

PEARC17

Practice & Experience in Advanced Research Computing
Sustainability, Success and Impact

Evaluation Report

November 2017

Prepared for

Dave Hart
National Center for Atmospheric Research
PEARC17 General Chair

—

Tom Cheatham
University of Utah
Advanced Research Computing on Campuses (ARCC17) General Chair

—

PEARC17 & PEARC18 Committees

Prepared by

Lizanne DeStefano
Director

Julie Wernert
Information Manager

Lorna Rivera
Research Specialist

PEARC17 EVALUATION REPORT

November 2017

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The “PEARC17: Sustainability, Success and Impact” conference was held July 9-13, 2017 at the Hyatt Regency New Orleans in New Orleans, LA. This first annual Practice & Experience in Advanced Research Computing (PEARC) conference focused on the science, education, outreach software, and technology used by members of the high-performance computing community. This report summarizes results from the PEARC17 evaluation activities.

Summary of Findings

- Across the board, survey respondents rated conference activities very highly.
- The co-location of the ARCC workshop was particularly well-received by attendees.
- The emphasis on diversity across all areas of conference programming is applauded.
- Attendees find that the quality of the papers could be better and more consistent.
- PEARC attendees desire more technical and hands-on content.
- Participants find the tutorials offered very useful, but would welcome more day-long sessions and additional tutorial offerings throughout the week.
- The visualization showcase could be improved to provide a better experience for presenters and attendees.
- The student program and the student-mentor program were well received and considered successful by participants.
- Networking was the top reason for attending PEARC17.
- Conference scheduling is problematic for some attendees.
- The registration and conference websites could be improved in terms of user-friendliness and content.
- Some participants had difficulty with the submission process.
- Concerns with food, room layout, and the conference environment, included lack of protein early in the day and limited vegan options; crowded rooms and cold room temperatures.
- Response to the student program survey was minimal, resulting in insufficient data to present findings or recommendations.

Summary of Recommendations

Participant feedback suggests that the PEARC17 was very well received, with respondents noting only a few inconveniences and offering largely-constructive suggestions focused on incremental, targeted and high-level improvements and expansion of existing components:

- Continue to establish ARCC-type relationships.
- Continue efforts to increase diversity across all areas of the conference.
- Establish a higher bar for the quality and consistency of content.
- Prioritize technical content for both tutorials and conference sessions.
- Consider accommodating more tutorial sessions.
- Reevaluate the visualization content and showcase.
- Continue the student and student mentor program.
- Continue to prioritize networking.
- Make an effort to reduce schedule conflicts.
- Improve the conference web site and registration mechanisms.
- Reduce the barriers to submission and improve communications with content contributors.
- Continue to improve the overall conference experience by providing varied food options, reliable Wi-Fi, and making accommodations for increased physical comfort.
- Include all student attendees in the student program survey sample population rather than only those funded by the formal program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PEARC17 Evaluation Report	2
Executive summary.....	2
Summary of Findings.....	2
Summary of Recommendations.....	3
Introduction.....	5
Method.....	5
Respondents.....	6
Findings.....	8
Overall.....	8
Tutorials.....	15
Student Program.....	15
Student Mentor Program.....	18
Recommendations.....	19
Appendix.....	21
Full Conference Survey.....	21
Student Program Survey.....	38
Student Mentor Survey.....	43

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Survey response	6
Table 2. Full conference survey respondent demographics.....	7
Table 3. Student program survey respondent demographics.....	8
Table 4. Value of conference sessions.....	14
Table 5. Full conference satisfaction.....	14
Table 6. Value of student program sessions.....	15
Table 7. Satisfaction with student program modeling day.....	16
Table 8. Student program participants' overall satisfaction with conference program.....	17
Table 9. Student satisfaction with student mentor program.....	17
Table 10. Mentor satisfaction with student mentor program.....	19

INTRODUCTION

Continuing the success of the five-year XSEDE conference series, the PEARC17 conference, held July 9-13, 2017, at the Hyatt Regency in New Orleans Louisiana, showcased the technologies, best practices, challenges, and achievements of those who use, operate, and support advanced research computing resources and services, with an emphasis on academic and open research infrastructure and science.

