend research groups
31. Generally good
32. On the whole it may have been better to start setting up the research groups by having people call out questions out loud -- as it was, so many individual questions got subsumed into overall "regions of the Earth" categories that various groups seemed to spend more time working out what problem within their overall category to work on than actually working on a problem in week 3. I suppose this can be a useful exercise in itself, but organizing the groups around interesting questions to begin with, rather than overall topics, would eliminate this hurdle and make the group workshop more productive.
33. great

Question #10: Research Group Workshop – Please describe your groups work style or dynamics. What worked well and what did not work well? (Page 1)

1. We were a group (Impacts) mainly composed of geochemists and only two geodynamists. We had no seismologist in the group. So, most of us were not able to use numerical models, which was the only practical thing we could achieve during these two weeks. Geochemical side of the team was only compiling literature data and discussing results.
2. This was fine as well. This year seemed to be more student lead, which was great.
3. our group would spend some time working together and other times working independently on assigned tasks. this was a good balance.
4. Our group worked well together, and we were all pretty comfortable speaking up. When everyone was together, we often got off topic and wasted time talking about things that weren't directly related to the project. However, when we split up, it wasn't clear that we were all working on the same task. In the end, we got a lot done, but a little more communication between the different disciplines during the day would have been more beneficial. I think if we came up with a goal for the day, then split up and only worked on that one goal, then came back together in the afternoon or next morning, that would have been able to accomplish more and make better connections between the data obtained for the different disciplines.
5. I don't like the research project part, particular when the team is not well organized, you don't know what to do to contribute to the team better. Most of the seniors, including faculties and post-doctors, left at the end of the third week, as well as most graduate students in our group. The only few that were remaining for the forth week are confused and struggling. I think at the forth week, the whole team is lost controlled of and the result are disappointing. I don't like, or I was not used to our group work style. Group members spend a week to discuss about our topic, but turn out no focus at the end of the week. Then most people left and can hardly be contacted then, and the only few that are left still don't know what exactly is our topic, with what kind of focus, and we don't know what to do next. What we do then is just aimless reading and summarizing and doing some very meaningless, maybe even wrong test.
6. very flexible, but loose organization. It's kind of disappointing that different majors are not mixed well. Mineral physicists, geodynamics and seismologists had little idea of what each other is talking about. Need a much better leadership! Maybe in the next time, when every group is being assigned, the leadership issue can also be considered.
7. Discussing anything with the whole group was always boring for some people. So, quickly we stopped discussing all together for more than 5 minutes per day and instead shared a room where we could each work independently or discuss in small groups.

Question #10: Research Group Workshop – Please describe your groups work style or dynamics. What worked well and what did not work well? (Page 2)

8. We were a group with mainly students. I liked that everybody was trying to read the main literature, so that we had a common basis to work on. After 2 days, we splitted the group to have groups of 2-3 to work on several small topics and recombine them afterwards.
The only problem was that some group members just talked and couldn't give definite answers to the other ones. Whereby some needed specific choices for further doing numerical modeling or some other things...
9. We worked together. It is fun people with different background worked together. One problem was we didn't have large enough room: not everyone had a table to work.
10. While I understand multidisciplinary work is the goal of CIDER, it is difficult for a group that lacks a lot of experience even in their own area. I felt my group was a lot of younger students, most of whom had little experience in their own field, and even less outside. Having a large group amplifies this problem because it enables people within a "diverse" group to specialize and segregate, and not concern themselves with the aspects of the project that are not nominally their own. I would have preferred a smaller, more well-organized group. A large group also had another side effect which was a more scattered as opposed to focused project. With people in a lot of specialties, there is an inclination to think of a good problem and then just try to throw the kitchen sink at it instead of coming up with a smaller tractable project.
11. I would like group members working on the same problems and make everyone in the group work comfortable on what are talking about. Since in the same group we come from different research fields, I don't like people from one field just discuss that field and not care other people.
12. We started trying to understand the state of art of the subject, we assigned papers to read to everyone and then we talked about that the day later. That worked well. Then, of course, there were people that had the perfect background to work on the subject and can easily work on it and others (like me) who just choose the group with a totally different subject from my research because I wanted to learn something different. We basically worked at different rhythms and it's no one's faults. I guess that the "rush" of having something to present in two weeks and maybe also the propensity of some people to show they can do better and faster then everyone else (which I am not criticizing, I am just not like that), didn't help to "wait" for someone.

