

To: **J. Crowley** **Kirsten Wilden**
Nicole Jorlett **M. Montgomery**
C. Young **Bill Kolata**
Linda Thiel **Sven Leyffer**
Conference Department File
Kristin O'Neill
Jonathan Dawes
Vivien Kirk, Unive

Evaluation Form

SIAM Conference on Applications of Dynamical Systems (DS11)
May 22-26, 2011
Snowbird, Utah

Meeting Attendance Total: 837
Survey Response Total: 268 (77.2% Male; 22.8% Female)

How did you hear about the meeting?

57.8% Friends and Colleagues
14.9% SIAM Web Page
13.1% Other
6.7% Call for Papers Postcard
3.4% Other Electronic
2.2% SIAM News
1.9% Preliminary Program on Web
0.0% NA – Net

Which medium did you use to register?

91.7% On-line Form
4.9% On-site
2.3% E-mail
1.1% Telephone
0.0% Fax
0.0% Postal mail

What were the two most important factors in the technical program that influenced your decision to attend this year's meeting? (please check two)

69.7% Minisymposium organizer/speaker
50.6% Conference Themes
31.4% Co-author/speaker of accepted paper
9.6% Other
8.0% Co-author/presenter of accepted poster
7.3% Plenary speakers
3.1% Organizing Committee

Please check the two most important logistical factors that influenced your decision to attend this year's meeting.

- 75.6%** Networking Opportunities
- 50.4%** Expenses being covered by my employer
- 25.2% Location
- 20.2% Conference Dates
- 10.5% Other
- 5.0% Job Opportunities
- 1.6% Registration fees

For each question below, please circle the number that matches your opinion:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Technical program was excellent	35.9%	57.4%	5.2%	1.2%	0.4%
2. Plenary talks interesting/well -presented	21.1%	59.0%	12.7%	6.8%	0.4%
3. Sessions interesting/well-focused on topics related to conference themes	33.1%	62.5%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%
4. I acquired information that will be useful in my research in my job responsibilities	40.9%	53.6%	4.0%	1.2%	0.4%
5. Registration process easy	53.0%	36.3%	6.0%	4.8%	0.0%
6. The book exhibits were valuable	7.6%	36.0%	44.8%	8.0%	3.6%

The following have emerged as possible ways of managing the size of the meeting in 2013 and 2015. Please indicate your opinion of the following options:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Have a much smaller number (e.g. 99 down from 143) of minisymposia which will be solicited and managed, for example to include a combination of longer and shorter contributions	18.3%	39.0%	16.7%	20.3%	5.6%
Have an additional poster session	21.0%	36.9%	20.6%	17.9%	3.6%
Encourage faculty members, whether senior or junior, to submit CPs or Posters	15.1%	33.7%	34.5%	13.5%	3.2%
Use a full five days and have a major closing event to keep attendance up until Thursday night	19.9%	34.3%	25.1%	17.1%	3.6%
Stick to the shortened IPs (45 minutes instead of 60 minutes)	50.2%	37.8%	8.4%	2.8%	0.8%

that were introduced this year

Make more free time for interaction	20.1%	33.7%	26.1%	18.5%	1.6%
-------------------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	------

It was agreed at the Business meeting that while Snowbird remains popular, serious alternative venues should be looked at for the 2017 meeting. Can you suggest any alternative venues that you would like the SIAM staff to investigate the suitability of?

- Washington, DC
- Gordon Conference Sites
- Santa Barbara Santa Fe
- Phoenix, AZ
- New Orleans 2. start a rotation with many cities (like every other siam meeting) 3. If it must be in Utah, Park City.
- I have no suggestions, but I agree that alternative venues should be considered. It felt like things were starting earlier and running later this year than in previous years. I doubt Snowbird has enough rooms to run more parallel sessions so we get out earlier in the evening.
- Keep it on Snowbird!
- Not really: I like Snowbird
- No -- Snowbird is perfect.
- Las Vegas, Miami, Boston, Chicago, anywhere that is (1) easier to get to for more participants, (2) cheaper than Snowbird, (3) more like a SIAM meeting place than a resort.
- Banff, AB, Canada Boone, NC (This is a ski town and college town, home of Appalachian State University. I'm not sure if there's an appropriate venue or resort space there, but it is isolated and fits with Snowbird's off-season ski resort concept.)
- I think that Snowbird is the best place for our meeting.
- Europe
- The Fairmont Chateau Lake Louise, Canada.
- No, sorry.
- Somewhere in South America. Chile perhaps.
- No, but I cannot say that I liked Snowbird very much (first time attendance).
- Consider a meeting in Europe?
- Keep it at Snowbird, but ensure that everyone is able to stay on site.
- Anywhere in Europe; Amsterdam, Paris, Barcelona?
- Would prefer East coast US
- Anywhere less dry and less high, I am tired of nosebleeds and symptoms of reduced oxygen!
- No, I think Snowbird defines this meeting
- No
- Banff center <http://www.banffcentre.ca/>
- I have been to conferences of a similar size in different places. I found the following to be particularly suitable: - San Diego - Seattle - Vancouver - Montreal - Maui
- Flagstaff, AZ, if facilities allow.
- I like Snowbird, although it is a bit difficult to reach and the coffee is only so-so. About 800 participants seems about right to me. I would rather make some adjustments to the program. On the other hand, it might be helpful to see what other venues are available, so we are better informed before we decide on a drastic move. At this point, I don't have a suggestion, but I am willing to think about it.
- no
- It might be nice to have a location in Europe, but it would definitely cut down on American attendance, due to the increased cost of travel. Given the way the economy is going, travel to Europe might become prohibitive. I think the Snowbird conference should remain in Snowbird. Given the interest in dynamical systems, perhaps it might work for a European society to set up a conference in alternate years.
- Chicago or Atlanta. Both have large conference facilities and both cities are home to several significant research institutions. Why can't SIAM conferences be hosted by Universities?