Aptly, this year's theme was "Sustainability, Success and Impact," underscoring the vision for the name change and aiming to strike a balance between continuity of its predecessor and necessary evolution, as the conference seeks to reach a broader, more diverse community.

PEARC17 provided a forum for discussing challenges, opportunities, and solutions among HPC center directors and managers, computational scientists, end users, students, educators, HPC system administrators and user support staff, as well as industry and government agency representatives from across the United States and around the world. The program offered tutorials, plenary talks, and in-depth technical content that informed experts in the field, while also providing introductions to the tools, technologies, and methods of computational science to new users.

PEARC17 also continued the dynamic student and student mentor programs and diversity efforts established in the XSEDE conference series, bringing together researchers, students, and prospective users from underrepresented groups and new disciplines.

METHOD

Evaluation of the PEARC17 conference consisted of four participant surveys:

- a full-conference survey,
- a tutorial session feedback form,
- a student program survey, and
- a student mentor survey.

Tutorial session feedback forms were provided to each tutorial instructor, and participants were asked to return the forms at the end of the tutorial. Copies of the full-conference survey were placed on the luncheon tables at the awards ceremony, the final conference event. All registered participants in the student program (not including the student day high school participants) were sent an e-mail invitation to take the student program survey online, as was the case for the student mentor survey.

Respondents

Response rates for the various surveys ranged from 42-100% (Table 1).

Table 1. Survey response

Survey	N	Rate
Full conference	233	90%
Tutorials	Varies	42-100%
Student Program	8	62%
Student Mentor Program	40	69%

Many of the respondents to the full conference survey (Table 2) were first-time attendees (37%, 87/233), those supporting campus- (40%) or NSF-funded (38%) resources, XSEDE staff (24%) or Campus Champions (24%). Just over half of respondents were comprised of research staff (15%), research computing operations/support staff (23%) or those in executive/leadership roles (16%), followed by graduate students (11%) and faculty (9%). Most attendees came to network (62%), attend presentations (47%), and/or give presentations (36%).

There were only 13 students in the formal student program and only eight of those chose to fully or partially participate in the survey. (Students who were not part of the Student Program only participated in the full-conference survey.) As such, data is not sufficient for drawing definitive conclusions about the student program offerings. Half of those responding to the student program survey were first-time attendees (4), as well as undergraduate students (4) (Table 3). Again, half of the student program respondents heard about PEARC17 through their academic institution or department (4).

Table 2. Full conference survey respondent demographics

		N	%			N	%
PEARC Relationship				Reasons for attending			
	Support/operate campus resources	94	40%		Network	144	62%
	Support/operate NSF-funded resources	88	38%		Attend talks	109	47%
	First-time attendee	87	37%		Present	83	36%
	XSEDE for research	62	27%		Attend tutorials	65	28%
	XSEDE-funded Staff	55	24%		Get technical information	39	17%
	Campus Champion	55	24%		Attend exhibits	14	6%
	XSEDE for education	39	17%		Other	12	5%
	Other cyber org.	33	14%		Demo/exhibit	10	4%
	Support/operate resources funded by other	33	14%		Meet vendors	10	4%
	No response	24	10%		Meet funders	6	3%
					No response	27	12%
Job Title/Academic Status				Tracks			
	Research computing ops/support staff	54	23%		Technology	64	27%
	Executive	38	16%		Tutorials	47	20%
	Research staff	35	15%		General/Plenaries	44	19%
	Grad Student	26	11%		Student Program	44	19%
	Faculty	22	9%		ARCC	43	18%
	Undergrad	19	8%		Software and Data	42	18%
	Other	3	1%		No response	35	15%
	Postdoc	1	0%		Accelerating Discovery	29	12%
	High School	0	0%		Workforce Div. & Eval.	25	11%
	No response	35	15%				
Race/Ethnicity				Gender			
	White	128	55%		Male	130	56%
	Asian	37	16%		Female	47	20%
	Black or African American	20	9%		Other	1	0%
	Hispanic or Latino	11	5%		No response	55	24%
	American Indian/Alaska Native	11	5%				
	Other	10	4%				
	Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	5	2%				
	No response	35	15%				