Question #10: Research Group Workshop – Please describe your groups work style or dynamics. What worked well and what did not work well? (Page 3)

13. During the first week, we had a lot of group meetings and discussions - I think this was useful in helping us to formulate a good problem to address. We managed to collect a good number of papers which we haven't all yet had time to read but will be useful to further the project in the future.

In the second week, our group became a little fragmented, because most of our members left and, as noted above, the AGU abstract deadline was during this week. However, I think that having formulated a reasonable question in the first week it should lead to the work continuing after we leave. Having a small group made it relatively easy to put together the final presentation.

14. We only have three students sometime we work together and learn something related to the questions we ask, and sometime we just work independently to do the task for everyone. I think both part works well eventually.

15. A problem might be that group faculty advisors were not permanent, but changed in the course of the group workshop phase.

16. We did a lot of applied coding, and group coding went fairly well. Different members of the group were most experienced in coding, mineral physics and seismology. For the project at hand, this worked well, as questions could be answered right away. For any one of us, undertaking this alone would have been daunting.

Unfortunately, some members of our group were more passive in their approach ('what should I be doing?'). These members began to participate less and less in the research team.

17. We basically divided our group into pairs of two, each of them working a particular aspect of the problem.

However, having 2-3 faculty members in the group would have been more helpful for advice and making progress.

18. Our group communicated well, and was pretty casual, we broke our subject down into parts that could be worked on by the different specialties, got together for a little while every day or two, and communicated extensively via email (several of our group left after week 3). It seemed to work well for us.

19. Once we had identified a research question it became much easier to decide a general workflow. We ultimately each chose an aspect of our question that we felt we could contribute on and worked individually on that, coming together several times a day (e.g. eating lunch together, as well as meeting first thing and towards the end of the day) to discuss our progress and put our story together.

20. Basically parallel working on different aspects of the same project in the same room. Worked very well to ask questions and guide each other when we assembled the final product.

Question #10: Research Group Workshop – Please describe your groups work style or dynamics. What worked well and what did not work well? (Page 4)

21. We're 5 students and 1 faculty.

We've spend the first days to mostly explain to each other what our specialty can give to the understanding of subjects, and deciding on a focus topic quite late compared at some other groups I think.

Then, we tried to work separately on several parts, but trying to explain everyday what we've found, which article we're reading, etc.

Our faculty advisor helped us mostly by providing literature and by explaining what were the questions he would like to look at.

22. The research group should be helpful as a multi-discipline group, but I found for most times, students from different area doesn't really want to understand the basic concept of the other area. Such as our group, the inner-core, people could not really understand the translation model unless they understand the force balance, the phase transform and the heat transfer at the same time, and I think that is why we really need a multi-discipline group. But the students seems only focus on what they could do in their area to this topic. To me, I don't really think people need to make significant progress in the CIDER workshop. Learning the basic concepts in other area related to the same topic may be even more helpful to our overall understanding to the topic. But the students seems too focused.

In our inner-core research group, we work on the translation model. This topic is separated into different sub-topics for students from different area. In my work, I found the force analysis used by a established Nature paper is not correct, which probably will impact the reliability of the whole translation model. It used only basic mechanisms and I am glad to discuss with the other students, but when I tried to discuss with the students, they seems not interested. One said she don't believe a Nature paper will be wrong and the other said she do not want to focus on the things she don't understand. These ideas seem really ridiculous to me.

When I discuss with our advisor Vernon, he support my idea and gave me a lot of suggestions. Quentin and my advisor, Thorne Lay, also agree the force balance may be wrong. I will talk to Bruce Buffet, and it will be more helpful to get suggestion from a geodynamist. If I am right, it will refute the translation model that these students are working on, but they just don't care whether it is right but only focus on what they a doing.