- Some place at a lower elevation. Many people I talked to were suffering from effects of altitude sickness. Also, a place with more dining options would be nice.
- Colorado Convention Center, Denver, Colorado, where the SIAM Annual Meeting was held in 2009.
- Perhaps a venue like Boston which would be more accessible for many of the international participants and which would for once be less financially burdensome for East Coast US participants.
- General Comment: Salt Lake City is not a major airport, which can make it quite difficult to get there and causes extended travel times. A big conference center about half-an-hour to an hour OUTSIDE a major metropolitan area on the east coast or a central European location (if such a center exists) would probably be a good solution. This solution would keep the Snowbird-style of the meeting, allow for easier travel and may also solve the restriction of the size of the conference site.
- Items 1 and 3 above are not precise enough to give an opinion on. They would have to be part of a total proposal. Raleigh NC convention center.
- Chicago, IL
- Buffalo Thunder Santa Fe, NM Portland, OR
- Bigger isolated conference centers such as in Leesburg, VA. (It is also worth considering whether to hold the conference abroad every other time. This would however significantly change the participation and potentially the character of the meeting, since some of us from the US would not be able to afford the flight.)
- east coast of US would make it easier for Europeans to attend
- somewhere in Europe
- I do not have any suggestion. However, as an European, I would like to insist on the fact that Snowbird is indeed not practical. The high altitude is also a bit disturbing.
- Atlanta
- Any of the venues at which the SIAM Annual Meeting or SIAM Life Science meetings were held recently: San Diego, Montreal, Raleigh, Portland, etc.
- No
- Hawaii
- Snowmass, CO Santa Fe, NM
- Snowbird is expensive but I dont know anything cheaper of similar size.
- Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, Minneapolis (Anywhere that is a city and not nearly so isolated would be much appreciated.)
- I actually like snowbird, it keeps people 'on-site', but next year make sue we ahve better weather
- New York
- Boston/Cambridge, MA
- Why can't the locations for the Annual Meeting be considered? How about London?
- It would sadden me if the meeting were to move away from Snowbird, but if it were to happen, I'd suggest a setting similar to Snowbird in its geographic isolation and its contrast from the usual convention centers in big cities. Accessibility from a sizable airport is important for attendance, of course, but I think the retreat-like ambience at Snowbird has helped to give the meeting its current unique charm. It's certainly worth the 45-minute drive from SLC to me. So... Maybe another mountain resort?
- Pittsburgh Chicago Any big US ski resort that can hold a conference of 1000 Anywhere BUT Snowbird
- warmer locations
- Vancouver San francisco moscuna convention center
- Perhaps a venue where food is not as costly.
- Hawaii
- I come to this meeting partly because of its location at Snowbird. If it were moved I would be less inclined to come.
- Are there other themed conferences of Siam (e.g. CSE or PDEs, etc.) that have a similar size ? Those conferences seem to travel ...
- No
- I think it should stay in Snowbird.
- Vancouver, San Diego, Austin, Amarillo
- Remain at Snowbird
- Something in a more urban setting, so there will be opportunities for off-site lodging and dining. Costs can be very high at Snowbird meeting for a student budget.
- No. I can't think of anything better than Snowbird.

- Pittsburgh convention center or hotel

Suggestions for technical program (e.g. minisymposia topics, meeting themes):

- themes: Transient dynamics; Optimal linking of models, experimental design, and data
- I think the bottom up approach is very good.
- Include workshops on methods and common areas of study in applied math and dynamical systems, e.g. data assimilation, networks
- Immunology
- (Computer) Network security and health.
- Evolutionary biology
- MS topic: Dynamics of chromatin organisation & gene expression
- Increase # of topics relating to industrial applications especially in the areas of robotics, micro robotics, neural networks, and disease research and control.
- Continuum mechanics in biophysics And bio mathematics
- Meeting themes: sustainability, infectious disease, probability. Steve Morris's talk was fantastic! Please bring more amazing speakers like him. Also, I always appreciate the fact that non-mathematicians give IPs and hope that is a trend that continues.
- localized/coherent structures, dimension reduction tools
- Try to avoid overlap of minisymposia on similar topics.
- It will be good to have more poster sessions earlier in the day.
- Many of the plenary talks had too much marketing, too little mathematics. Some of the minisymposia were excellent. It is always appreciated when the organizer - if he/she has to give a talk at all - gives a fair overview talk instead of presenting most recent own work.
- Dynamical Systems in Economics
- Future looking panel suggested "tutorial" sessions ahead schedule, or as a part of the main schedule. I think it would be a good idea to have a tutorial on a up-and-coming approach from dynamical systems, and a tutorial on a field where we might make a bigger impact, e.g., on modeling in climate science.
- I suggest to restrict minisymposia to have no more than one part. Moreover, I suggest that in the minisymposium application only three talks should be suggested by organizers, while one more talk could be added by the program committee by choosing an appropriate one from contributed talks. May be the application should be even two-stage: first only the topics of minisymposia should be approved, and then these topics should be opened for applications both from the minisymposia organizers and from other scientists. In the present form a minisymposium is just a meeting of friends who already know each other...
- Models of circadian (and other) biological rhythms.
- biology other than neuroscience (there is always too much neurobiology)
- Themes are largely irrelevant for this meeting with the exception of choice of plenary speakers.
- Less MS on low dimensional nonlinear dynamics, more sessions on networks and biology. Also, include sessions on emerging topics in dynamical systems which could be solicited by organizers.
- Applications of DS in engineering disciplines. I would also like to see more emphasis on theoretical developments and new ideas in the theory of DS.
- More climate science.
- Extra poster session in stead of contributed sessions
- The plenary talks were too technical. Do not need printed copies of all the abstracts, just make them available online.
- Mathematical biology, Individual-based modeling
- The topic were OK
- 45 Min. plenaries were great. 20 min m/s talks were NOT so good.
- avoid parallel sessions of similar topics. Rather, reduce the number of minisymposia. Inform organizers of similar symposia.
- Fusion plasma physics
- Theory of nonsmooth bifurcations
- New applications of mixing in fields other than fluids. More stochastic sessions, fewer synchronization sessions.
- None