Table 3. Student program survey respondent demographics

	N	%		N	%
PEARC Relationship	N	%	Reasons for attending	N	%
			Network	144	62%
First-time XSEDE attendee	4	50%	Attend talks	109	47%
First-time ARCC attendee	2	25%	Present	83	36%
Use XSEDE for my work	0	0%	Attend tutorials	65	28%
XSEDE Scholar	0	0%	Get technical information	39	17%
Part of ACSC Program	0	0%	Attend exhibits	14	6%
No response	4	50%	Other	12	5%
			Demo/exhibit	10	4%
			Meet vendors	10	4%
			Meet funders	6	3%
			No response	27	12%
Job Title/Academic Status			Tracks		
Undergraduate	4	50%	Technology	1	13%
Grad Student	0	0%	Tutorials	2	25%
Portdoctoral Fellow	0	0%	ARCC	0	0%
High School	0	0%	Software and Data	1	13%
Other	0	0%	Workforce Div. & Eval.	0	0%
No response	4	50%	No response	4	50%
Race/Ethnicity			Gender		
White	0	0%	Male	3	38%
Asian	0	0%	Female	1	13%
Black or African American	3	38%	Other	0	0%
Hispanic or Latino	1	13%	No response	4	50%
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0%			
Other	0	0%			
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0%			
No response	4	50%			

FINDINGS

Overall

GENERALLY POSITIVE. Respondents to the full conference survey rated conference sessions (Table 4) and their satisfaction with the conference (Table 5) very highly. In particular, respondents found the conference venue (Table 5) and the daily schedule, with expanded times and increased opportunities for social and networking activities (Table 5), particularly noteworthy. Respondents indicated that sessions were well-organized and lauded the co-location of the ARCC workshop. Some comments include:

- I feel more connected with this community as a byproduct of this conference.
- The venue was very good and the city was a good choice. There was a good variety of sessions to cover topics relevant to my work and interests. My goal of building networks and relationships was facilitated by the breadth of sessions provided.
- The ARCC joining with PEARC helped with the ability to attend both, since budget is

- always a problem if we have to attend more than one conference a year!
- Conference was well planned and, in combination with ARCC, provided an excellent resource and value.
- Continue diversifying beyond XSEDE focus.
- Continue establishing ARCC-like relationships
- PEARC can be the primary meet-up for academic (and more) research computation professionals with champions, ACI-REF, CARC, etc. confluence.
- Great value in this conference for "in the trenches" workers.
- Filling a niche that was needed.
- Well organized. Good mix of content levels [from] beginner to advanced. Growing inclusion of arts and humanities.
- Fill[s] a space between SC and domain-specific conferences.
- [PEARC should] become nexus of ACI/XSEDE/OSG/CARC/ARCC activities to support research cyberinfrastructure.

CONTENT AND TRACK SESSIONS: Many respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the conference met their goals for attendance (214/229, 93%); provided knowledge/skills that will significantly contribute to their work/research (200/225, 89%); and provided a high return on investment (215/227, 95%). Further, many respondents agreed or strongly agreed that presenting at PEARC will enhance their career (137/165, 83%), and that they are planning to submit to (184/209, 88%), attend (200/223, 90%), and/or recommend to others (213/226, 94%) the conference in the future. Others, however, when responding to how PEARC18 could be improved, commented on the need to improve the quality of papers, reduce confusion in track content and scope, and provide more technical and hands-on content:

- Stronger technical track.
- Better technical content "across all sessions!"
- It would be great if there were more technical content.
- Strengthen the paper and poster sessions.
- Rethink tracks.
- Many papers were extremely poor. Some papers were really good. Too much difference in quality.
- The tracks weren't super clear in scope.
- Have one of the plenary talks given by a technologist.
- Continue to push for more paper submissions to improve overall quality of papers/talks.
- More detail from presenters. I felt many just gave summaries and overviews. Needed more depth in almost all (i.e., more rigorous review process.)
- Deeper technical. More full-day tutorials.
- Better separation between research talks and system "ads" (i.e., please use our HPC system/software.)
- Wider variety of papers.
- More hands-on technical tracks.
- Separate track for arts and humanities.
- More cloud content.
- More hands on HPC admin workshops/training.
- Higher impact talks.