It really surprised me that the young people who should open their mind are right the ones who don't.

23. excellent team work, very different skill sets
to be improved: meeting room, meeting times

24. I'm not sure that our group's work style really worked well for me. I felt a little lost because the subject was outside of my research area, but there were others whose research area was the same as the group subject who clearly knew a lot more. It was nice to have knowledgeable people around to help us learn the topic, but difficult to keep them from controlling (or trying to control) the group. A lot of times I didn't feel like I had a clear idea of what my particular contribution to the group was, so I mostly tried to look up things that I thought would be useful. It was sort of a struggle, but collaboration is always a struggle.

Question #10: Research Group Workshop – Please describe your groups work style or dynamics. What worked well and what did not work well? (Page 5)

25. We have geochemistry, seismology and geodynamics studies. The discussion works very well. However, due to limits of time, most students can not do original work in two weeks. And some are going back early.
26. My group has two main field of research. We tried our best to define a common subject of research, and it worked well. After spending a couple of days to discuss all together on how to focus the problem, and how we would resolve it; we have set task to do by individuals. Regularly we all met to see advances and combine things together.
27. We meet every morning around 10, we often do a recap of every one's work and assign tasks. During the day we stay usually all in the same room, so we can ask each other questions while working. Most of the time we write, or set un models by small groups of two or three. We did not plan to work with that, it was sponaneous.
28. Everyone attacked the problem through their individual expertise and contributed to the group. The lack of a senior member at times forced the participation of everyone in the group which was great.
29. This is the first time where I have been able to work in a close group setting with people from different fields on a single project. I think the most interesting and useful thing I will take from this (aside from the actual research being done) is to take into account the background of each individual in the group in order to make the group dynamic to work. Geodynamicists, seismologists, geochemists, and mineral physicists all come from differing backgrounds and viewpoints; and even though that might lead to a few conflicting moments about certain topics or ideas, I believe having multiple view points a single problem has afforded us to come at our topic with a well-rounded approach and seems an ideal way to try and tackle new and/or unanswered scientific questions.
30. We are 2 postdocs, 2 students and two faculty in the 3rd week of the program. I think the interaction and communication is rather equitable (we sit in the round Founders Room to discuss). We are not dominated or pushed by the faculty, we are rather inspired. After defining objectives and assigning individual tasks, we now each start to take responsibility for some part of the project.
I'm not sure, but the dynamics might be different in a research group with only one faculty and more students that PostDocs. In my opinion, such a cocktail could lead to a domination of the group by the faculty person in some way or another.
31. Read a few related papers and then try to assign different tasks to people depending on what they may like or can do. Discuss from time to time to ensure that everyone has the same research goal in mind. We have just started working and it seems fine so far although the tackling of the problem may require more than two weeks.

Question #10: Research Group Workshop – Please describe your groups work style or dynamics. What worked well and what did not work well? (Page 6)

32. Our group organized itself into informal subcommittees to work on various aspects of the problem, largely along discipline lines -- the geochemists worked on one aspect of our problem, the geodynamicists on another, etc. This has worked well. Our faculty member has a "hands-off" approach to our work and is there in an advisory capacity but does not dominate or lead discussions, which is helpful in keeping the group student-led and -oriented.
33. It's the first week of research group workshop, so we have not done a lot of work so far. Up to now, we have been establishing the problem of our interest. What are the crucial questions to ask? We are reading a lot of literature about our research topic. Finally, we have been establishing how every person can contribute to problematics regarding his/her own field. I am very satisfied with my group. It works very well.