- Please do not reduce the speaking time below 20+5! Of the two evils, rejecting more proposals is the lesser one.
- For the IPs ONLY: The biological and neuroscience applications are very good and should be continued. It would be nice to see this broadened to other aspects of biology. For example, true population dynamicists and epidemiological practitioners. More social science and economics applications in the area of "complexity" would also be a good addition. Networks and stochastic dynamics continue to be important. Although climate dynamics is important, it was significantly over-emphasized this meeting. Likewise there have already been two speakers in power grids in the past few years, and that is sufficient. I don't think that more are needed. Aside from the IPs, I strongly disagree with the idea of trying to shape the topics by deciding on minisymposium themes in advance. Let people submit minisymposia, and accept them if they seem reasonable. They may have something important to say even if it is not what the organizers deem as trendy. Do not try to shape "what is important." This is a terrible mistake that can completely set the field back and will marginalize this meeting.
- Dynamical systems in finance
- more mathematical techniques, coagulation-fragmentation problems, exponential asymptotics,
- Realizing it's a math conference, more talks from experimentalists would be great. It helps to see more directly what the math is being applied to. Plus experimental talks help break up the monotony of equations.
- Stick with a broad range of topics
- I have been happy with the MS topics and meeting themes that reflect the main interests of the DS community.
- As discussed at the business meeting, I think having some invited talks on the theme of the environment and sustainability would be a good idea for the next Snowbird meeting.
- Chaotic synchronization, active network, pattern formation, information actively storage.
- Stochastic neuroscience Noise in slow/fast systems Noise in spatially extended systems Pattern formation in biology
- Obs: the quality of minisymposia presentation was high. And better focussed than CP sessions.
- more time for discussions, the time spend with talks is too long minisymposia: dynamics in environmental science including climate, ecology etc.
- Dynamical neuroscience -- very well represented in minis, would be nice to have a plenary too.
- Dynamics of power systems
- Pattern formation in granular media: Theory and experiments
- It would be nice to have a plenary talk by a prominent dynamical neuroscientist such as Terrence Sejnowski of the Salk Institute.
- climate; environment; medical applications; resource management; uncertainty quantification
- Delay equations
- More days in the conference.
- Parameterization and Identifiability of Parameters in Dynamical Systems
- This was my first participation in a SIAM conference. I was very impressed with the organization and topics of MS and CP.
- I would like to see a little more of talks about fundamental results (general theories, theorems and so on), perhaps at the expenses of the little-too-many talks about biology and network-related research.
- Minisymposia often lacked coherence among the talks, perhaps because they were organized mostly through personal connections (friendships). They should be organized by selecting relevant talks submitted as CPs. That way, the networking among researchers would be promoted more.
- I promise to suggest a good minisymposium topic before the next meeting's submission deadline. ;)
- A number of minisymposia were from their topics very close. SIAM could try include one step before organizers ask speakers to find out if there are several plans for similar minisymposia.
- materials science condensed matter physics quantum chaos networks computational social science
- I think this is generally very good. No suggestions.
- The scheduling of MS could be improved. Too many clashes and then nothing to attend. Whoever put Neural Networks in opposition to Networks and Dynamical Systems III in opposition to Dynamical Systems iV
- Mathematical biology Emphasis on applications
- I was surprised that there were very few talks related to epilepsy.
- The most straightforward way to manage the issue of time allocation would be to: a) Remove all contributed talks and replace them with poster presentations, which are given higher priority throughout the meeting. Most large-scale conferences in other disciplines use posters extensively and mathematics needs to get with the times. By raising the profile of poster sessions, rather than an add-on late at night, this will encourage participation from the community. b) Decline all MS proposals that do not stick to the remit and include an introductory talk to the area being covered. Of

the 8 MS sessions I went to, only 2 had an introductory talk at the start. c) Have a later deadline for poster presentations, to enable rejected MS applicants to submit abstracts for posters. d) As a result of the above there will be considerable time savings, which would free up time each day to give priority to posters and more free time for networking, which seems to be the priority reason for most attendees attendance, judging by the large numbers of individuals not in sessions at any particular time of day. A day consisting of (along the lines of): 8.30-10.30 MS (12 parallel sessions) 10.30-11.00 Coffee 11.00-12.00 Plenary 12.00-1.30 Lunch 1.30-3.30 MS (12 parallel sessions) 3.30-4.00 Tea 4.00-5.00 Plenary 5.15-6.30 Posters would still enable 108 MS (assuming final day remains half), duration returned to 30mins for MS and 1hr for plenary. A daily poster session in one of the larger break out rooms, could allow an additional 200-300 presentations.