- Make certain presenters show relevance of their work to PEARC mission.
- More hands-on sessions (I attended the tutorials.)
- If tracks can be better defined (i.e. expectations), the movement between rooms/wings can be reduced. Based on talk title it was common to not get what I expected from the sessions.

SCHEDULING. Many respondents expressed frustration and disappointment with competing parallel tracks, conflicting commitments, and having to choose between multiple options. Others suggested that some sessions—as well as the conference itself—were not sufficient in length to adequately address all the much-needed content. Some suggestions to consider include:

- Possibly add more talks or have more timeslots so it's easier to attend more talks.
- Allow ARCC program to overlap less timewise. Perhaps start ARCC one day earlier so that I don't miss too many XSEDE talks.
- More plenary speakers, fewer smaller talks to prevent overlap.
- Having only one talk at a time is risky, imho [in my humble opinion]. The plenary sessions didn't apply to me therefore I didn't attend.
- Repeat talks that are popular.
- Work to eliminate/reduce parallel sessions.
- Add a day - hard to choose sessions.
- It seemed there was a lot of competition in terms of what to attend. But I'm not sure fewer tracks is the solution. BoFs at one hour is too short.
- Reschedule the student program to allow students to attend more of the panels without being forced to compromise their student program attendance.
- Closing plenary sessions. Feel odd that lunch is the last session. Have the training in different day, instead of all on Monday.
- Mix tutorials with lecture sessions.
- Better schedule. Parallel sessions were confusing.
- Less overlap between sessions/missed out on sessions I wanted to attend.
- I wanted to attend multiple sessions held at the same time. Hard to choose and feel I missed out.
- ARCC should be integrated, not co-located. Many tech program talks would have attracted and been useful to ARCC folks and vice versa.
- Schedule/track - time misalignment and number of tracks made track hopping hard to impossible worst yet.
- Perhaps have a few workshops/tutorials spread out over the length of the conference, e.g. mornings from 8-10am for three - four days.

VISUALIZATION SHOWCASE: Although most participants thought that the Visualization Showcase (Table 4) was valuable or extremely valuable (149/199, 74%), it was the lowest rated of the conference sessions evaluated. Respondents offered a number of comments for improvement that might be considered in planning for future visualization activities:

- Vis needs to [be] presented as a session in lieu of showcase.
- Vis showcase was interesting, but it was hard to judge without a lot of background in what was being visualized.

- [Visualization Showcase and Reception] Hav[e] members of the team next to the visualization.
- I didn't understand the purpose of the [visualization showcase]. There were no presenters when I stopped by.
- Would help if visualization students were present. Many did not have sufficient explanation.
- Have the visualization showcase panel prior to the reception and voting.

NETWORKING AND BREAKS. Networking with colleagues and meeting others with common interests and challenges were the top reasons given for attending PEARC17 as reported by 62% (144/233) of respondents (Table 3). Over 91% (210/230) of respondents agreed that the schedule provided enough breaks for informal networking (Table 5), and many respondents cited networking opportunities as a strength of the conference:

- Wide variety of topics, a lot of great talks, and plenty of networking
- Networking was easy due to efficient flow and number of networking events
- More structure to networking event. The conference was amazing.
- PEARC17 provided an excellent venue to networking, as well as panels designed to foster interest in HPC and related fields

DIVERSITY: A common theme among respondents was *diversity*. Many applauded the ongoing efforts to increase to increase diversity, while signaling the need to continue seeking diversity and broader representation. When asked about PEARC17's greatest strengths, as well as how PEARC18 could be strengthened, respondents repeatedly emphasized diversity and its manifestation across all areas of the conference, not only in terms of minority representation, but also in terms of content, attendee background, academic/institutional affiliation, and research interest.

- Cited strengths of PEARC17 with regard to diversity:
 - Diversity, accessibility to researchers.
 - A broad variety of topics: technical talks/presentations, organizational info, sessions and workshop (bias diversity) which make the conference relevant to a very diverse audience.
 - Diversity, breadth of sessions.
 - The breadth and depth of topics from cybersecurity to diversity.
 - The greatest strength of the PEARC17 conference was the wide variety of disciplines of the attendees.
 - Topic variety and diversity of attendees.
 - Diversity of information
 - People from diverse organization[s]
 - Diversity with fields represented.
 - Interdisciplinary community.