Question #11: Were you comfortable asking questions or making comments during the Research Group workshops? (Page 1)

Yes - 88.9%

No - 11.1%

1. Very comfortable and motivated to ask questions.
2. I felt very comfortable asking questions and making comments during the research group workshop. The small groups were much less intimidating than the large auditorium of people. I was able to ask basic questions and offer my expertise when questions were asked of me.
3. No. It is my problem, I don't like asking questions. I am not confident about my background and understanding and am afraid that I will ask silly questions and be looked down upon by seniors. My English is poor, I don't know how to organize my question and express it precisely and fluently. Sometimes I am not able to organize my questions quickly enough to raise it at the right time of the lecture. I am not used to the team work in this style. The general research topic for our group is unfamiliar to me. So I don't want to ask questions that might waste others' time. This problem may be addressed in the future.
4. very flexible, but loose organization. It's kind of disappointing that different majors are not mixed well. Mineral physicists, geodynamics and seismologists had little idea of what each other is talking about. Need a much better leadership! Maybe in the next time, when every group is being assigned, the leadership issue can also be considered.
5. Because I totally lost in some people's discussion on their field and sometimes I have no chance to ask questions.
6. I had no problems in asking questions in the group, but again, it took me always a while to actually have questions.
7. The research groups were a friendly environment to discuss ideas and possible research directions.
8. People try to let everyone knows what is going now and understands what we are talking about.
9. Everyone in the group was very friendly and cooperative in discussing questions or doubts. Some members were however not attending the group meetings and thus could not get to know the progress in some aspects.
There were debates and disagreements too but I feel that it part of the process.
10. It was much easier to contribute in the smaller groups.
11. Our group meetings were very informal, facilitating discussion and allowing us all to get up to speed on a fairly new topic for most of us.

Question #11: Were you comfortable asking questions or making comments during the Research Group workshops? (Page 2)

12. At this point, we are all really excited by the subject, and it's easier to speak.
13. I feel comfortable to ask, but it makes me uncomfortable when people answer.
14. There were a lot fewer people, and I knew everyone in the group fairly well. I felt comfortable with them.
15. There are people who speaks a lot and I find it difficult to cut in the discussion. Sometimes, I can not quite what they are talking about because people talk too much details and technique problems, which are not easy for other major students.
16. In the group workshops I did not have any fears or hesitations about asking any questions or putting forth any ideas, wether they were god or not. The smaller group setting allowed for more of a conversational discussion rather than a straight lecture or tutorial being taught to you.
17. I think everybody in our group was.
18. Group discussions or one-to-one conversations as required.
19. We are a research group, working all together. How could I not ask questions?

Question #12: Were you able to make significant progress on your project while at CIDER II? What do you think would help make this process smoother or faster?
(Page 1)

Yes - 75.0%

No - 25.0%

1. In my case, I stayed only 3 weeks, so one week of the group was not sufficient and other members who stayed longer benefited from it more. It would be better to explain why is it important to stay all 4 weeks.
2. I'm not entirely sure how to rate our progress. Our project required a lot of background reading to see what information was out there. I think we made good progress and put together an interesting story about the regions we were investigating. I think we could have been more productive if we had a bit more structure. Individually, the group members made progress, but we didn't put it all together the way we would have liked. Our group did submit an abstract to present at AGU in the fall, and we have plans to continue working on this.
3. I left after the first week of research groups (third week of CIDER). Looking back, I should have planned to stay for full 4 weeks, in which case I could have participated more productively in the research. I plan to continue contributing to the post-CIDER group effort.
4. More guidance by faculties who are good at this topic. Group members should step into the topic in an efficient way. I would like some short lecture about this topic, suggestions of good literature to read, some brief discussion with group members prepared with their basic understanding and questions about the topic.
Better organization by the group leader, or the experienced seniors in the group. We should spend some time on literature reading and summary, and students with different background should work on different literature, then we need a group meeting that gather the summaries from view of different fields. Every group members should be informed of the basic knowledge in this meeting. Then, the group should determine a focused topic or a particular problem as fast as possible, say, just within one day. Then, every member should propose what s/he can do in the coming days and let the group, especially the seniors to determine whether it is doable. From the daily schedule of the last two weeks of CIDER, I can see that the above organization style is recommended, however, our group didn't do it well.
5. definitely read a lot of papers and expand my knowledge in that particular topics which benefits me a lot! But about project itself, 1-2 weeks is not definitely not enough time to make any good progress, considering the loose organization...
6. Maybe change one of the "meet with research groups" afternoon sessions into a study hall for people to do background reading. We could sit around all together in the lecture hall and read about the project ideas that interest us, discuss in small groups what might be interesting. We did that in our research group during the first week without lectures, but I don't see why it would be a problem to do that in a large group.