- Some of the mini symposia could have been unified.
- Control Applications in Dynamical Systems Networks Experimental Validation of models/methods
- Social Networks
- Methods in ...
- It would be great to have some more panel discussions included in the program, focusing on specific areas of strong interest. It would also be useful to have more general networking sessions.
- Maybe first define minisymposium topics in line with conference themes, and let people either contribute to a minisymposium or contribute as such.
- The first talk of every minisymposium should be an introductory survey to the field to improve accessibility.
- Rigorous results for stochastic DEs
- I liked the increased emphasis on climate change.

What was the most important feature of the 2011 SIAM Conference on Applications of Dynamical Systems? The least important?

- networking / working on papers
- Diversity of topics covered
- Most: Opportunity to hear many high quality MS talks and time to talk to speakers after sessions. Least: The plenary talks were disappointing - too specialized.
- No idea.
- minisymposia speakers and topics
- IPs, CPs, and posters on cardiac dynamics
- Most important: sessions related to my research. Least important: repetitive plenary talk topics.
- Networking is the most important feature.
- Most important for me: poster presentation, least important: most of the contributed sessions
- The community
- Applications, research progress, and personal networking.
- Mini symposium and some planetary talks are most important to me.
- The most important thing to me about this conference is the opportunity to speak with so many people from the field and to feel part of the community. The least important is probably the scientific content of the poster session, which I do regularly attend, but I think that efforts to make the poster session integrate post-grads as well as graduate students would be excellent. Personally, I would love to see Jim Yorke present a poster!
- Don't understand what is meant by "feature"
- The fact that important scientists will attend this meeting was very important.
- Network and ideas
- Meeting people was the most important feature.
- Getting an efficient overview of the state of the art in certain subareas thanks to minisymposia.
- Large part of community represented.
- strong attendance of the neuroscience-related presentations
- Most important: meeting my regular collaborators, hearing about new work, and getting feedback on my work and on my student's work. The poster session was (as usual) very good.
- Some of the invited presentations (Jones, Morris) were absolutely fantastic.
- Most important is the power of Snowbird conference to attract almost entire field and hence provide an excellent opportunity to meet and network. I can't label anything in particular as "the least important", but I feel that "themes" chosen for CP sessions weren't really informative and were unhelpful in trying to organize my schedule.

- Most important part is the networking opportunities, the least important feature are the talks.
- Most: Networking opportunities / Least: Business meeting
- The invited sessions provided an excellent opportunity for researchers to network, especially those within growing fields.
- I think the number of plenary talks could be reduced. I usually attend no more than half. I also think the contributed talks could be reduced (or maybe restrict them to particular areas, but keeping minisymposia and posters open to all areas).
- Climate !
- most: forward-looking panel
- Number of people present in a location that encourages contact.
- Most important: attendees Least important: location
- The technical program. The location.
- connecting with people
- The most important feature was the opportunity to meet others in the field.
- networking - most important
- Most important: minisymposia. Least important: ?
- Most important: networking opportunities. Least important: contributed papers.
- Sessions on stochastic population biology, Lagrangian coherent structures, time dependent transport most important.
- For me, it was my presentation.
- Most important: Minisymposia and interactions during coffee breaks. Least important: Most plenary talks were too narrowly presented and would be more appropriate for smaller workshops.
- Hard to say
- Networking interactions, as always, most important. Many minisymposia talks and weak CP sessions the least beneficial.
- most important: - Forward-looking panel discussion. - minisymposia on networks
- Most important: Open minded orientation Least important: Expositions
- Minisymposium format (most important) The Forward Looking Panel (least important)
- No need to write up a paper. All submissions accepted. Yet the standard was very high. I could present a new idea and could obtain important feedback from peers.
- Collaborating with colleagues was the most important
- Minisymposia were most important. Some invited talks too long and too much detail put people to sleep.
- The community of people who attend/contribute.
- Most: many excellent mini-symposia. Least: perhaps the granting agency presentation? Only relevant to the US?
- Important: Variety of minisymposia. Least important: The contributed talks were scheduled in such a way that they became unimportant.
- this meeting was very heavy on applications - climate, math biology, power grids, not much on methods eg bifurcations, analysis , applied analysis
- Most: Networking with collaborators. Least: ??
- Most important: strongly focussed and well organizes minisymposia. Least important: boring/too technical plenary talks
- Almost everyone is at this meeting, making it valuable.
- I will always remember Yorke plenary talk as a particularly illuminating talk. I found the purely medical talk on stress hormones particularly boring.
- The most important thing for me at this point in my career are the networking opportunities which conferences such as Snowbird present. I found that once again it was very helpful for me in this regard.
- Focused minisymposia. None that I can think of among least important.
- The ability to meet people and discuss research was the most important feature. (I can't think of a least important feature.)
- That a large number of highly regarded people in my field (dynamical systems) attend.
- The high level of the minissymposium and speakers, was the most important feature; The least one was that the schedule was not prepared with care to avoid parallel sessions with similar subjects.
- The most important was the climate modeling theme.
- Strong talks in minisymposia were important. It is not important to have two plenary talks a day.