- Suggested improvements for PEARC18 with regard to diversity:
 - More education, more diversity.
 - Add a workshop on diversity and inclusion, maybe working with NCWIT. Also have the diversity presenters do a lightning 30 sec advertisement in the plenary.
 - More attendance from faculty researchers.
 - Broader participation from non-XSEDE staff.
- More involvement from national labs and government
- Invite data scientists and library sciences. They have a lot to add to the conversation.
- I would like to see more people from different government agencies involved, especially DOD (NRL, ARL, AFRL, ERDC) and NASA HEC.
- Reflect the full diversity of computational science.
- Needs involvement from broader community. Strongly NSF oriented. Need to reach not only to other agency communities but also to campuses.

REGISTRATION AND CONFERENCE WEBSITE: Respondents were largely positive and in agreement that the online (196/215, 91%) and onsite (134/145, 93%) registration processes were efficient. However, a number of respondents noted pain points, deficiencies, and areas for improvement in the online registration process, as well as the conference website:

- Could not use AmEx to pay for registration.
- Registration did not accept our grant AmEx card.
- Lack of acceptance of AmEx for registration fee payment was an issue since my institution only has a corporate AmEx card.
- Accept AMEX so we can use our corporate card.
- Online registration should generate email receipt.
- Had to register with two email/addresses to use two different reg codes.
- Make signing up for events more centralized. Rather than sending e-mail, have events - like student modeling day - be included in the online registration.
- The website (especially on mobile devices) was difficult to navigate. I could not find the schedule on my phone at all.
- Have the mobile website be more friendly.
- More update[s] to online schedule and talk descriptions.
- [Add] mobile app with interactive schedule.

FOOD, WI-FI, CONFERENCE ENVIRONMENT. Most respondents (204/229, 90%,) agreed or strongly agreed that the conference food and beverage was satisfactory (Table 5), with more than one calling the food and hospitality nothing short of “amazing;” however, other respondents expressed concerns with the lack of protein at breakfast and limited accommodations for those with dietary restrictions (e.g., vegans.) Respondents also made note of other issues that could improve attendee’s comfort and, in turn, the overall conference experience, including room temperature, room layout, spacing, acoustics, and unreliable Wi-Fi.

- No vegan choices during breaks. No vegan choices at the receptions.
- Food: food poisoning at Tuesday lunch - need to watch time and temperature
- A better breakfast selection. It was a bit heavy on pastries.
- The food was problematic. Breakfast was continental. Lack of protein at most meals and ALL snack breaks. I am ketogenic, my food options were extremely limited. Nuts and cheese for snacks. Bacon and eggs for breakfast would be nice.
- Vegan choices are also suitable for vegetarians. No need to provide both but with no vegan options you exclude some people.
- Food options! Full breakfast and protein options at breaks.
- More room in session rooms between chairs. Very cramped this year.
- Better acoustics in sessions. Some extremely difficult to hear. The gluten free and dairy free food options were awful.
- Venue: too many rows too small - lack of classroom setup in rooms.
- Try to include areas for impromptu meetings.
- More tables for working.
- Have tables in the meeting rooms.
- Temperature in some rooms was "freezing" on Monday. It could be increased couple of degrees.
- More consistent Wi-Fi.

PAPER SUBMISSION. In the majority of cases, respondents (83%, 141/170) agreed or strongly agreed that the submission process was efficient (Table 5); however, several mentioned difficulties, most citing vague or unclear communications and/or submission instructions and a cumbersome submission processes:

- Submission of a paper for the proceedings was not obvious for posters that had already been submitted. My paper was submitted by the deadline, but was declined because it was only possible to submit as a separate submission.
- There was a ridiculous process for abstracts, in my opinion. Anything that gives you a 111-page document to describe how to get your paper in the right format is too long. The templates helped, but they weren't obvious to me.
- The online registration process was complex and somewhat confusing. It should be simplified. It should also be mobile friendly with iOS and Android devices.
- Poster submission was in a time zone very different from ours, which caused us to nearly miss the deadline. Additionally, there was no way to also submit the proceedings version of the poster without making a separate submission. Even so, we submitted both on time, but were told our poster would not be in the proceedings due to "late submission."
- Deadlines were pretty early, and it was unclear what was required - many conference[s] do not couple presentations with paper submissions, so I had to scramble to put in a paper.
- Submission and review process for tutorials was a problem. No official notification of rejection. Instructions were vague.