Question #12: Were you able to make significant progress on your project while at CIDER II? What do you think would help make this process smoother or faster?
(Page 2)

7. The timeframe was just too short, to really make significant progress. We set up the goal, and also what will be done in the next weeks. However, it is hard to get significant progress by just doing literature work. We would have needed some better computing resources for example, to make more progress in the numerical modeling...
8. The verbal discussions of the possible research group subjects at the end of the second week was fairly inefficient. I thought it could have been done better, possibly electronically.
9. I get some help from people working on similar research problems. And I get more information from lectures from different fields and make me think more about the relationship between them.
10. I am at the beginning of my post-doc, CIDER has been the perfect way to know the state of the art of different subjects all related to my research topic. Also, it gave me the possibility to learn some basics of geochemistry and mineral physics and that is really useful for me.
I think a way to make even more progress would be to let more space to the tutorial. In 1h30/2h we could start getting familiar with the softwares and that's it. We didn't really have time to make any exercises. And when we did have time it was because they didn't really explain the software. Maybe having a 3-4 hours (one afternoon) seems a lot but we would have had time to have both a good introduction on the software and the chance to exercise on it. I still enjoyed a lot the tutorials and found them really useful and interesting, this is just a suggestion.
11. I think that we managed to formulate a good question, and make a good start on thinking about it. Hopefully the impetus will be maintained once we have left the program - in this regard, having a small group is probably best.
12. The time is too tight to make significant progress. I think smoother will be better.
13. We were able to produce a product (which was not totally unique, but is needed for the rest of our work). Having the team complete for the full two weeks would have improved the amount of work done.
14. Starting the project work earlier or at least forming the groups earlier would help. That way, the members can discuss the issues and the approach to tackle the problem.
15. Actually, my answer is yes and no. We managed to get extensive literature searches done, and our geochemical people were able to compile a great deal of data, but there wasn't enough time to produce any meaningful seismological results in less than two weeks. However, our group did an AGU abstract, and plan to continue working on the project, and hope to have some original work to contribute to our AGU abstract.

Question #12: Were you able to make significant progress on your project while at CIDER II? What do you think would help make this process smoother or faster?
(Page 3)

16. Due to the broad nature of CIDER 2012's theme (Deep Time), it was difficult for the inner core group to isolate a precise question, which slowed progress initially. However, once we had done some preliminary work and planned We have been able to submit an AGU abstract, which means that although our project is not complete, there is a clear goal, so although we couldn't write a paper tomorrow we will definitely be able to put something together for AGU.
17. Limited advisor meddling.
18. I have no idea
19. If I am right, it will be a significant progress.
20. Unfortunately I had to leave a week earlier than I originally anticipated, I wish I could have stayed another week. Also, at times it seemed like my group wasn't very cohesive, and that was difficult. Although we had a big room for our group to work in, I actually think that a room with one or two tables and some chairs would have been better - a smaller room that forces us all to be face to face with each other.
21. I think I can try several groups first then determine which one to join. So, I can find the most interesting things to do.
22. Difficult to say. it seems difficult to make it going faster, and I found that things went pretty fast already.
23. Not at all.
24. While this is still a work in progress, we have been able to construct a solid plan of attack to tackle our project. The help given by the faculty in our group has been invaluable. In particular (and I am not sure if this is the case for all groups) our faculty advisors seemed to be there to help in a complimentary fashion rather than taking over the project and discussions. Having people with their knowledge as sounding boards was surprisingly the best part of the group discussions. This allowed our group of grad-students and post docs to throw out different ideas (regardless of feasibility) without hesitation of doing something wrong or repetitive, as well as allowing our group to form our own internal working dynamics.
25. It's too early to answer this question, but we are on a very good track.
26. Cider allowed me to learn other things from other research areas. The goal was not to help me in my particular project.