- Networking opportunities around mini-symposia. Possibility to attend mini-symposia a bit "off" my own research, giving a good overview over the state of research in the covered field
- many interesting minisymposia, good mixture of theory and applications
- Most: climate science
- networking 2) location
- Most important: networking
- Experimental results in many symposiums were very useful and important. Overemphasis on climate-change and social networks.
- The good minisymposia were the most important for me. The least important was the business meeting and the looking forward panels.
- Talks, either MS or CP, related to neural systems were spread out over most of the sessions as well as every day of the meeting - very important and this aspect is causing me to consider this as the major conference that I will attend.
- It is a great opportunity to meet with colleagues and get work done and generate new research ideas. It is very energizing.
- The best thing about this meeting is the broad attendance which generates excellent networking opportunities.
- Networking with people in my field - interesting plenary's introducing me to other exciting developments
- Broad spectrum Dynamical systems
- The feature I like the most is the broad spectrum of topics that have been discussed, both in the invited plenary and in the regular talk.
- Important: The overall focus on climate modeling.
- Jim Yorke rekindled my love of Jurassic Park.
- The most important feature was being able to meet people in my specific field for the first time.
- This question would be easier to answer with examples of "features" to choose from. Is the entire technical program a single feature or many? And where should I draw the line among trivial features before selecting the least important? Overall, I really enjoyed the whole package...
- The most important feature was seeing collaborators and potential collaborators in person.
- Always an excellent opportunity to interact. Certainly enjoyed keynotes.
- Reduction of Plenaries to 45 minutes was a great idea.
- Most important: variety of talks and senior faculty attendance
- The dynamical systems meeting has become popular with computational neuroscience researchers; I was able to see talks by many well-known people and meet with a few that I had met before. The plenary sessions were the least important part to me.
- Most important: Some excellent plenary sessions and MS which highlighted the need for mathematics to more closely integrate with experimental disciplines. Least important: Contributed sessions
- Most important: the Poster session, as well as the minisymposia and talks.
- I think the fact that this time there were quite a number of talks with experimental data/results in biology and neuroscience, was the most important feature. Least important: I don't know!
- most important: chance to see friends and colleagues
- Speakers/talks I wanted to meet/see.
- Plenary talks were great! Book displays were fine too. The conference went for too long.
- The large number of participants working in areas related to my research, and the fact that I saw them often. The latter point reflects the location of the meeting, at the Snowbird center high up in the mountains. In many other conferences there are too many distractions and you don't see participants as often.
- Most important : the emphasis that is growing on stochastic systems. Not really the least important, but certainly the most disappointing. The JD Crawford prize was awarded to someone who did not speak at the conference, and only showed up to collect the prize and run. We did not learn anything about this work that has been valued so much by that committee. Moreover, the winner is not a regular attendant of the snowbird meeting, making it all the more useful to have him included as a plenary.
- I like the reduction of the plenary talks to 45 min
- Conversations with colleagues from other states and countries.
- most important: networking

Did you learn anything useful? Will it have an impact on your research programs?

- yes
- I learned a lot but at the same time it is often difficult to follow unfamiliar research topics although that makes the conference unique.
- yes
- I learned many useful things in via all the various forms of communication (posters, talks, symposia, etc).
- Yes from my minisymposium especially and from a few others.
- I found the minisymposia that are not in my area more useful; they were interesting sources of informal exposure. The minisymposia related to my area were too short and thematically fragmented for me to learn much.
- I learned about new feedback and modeling methods that are being applied to cardiac and neural systems. I expect that these results will affect my research.
- The lectures on power grids (IP6, MS78, and MS89) were are useful to me and will likely have an effect on my orgaization's research.
- Yes, hopefully.
- It is always useful to learn what other researchers are doing in fields related to my own, and to have an opportunity to talk with them further.
- Yes, both in the plenary sessions, as in the minisymposia.
- Yes, I do
- I made some contacts that may prove useful.
- Yes, absolutely.
- YES!
- Yes definitely: I 've started a collaboration with people I met there.
- Yes. It will.
- Yes. Yes.
- After my presentation, I spoke with a couple of people who had ideas about how to extend my research. I met with one of them during one of the sessions to discuss her ideas. I also attended a session that focused on using similar ideas. I think that these ideas will be very helpful and result in productive research.
- Yes, definitely.
- learned new stuff specific to my research
- Yes, I found some new directions in my research
- Yes
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Not directly related to my research, but I've seen lots of interesting ideas throughout the talks.
- yes; I work for Mathematical Reviews as the editor in charge of the Dynamical Systems section (37), so it was great to get a wide picture of what people do
- Yes.
- Yes: both specific knowledge (a little) and background knowledge (a lot).
- Yes, I learnt about a few techinques I was not aware of, mostly in the neurocomputation field.
- I attended some minisymposia on topics I don't know anything about. Some were very inspiring and gave an impression of the research field. Otherwise networking and meeting with friends and collaborators is so useful.
- Yes, however, I felt I learned more from being able to have longer conversations with researchers present rather than from the presentations they gave. But, of course, presentations served as an intro to those conversations.
- Learned a number of new things, but not in the talks.
- Yes, new contacts will definately broaden my research
- The sheer scope of my field of study. I suppose I knew this intellectually, but it wasn't a gut knowledge before now.
- I consider this meeting as highly important for my research, in fact the best one.
- Yes
- Yes, I learned about some new disciplines which I plan to incorporate into my own research. I found the sessions on collective effects in coupled oscillator systems and traffic dynamics the most useful in that respect. I also very much enjoyed learning about the science of climate modeling via the plenary sessions.
- yes
- Yes. Good discussions with colleagues potentially leading to new collaborations.
- Several interesting techniques and promising contacts