Table 4. Value of conference sessions

Statement	Not at all valuable	Not very valuable	Somewhat valuable	Valuable	Very valuable	NA/No response	Mean	SD
Q23. Plenary Session (Tues. 9am): Paula Stephan	2	7	16	82	82	44	4.25	0.84
	1%	4%	8%	43%	43%			
Q24. Poster Reception (Tues. 5:30pm)	2	3	20	95	84	29	4.26	0.77
	1%	1%	10%	47%	41%			
Q25. Plenary Session (Wed. 9am): Paul Morin	0	1	18	66	86	62	4.39	0.69
	0%	1%	11%	39%	50%			
Q26. Visualization Showcase and Reception (Wed. 5:30)	4	9	39	98	51	32	3.91	0.89
	2%	4%	19%	49%	25%			
Q27. Student-Exhibitor Speed Networking (Wed. 4pm)	4	2	20	14	35	158	3.99	1.16
	5%	3%	27%	19%	47%			
Q28. Lunch and Awards Ceremony (Thurs. 12:30pm)	0	2	51	83	68	29	4.06	0.79
	0%	1%	25%	41%	33%			

Table 5. Full conference satisfaction

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/No response	Mean	SD
1. The knowledge/skills I gained during the conference will significantly contribute to my work/research.	1	5	19	113	87	8	4.24	0.74
	0%	2%	8%	50%	39%			
2. The information on the conference website was sufficient for planning my time at the conference.	3	5	12	101	108	4	4.34	0.79
	1%	2%	5%	44%	47%			
3. In general, the conference activities I attended were well organized.	1	0	7	86	127	12	4.53	0.61
	0%	0%	3%	39%	57%			
4. I am satisfied with the merger of the ARCC workshop series and XSEDE conference series into PEARC.	1	2	29	56	94	51	4.32	0.82
	1%	1%	16%	31%	52%			
5. The merger of the ARCC workshop series and XSEDE conference series into PEARC is appropriate.	1	0	24	59	103	46	4.41	0.75
	1%	0%	13%	32%	55%			
6. The conference schedule allowed sufficient time for breaks and informal meetings/networking.	1	4	15	74	136	3	4.48	0.73
	0%	2%	7%	32%	59%			
7. The paper/abstract/poster submission process was efficient.	2	7	20	58	83	63	4.25	0.90
	1%	4%	12%	34%	49%			
8. Submission deadlines were reasonable.	2	3	14	67	84	63	4.34	0.80
	1%	2%	8%	39%	49%			
9. Presenting at this conference will enhance my career.	2	1	25	67	70	68	4.22	0.81
	1%	1%	15%	41%	42%			
10. I plan to submit to this conference in the future.	1	2	22	90	94	24	4.31	0.74
	0%	1%	11%	43%	45%			
11. The conference was well advertised (i.e. User News, Facebook/Twitter, PEARC17 Committee emails, etc.)	1	5	40	101	65	21	4.06	0.79
	0%	2%	19%	48%	31%			
12. The online conference registration process was efficient.	1	6	12	88	108	18	4.38	0.75
	0%	3%	6%	41%	50%			
13. The onsite conference registration process was efficient.	1	2	8	53	81	88	4.46	0.73
	1%	1%	6%	37%	56%			
14. There was an adequate variety of sessions.	2	7	12	110	94	8	4.28	0.78
	1%	3%	5%	49%	42%			
15. I was satisfied with the food and beverage provided at the conference.	5	8	12	69	135	4	4.40	0.91
	2%	3%	5%	30%	59%			
16. I was satisfied with the conference venue (location, hotel, meeting rooms, etc.).	1	4	10	67	144	7	4.54	0.71
	0%	2%	4%	30%	64%			
17. The scheduled social activities helped build comradery among attendees.	1	7	22	90	98	15	4.27	0.81
	0%	3%	10%	41%	45%			
18. I plan to attend PEARC18.	2	3	18	73	127	10	4.43	0.77
	1%	1%	8%	33%	57%			
19. My goals for attending the conference were achieved.	1	3	11	94	120	4	4.44	0.69
	0%	1%	5%	41%	52%			
20. For the amount I invested in the conference, I am happy with what I've gained.	1	4	7	90	125	6	4.47	0.69
	0%	2%	3%	40%	55%			
21. I would recommend this conference to others.	1	1	11	84	129	7	4.50	0.65
	0%	0%	5%	37%	57%			