Question #12: Were you able to make significant progress on your project while at CIDER II? What do you think would help make this process smoother or faster?
(Page 4)

27. More time would definitely make it more smoother but that is not very realistic in the scope of the workshop. I think good feedback from the senior members on the importance of the problem and feasibility of our approach might encourage continued collaboration post-CIDER. I think formulating a definite problem and approach is more realistic and essential within the first one week of workshop.
28. Organizing research groups around particular questions or problems rather than overall categories.
29. Yes, in a sense that I found a well established problem that I want to look at.
No, in a sense that realizing it will take some more time and I am not staying for the fourth week of the workshop. However, I plan to work on it later at my home institution.

Question #13: Would you recommend the CIDER II program to other graduate students or postdocs? (Page 1)

Yes - 100%

No - 0%

1. It is very informative and it gives a certain impulse to young scientist to collaborate more with other similar fields of research.
2. Absolutely!
3. Absolutely! I learned so much about the other fields that are ultimately trying to answer the same types of questions. I met some great people and have built collaborations that I hope to maintain for years to come. I also got some great input on the research I'm doing. I think this is a great opportunity for graduate students!
4. introduction & overview to all disciplines of geoscience, including hands-on tutorials
significant face time with colleagues, both at student, junior and senior levels
time for fruitful discussion and formulation of new research ideas
All of these make CIDER special and useful.
5. Definitely I will. After coming back from CIDER, I feel myself full of knowledge, interest, and energy for the coming research work.
6. definitely. It makes me love this major more.
7. The interdisciplinarity was one of the most important things to go to this program and i was completely satisfied with this. I learned a lot abroad from my field, which i can however combine with my own studies. So i have now a lot of new ideas what to do in my future scientific research.
Also the venue is a dream and the general organisation was well done.
8. It was very well done
9. With enthusiasm. I'd even go again myself.
10. It is a good chance for graduate students or postdocs to get more generalized information and get a bigger frame from different fields.
11. I would recommend CIDER to other students since it is almost a unique opportunity to learn a lot in such a short time. I also think that the way it is organized really help to talk with everyone, especially seniors (if you meet them at other conferences there is never time to have a good discussion).

Question #13: Would you recommend the CIDER II program to other graduate students or postdocs? (Page 2)

12. It's a wonderful opportunity to meet people at all levels across a wide range of disciplines, and make friendships which will hopefully lead to future scientific collaborations. For scientists at the start of their careers, I think it's an excellent chance to enlarge one's scientific network. From that point of view, it's much better than conferences as everyone spends so much time together. This is helped by the lovely environment at UCSB.
13. It is useful for the future career setting up.
14. I did before, and I would still do so. CIDER I/II are the best programs I've been to during my PhD.
15. Definitely. It was very useful for new students to get involved in the field and more productive for students already working in the field.
16. Very much so. People tend to get very narrowly focused within their fields, and CIDER has been very valuable helping bring disciplines together to focus on a larger problem.
17. My experiences at CIDER 2010 and CIDER 2012 have both been excellent. As this program ends I feel I understand much more about the formation and development of the Earth. I have made and renewed personal connections with geoscientists from a variety of fields. This is particularly useful when I have questions about papers from outside my discipline - I can just email my geochemist friend from CIDER and they will explain it to me!
I recommend CIDER to everyone at every conference I attend.
18. It's really interesting to meet people, young scientist or faculty people, and start collaborations.
19. Very helpful.
20. Absolutely. 100% - this is an really great opportunity.
21. This is great experience for me. I learned a lot and meet a lot of people.
22. This is a great opportunity to gather people from different horizons on a single large subject. Anybody will find something to learn in there, and to bring its knowledge to higher grounds. Also it is a very good way of meeting people, usually top researcher in their field. The lectures are really well designed, leave space for discussion, and bring a state of the art summary in a field. These things are usually not achieve in common meetings. Also I think that is a good way to meet future possible collaborators.
23. But I will warn them that it is 4 weeks off in their PhD project. Are they ready to give up their holidays to do it ?... but they may come up with a nice project during the resarch group, make some useful contacts for their reseach current and future.
It is really interesting to work with people of other fields on a same project.