- yes
- I learned a ton of useful information, and yes it will have an impact on my research.
- Good session on the auditory system. Lots of people to talk to.
- Yes. Some ideas on visualization of data.
- yes, definitely.
- yes
- I did learn quite a bit, although I'm not sure yet of the impact on my own research.
- yes and yes
- Yes. Yes
- Definitely and emphatically yes.
- Absolutely
- Learned a lot that will impact my research program.
- No, most of the talks were too technical/advanced for someone to understand without a background in the specific topics.
- I got some useful information. However, the impact on my research will be probably marginal.
- A LOT !
- Yes. It did not have a big impact on my research, but I did learn what is going on in other fields which is very important.
- Yes, almost all the important people in the field were there
- Many things. I will apply these on my research.
- Yes. Yes.
- Yes, yes.
- There were many useful ideas that I got from DS11, several may have an impact on my research. It's too early to tell for certain
- Yes, I learned the applications of bifurcation theory in climate research and biology. There were also interesting papers in nonsmooth dynamics.
- Yes, a variety of small insights or inspirations for approaches to my own work.
- yes, there is always something useful for my research group to learn.
- Sara Solla's presentation on Poisson regression directed me to established techniques that I will use almost immediately.
- I learned that many people are interested in models in biology and neuroscience.
- Yes, in particular about Lyapunov vectors, linking measurements to the output of neural models, pattern formation in PDEs and turbulence.
- Yes, and yes.
- yes, yes,
- Yes
- I learned that my research is indeed used in different applications, which gives a very strong motivation to continue working on it.
- I do use results from this meeting
- Yes, I come back with some ideas that I would not have had otherwise. I have in mind some specific problem that may impact my future research.
- I really appreciated the plenary lectures, in particular the one about stress (which I found generally very interesting) and the lecture by Felix Otto (which I found very interesting from a research perspective).
- Yes. Yes.
- Yes and Yes!
- I found several new ideas and concepts that I will think about more.
- A lot of things.
- I learned a lot about climate modeling, which will affect my research.
- Yes, it will.
- yes. Most probably it will have an impact on my research.
- I got about three ideas for new research directions.
- Yes and yes!!
- yes

- Yes and yes
- yes
- I learn a ton that is useful and will impact my research. Especially helpful was to meet new researchers in the field and discuss our respective projects. I think allowing more time for this would be beneficial.
- Some significant collaborations were solidified and will potentially have an impact on my research program.
- It will definitely impact my research
- yes; yes
- Yes, yes.
- Yes.
- Yes, specially on network theory and applications.
- I definitely learned useful things and this would be useful to broaden my research program.
- Yes, to the first question. Not sure, to the second question
- Adaptive graph theory. I hadn't really been exposed to it until Snowbird 2011. I now intend on contributing to this field.
- I have met potential postdoc mentors
- I learned at least one thing of a technical nature that will impact my research, and I initiated at least one collaborative activity with someone I met at the conference.
- Yes, and maybe.
- Absolutely.
- Always do. Yes, definitely affect my research.
- Yes
- Yes - I learned a new technique for network analysis that I plan to try on my own data.
- There were several interesting ideas and analogies presented which will surely influence my thinking in future.
- Yes, I learned many useful things that will help in my research.
- Yes, learned about the existence of other researchers in my area and various talks helped me reframe my work
- Yes
- Yes, I think so.
- Yes, absolutely. Snowbird is a great place to keep up with the latest research, much of it not yet published.
- Yes, yes.
- Yes. And I hope so!
- Yes, I learned useful things that will impact my research.
- Yes.
- I attended most sessions on data assimilation: I had already planned to start working in this area, and this decision was reinforced by the sessions on this topic
- Yes. Yes.
- Yes.
- This was my first international conference and poster presentation. I got a lot of ideas and useful comments about my work.
- Yes. absolutely yes.

Additional comments/suggestions, including comments on the SIAM Conferences Web Page:

- The reception at the beginning of the meeting should be held without tables to encourage mixing of people. Most attendees are stuck with the same table. Also the queue for food was too long, which may suggest the number of attendees are reaching the limit.
- It would be nice to have access to an online abstract planner.
- It would be convenient to keep online registration available even after the advance registration fee discount expires.
- Send out an additional e-mail about 48 hours before the major deadlines to increase the likelihood of participants to remember to meet the deadlines for registration and hotels. (Yes, it is the participants jobs to remember, but an additional e-mail never hurts.)
- The forward looking panel discussed the problem of people leaving early; I left before the conference ended on Thursday based on when the best flight that day for me was.