Question #13: Would you recommend the CIDER II program to other graduate students or postdocs? (Page 3)

- 24. I would not recommend it to younger graduate students (except those who have shown to be extremely ambitious) as there is a level of knowledge accumulation needed in order to participate. However, I will strongly recommend CIDER to any and all grad students in the future as I have come to believe that these sort of workshops are invaluable in fostering working relationships and introducing new concepts.
- 25. Very good to meet people and open yourself to broader questions in geosciences
- 26. Excellent way to keep updated with research problems and newer ways to solve them ... especially encourages interdisciplinary research perspective. Its a great program for newer graduate students as well.
- 27. It is a good environment to meet other students in a variety of fields, get experience with another research project, and talk with/hear from experts in various fields.
- 28. Definitely, you learn a lot from a lot of different fields. You progress very fast since there are many discussions going on.

Question #14: Other comments and suggestions for the future of CIDER (Page 1)

1. Overall, this was a fantastic workshop. My main suggestions are to have more structure in the research group workshop and a intro session for basic commands used in the tutorials.
2. It could be organized better, but already very good anyway! Love it, will attend it again if there is a chance.
3. It should be held at KITP again.
4. No.
5. Organize a local geology field trip, e.g. on a weekend, led by someone who knows the area. This is an idea many people shared but it didn't really get voiced.
Merge the "informal program" and research group work times. Instead of coming a week or two early and leaving at the end of the tutorial, the faculty could arrive at the same time as the students and stay the whole four weeks. The research group time should be fine for the faculty to have their informal program and ignore the students for most of the day, and there would be more faculty available to the students during the research projects with less pressure on any one faculty member individually.
6. More chance for people to get communicated. I suggest to make a website for people to ask question on related lecture or tutorials. We get some much information during daytime and during evening we would like re-think about it and there are more questions coming out. If we have a website to write down the questions/comments and get different feedback from lots of other people. It may be also good for people to communicate their interesting topics before building the research group.
7. I really enjoyed the whole experience.
One last thing is that 4 weeks is probably too much, at least for a post-doc. I do understand why it is organized like that, but 4 weeks of not working (or almost) on my own project is a lot.
8. Keep up the good work! The CIDER workshops are beginning to amass a collection of resources that are useful within our community - I think that expanding these (as has been discussed by various people during the program) is a worthwhile investment of time. It's often hard to find a 'way in' to other disciplines related to ones own, so if CIDER can provide this to a wider audience, I think many people would find it useful and it would encourage more cross-disciplinary research and collaborations.
9. Great program for developing students and postdocs.
10. As mentioned (a lot of times), more continuity in the (senior) members present. The last week was a bit scattered, due to people leaving, an the lack of common dinners.
11. The research talks can be spread over the 4 week period or maybe only during the workshop component, giving more time to the tutorials and organizing research groups.

Question #14: Other comments and suggestions for the future of CIDER (Page 2)

12. Please keep running CIDER, it has been very important to my development as a scientist, both in terms of my understanding of the Earth and my development of collaborations with other scientists. I hope other young scientists will be able to enjoy the opportunities that I have.
13. Maybe, CIDER should focus on teaching students something but not expect them to work out something. It is a short time workshop, and hard for people to work too much on that. After CIDER few people will still work on that if they have other work.
14. A few of the organizers mentioned fixing wikipedia pages - I think that an AGU abstract, CIDER or CIDER post-AGU presentation, and wikipedia page (or edits/additions) should be the minimum requirements of a group.
15. No, It is just great !!
16. Only one week of lecture and tutorials!
17. Hope this will go for a long time.
18. It is a good interactive program that encourages dialogue between different research groups and thus pushes towards solving realistic problems. Therefore CIDER should continue on interdisciplinary research themes in earth sciences.
19. I would like to thank you for organizing CIDER program. It was a great experience and you did a very good job in terms of organization and all the work around.