- I benefited greatly from a postdoc travel award. I think this is a very good program and helped me cover the cost of attending this rather expensive meeting.
- While the focus in the business meeting was how to control the size of the conference, and how to fit more into the five days, my suggestion is in the other direction - I would like to see the conference days a little less-programmed. Currently, these are long days, with presentations going almost non-stop from early-morning into the evening. This leaves little time (and energy!) for down-time, and opportunities for networking without feeling that a portion of the scientific program is being missed. So, I suggest having blocks of "networking time", without any formal presentations during these blocks, set aside for this purpose.
- Snowbird (despite location issues) is still the best SIAM conference of the year.
- I'd like to see better sorting and organization of talks into sessions. In the contributed sessions that were rejected minisymposia, the talks fit together well thematically and were really interesting. Some of the other contributed sessions were unrelated and shouldn't have been grouped together. The American Physical Society (APS) has sorting categories for conference abstracts which are mostly the same every year. When people contribute talks, they select a category (used to be they selected the top 3 choices of category) which helps the talk get placed appropriately. Also, experts in the field meet for a day or two to sort the abstracts into sessions. If SIAM could do a better job organizing the talks into contributed sessions, maybe people would stop feeling like they have to speak in a minisymposium or not at all. You might also look into the APS focus sessions. People propose in advance a focus session topic (which is usually more specialized than the standard sorting categories), and one or two speakers are invited, but the rest are contributed. Of course the focus session topics have to be decided on and listed online before the contributed abstracts are due. For possible sorting categories, you could take a look at minisymposium topics from the past couple conferences.
- In the past, the book displays by the publishers have been extensive and useful. (Below I am not referring to the SIAM table, which was great as always, but the other publishers.) This year in particular, it was almost useless, since there were only two publishers with an extremely limited selection of books.
- I would like to see more of a mix with industry. Academic research is great but it is even greater when applied / used in industry.
- The registration fee is high and I don't know if the rules are enforced on some who register only for one day but participate more than one day of talks and presentations.
- Since the institutes are devoting 2013 to sustainability and climate change, I think that we should try to green the 2013 Snowbird conference as much as possible. One possibility would be to ask registrants if they would like to have the program in paper form or electronically (either as a pdf that could be downloaded, as an application that could be installed on a smart phone or iPad, or using DVDs or thumb drives), we could also have the paper programs made from recycled paper.
- Thanks.
- The conference is tough physically because of the number of sessions. Maybe add more coffee breaks and PLEASE PROVIDE SNACKS (COOKIES, ETC) along with coffee.
- The venue is difficult. One tends to feel trapped on the mountain paying lots of money for food that isn't good, and many people were suffering from altitude sickness.
- While the surroundings of Snowbird were beautiful, there were some major drawbacks to the location. Being so remote left dining options extremely limited, and quite pricey. It was nearly impossible to stay within my per diem of \$42, and it seemed that the dining locations were not easily able to accommodate the large number of people within the time frame allowed for meals. Also, because of the large number of people and the large amount of snow on the ground this year, I felt a little claustrophobic because there wasn't really even anywhere to walk outside or any options for activities in my spare time.
- create opportunities for potential employers and job seekers to interact
- Some tool (database) using keywords to get an overview of the interesting talks and help making choices between the parallel sessions. A physical Pinnwand to get in touch with people on the conference without using the computer all the time. Photos of the conference somewhere on the www.
- The sessions started too early in the morning and the last event of the day was too late in the evening.
- Sometimes, somehow similar minisymposia were overlapping. More efforts to avoid such cases should be made
- Why are the talks in the MS longer than the CP? Some of the MS contained talks that clearly did not warrant the extra time. As long as there is more time at the MS, there will be a pressure to give these talks, even if the MS is not particularly coherent. Suggest to insist that the first MS talk is an introduction and overview of the field.
- Since computational techniques have become very important, perhaps it would be good to have an invited session, e.g., in the evening, focused on developing computational software as a part of a research program. I feel that advice

from, e.g., Guckenheimer's group, or Gibson's development of Channelflow, could be valuable to others looking for making their internal code available to the community.

- Some minisymposia were not well planned (eg. sometimes more than one similar minisymposium at the same time, sometimes no interesting minisymposium at all).
- Unlike at most other events I have attended, I had few 'conflicts of attention' - ie there was seldom more than 1 session of talks that I felt strongly that I needed/wanted to attend. So well done whoever scheduled the talks.
- The forward-looking panel should be 2 hours.
- It would be good to have an electronic version of the programme that was searchable and in a format that one could bookmark sessions of interest. It would be good to include coauthors in the speaker index, even if only in electronic form.
- An idea could be for the students who win the red sock prize at the poster session to be judges of the posters of senior academics if a second poster session is organized and assign a best poster prize.
- an author index instead (or in addition) to the speaker index would be useful.
- add on line scheduler list all the authors for the presentations and posters not just the presenters
- I have attended almost all Snowbird meetings to date. The programs have shifted, there was more diversity in the areas of applications than at earlier meetings, which shows that the field is alive and well. On the other hand, it leads to overload, so maybe we should reconsider and begin to focus on fewer areas.
- Too many conflicting sessions. The conference would be improved by limiting the number of MSs and CPs.
- Some minisymposia were accepted even though they didn't meet the guidelines listed (i.e. they were all talks from one or two research groups/institutions). I tried to attend one on population models where noone (speakers or organizers) bothered to show up! I'd hate to see a cap put on the number so that good symposia get rejected, but perhaps more scrutiny can go into the acceptance process.
- The index should also link to co-author presentations.
- The Snowbird Resort is price gouging more than previously. The lack of alternative restaurants allows them to serve low quality food at high prices. Also, the fact they they hid the "free" coffee prevented coffee breaks from becoming central places for networking and interacting as they were before. I would strongly support holding the conference at an alternative venue.
- To have better selection of the quality of the talks. The span between good and bad talks was extremely large. For planery talks to choose better speakers and to guide them not to be too technical.
- I would not attend Snowbird unless I was invited to give a talk or I was organizing a minisymposium myself.
- Keep the open minded orientation and conference open for all works on dynamical systems.
- Possibly more time for interaction/free time to discuss projects on an individual basis.
- There should be more CPs, and less minisymposia. Continue with the no-review policy. As regards poster session, please keep in mind that those of us coming from far-away places do not get funding unless the paper is accepted for presentation in an oral session.
- i think the web page should include a program scheduler, similar to the APS web site for the national meeting. Given the intense number of parallel sessions, that would be a great help in organizing one's dynamical life during talks. Also, the pdf of the program should be available much earlier to download prior to the meeting.
- Put posters and CPs in middle days and MS and IP at beginning and end to discourage coming late and leaving early
- Is the predominance of network stuff really representative of nonlinear science today? I had the impression that more than half the posters were about networks. BTW, perhaps you could offer a discount hotel rate for those staying until the last day? Just a non-academic way to boost attendance towards the end.
- I strongly disagree with REDUCING the number of minisymposia. This is a terrible idea. This would make the popularity contest aspect of minisymposia far worse than it already is. The necessary rejections will gratuitously insult a large number of people. One of the best features of this conference has always been the sense of egalitarianism and inclusion. To keep this sense, either you keep the large number of minisymposia, or you have no minisymposia at all, and instead have everyone contribute and thematically place them. Rejecting people and telling them that they should contribute a contributed talk or poster is an extreme insult. It would take care of the crowding issue in the worst possible way. The meeting would become just another one of these elite meetings with hierarchical structure where you only get to hear the top people in the field - as deemed by the organizers' personal opinions. It is a huge risk, since the organizers most likely will not be able to predict who is at the future forefront of the field. Yet another elitist exclusionist meeting with a strong hierarchical structure is NOT why we all go to Snowbird. Don't ruin the meeting like this!

- In the MS and CP meeting rooms, it is very often rather difficult to be able to read the half lower part of the screen except when you are in the very first lines. However I cannot see a practical solution, but this is uncomfortable.
- As mentioned at the business meeting, I think having some tutorial sessions, perhaps at the very beginning of the meeting, would be useful, especially to students, but potentially also to established researchers.
- I really enjoy Snowbird resort, in particular that it is centrally located (i.e. Utah), secluded, the hotels are nice and restaurants are varied.
- This policy of allow just one talk per person is good, but it may allow exceptions. If one of the speakers was not allow to come in the last minute, it should be allow for him to send his presentation to be presented for someone. It is important to note that if a schedule talk is not delivery, it seriously compromise the quality of the minissimposium It is not good that happens.
- The quality of the contributed talks was significantly lower than the quality of the solicited contributions. To reduce the huge number of session, it could be helpful to turn all contributed presentations into posters.
- there should have been shuttle service (during evening hours)to downtown to facilitate sight-seeing during conference
- The registration fee + hotel costs are much too high, especially for postdocs with a lack of travel support. SIAM should arrange funds to support this group.
- The formatting of the conference program book should be improved (the hierarchy of information and cross-linking is good). For a start, need to be able to move to a format suitable for iPads and other e-books (e.g. typeset onto A5 size as well as paper size). Second, restrict minisymposia to a maximum size (e.g. one column), cut waffle. Third, do not use the variety of fonts: stick to one serif font. Fourth, cut the information that is not relevant to people making decisions, or move the low priority information to the end (e.g. the minisymposia organisers could be at the very end, co-authors not presenting are of little interest).
- The scheduling of coffee breaks was really stupid. Who wants to late until 11am and 4pm to have a coffee break? These are actually really important, both to keep us awake but mostly for people to mix and discuss. There should be coffee and pastry/cookies available between every set of blocks.
- Please move to a different location, or at least rotate between Snowbird and somewhere else.
- I enjoyed being able to finally meet people in my specific field. Other conferences are too big and I haven't had a chance to find these people.
- Why was there an exclusive free meal and alcohol for commitee members when phd students get almost no help with costs from siam
- Kirsten Wilden is always very helpful!
- There is not enough space during the coffee breaks in Snowbird. Discussions there are very difficult.
- Please make sure that internet access is more reliable THROUGHOUT conference venue. Give more oppportunity for breaks. Consider spreading out event with more time for social interactions on, say, Tuesday, with perhaps Tuesday afternoon open, and a more intensive program S-M and W-Th. This way, you may be able to have equal attendance across the conference, but not everyone there at all times.
- Registration process very unorganized
- Should have had catered food/meal vouchers included with cost of conference, as well as internet in the conference rooms.
- As a young researcher, the most useful networking activities at a conference are the ones that have aspects of both social events and research, such as poster sessions. They make it easy to meet new people by facilitating one-on-one discussions. A conference dinner would fill this role as well -- I know that cost may be an issue, but it would be great if it could be included in future meetings.
- The SIAM webpage for the meeting was very comprehensive.
- It would be nice to have some planned social events, similar to the opening banquet (e.g. music, dancing, etc.)
- Web program should have a link to each day separately for ease of browsing during the days of the conference. Add mentoring program - like the one in the SMB (math biology soc.)
- It would have been much better if the timing of the conference was not in the middle of the term when faculty are engaged in teaching or students in classes. Beginning of summer is ideal in my opinion.
- I think that it is necessary to take a critical look at the success (or lack thereof) of the Contributed Presentations. The attendance always seems to be much lower than for Minisymposia. It is worth exploring having another poster session instead, since these tend to be very vibrant and well attended. If this conference moves to another venue, I feel it is crucial that it be "similarly remote". Being "stuck" on the top of a mountain has the desireable outcome that people interact with each other more. Also, I think that it helps to maximize attendance - there aren't many other distractions

drawing you away from the conference. Overall Snowbird is a huge success. Whatever changes get made, let's make sure that it retains its essential features and flavor.

- I think you should strongly consider having a few more networking events to encourage new discussions. Perhaps one sit-down meal, which is often a situation for people to meet and chat. Or more tall standing-tables at the coffee session or near individually-purchased breakfast lines for people to gather around so they can chat and eat. The poster session was a good way to chat with more people as well, I recommend having perhaps another session earlier in the conference. Perhaps the first full day.
- If you continue to hold it at Snowbird, have them fix the doors (particularly of the ballrooms) so that every time someone enters/leaves it doesn't make so much noise! It seems minor, but can be quite distracting to both the audience and speaker.
- Snowbird conference should have a bar.