Tutorials

SATISFACTION. In general, participants were satisfied to very satisfied with the tutorials. A number of tutorial survey respondents noted the need for longer, day-long sessions and the desire for more-hands-on activity and less lecture content. Several respondents suggested that a greater number of tutorials—and having them spread throughout the week—would be desirable. See the supplemental tutorials document for details on each tutorial, including respondent comments.

Student Program

While the students who responded to the student program survey found the program and the conference, in general, a valuable to very valuable experience, there were only 13 students in the formal student program and only eight of those chose to fully or partially participate in the survey. (Students who were not part of the Student Program only participated in the full-conference survey.) As such, data is not sufficient for drawing definitive conclusions about the student program offerings or making recommendations for future programming. Tables 6, 7, and 8 detail responses from those in the student program.

Table 6. Value of student program sessions

Statement	Not at all valuable	Not very valuable	Somewhat valuable	Valuable	Very valuable	NA/No response	Mean	SD
Student Welcome Event (Sun. 4:30pm)	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.17	1.46
	17%	0%	0%	17%	67%			
Student-Mentor Dinner (Mon. 6:30pm)	1	0	1	0	3	3	3.80	1.60
	20%	0%	20%	0%	60%			
Student Modeling Day (Tues. all day)	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.67	0.47
	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%			
Plenary Talk by Paula Stephan (Tues. 9am)	5	0	0	1	0	2	1.50	1.12
	83%	0%	0%	17%	0%			
Posters Reception (Tues. 5:30pm)	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.83	0.37
	0%	0%	0%	17%	83%			
Plenary Talk by Paul Morin (Wed. 9am)	5	0	1	0	0	2	1.33	0.75
	83%	0%	17%	0%	0%			
Student Mentor Lunch (Wed. 12:30pm)	1	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	1.53
	17%	0%	17%	0%	67%			
Student-Exhibitor Speed Networking (Wed. 4pm)	2	0	1	2	1	2	3.00	1.53
	33%	0%	17%	33%	17%			
Visualization Showcase and Reception (Wed. 5:30pm)	3	0	1	1	1	2	2.50	1.61
	50%	0%	17%	17%	17%			
Student Modeling Day Presentations (Thurs. 11am)	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.17	1.46
	17%	0%	0%	17%	67%			

Table 7. Satisfaction with student program modeling day

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/No response	Mean	SD
My goals for participating were met	0 0%	0 0%	1 20%	4 80%	0 0%	3	3.8	0.4
The range of experience of members on my team was balanced	0 0%	0 0%	1 17%	2 33%	3 50%	2	4.33	0.75
The range of interests of members on my team was balanced	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 33%	4 67%	2	4.67	0.47
The senior student on my team had sufficient experience to lead our group during the event	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 33%	4 67%	2	4.67	0.47
I felt as though my team was collaborative	0 0%	0 0%	1 17%	3 50%	2 33%	2	4.17	0.69
My team members were supportive of each other during the event	0 0%	0 0%	1 17%	0 0%	5 83%	2	4.67	0.75
I enjoyed the immersive experience of the event	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 17%	5 83%	2	4.83	0.37
I prefer the immersive experience of the event over traditional conference tutorials	0 0%	0 0%	3 50%	2 33%	1 17%	2	3.67	0.75
The set of available questions were interesting to me	0 0%	0 0%	1 17%	4 67%	1 17%	2	4.00	0.58
It was easy to select an interesting question	0 0%	0 0%	2 33%	3 50%	1 17%	2	3.83	0.69
My programming skills were sufficient for participating in this event	0 0.00%	1 16.67%	3 50.00%	1 16.67%	1 16.67%	2	3.33	0.94
I am confident I can incorporate the knowledge/skills I gained during this event in my work/research	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	5 83%	1 17%	2	4.17	0.37
Overall, I would rate my experience in the event as successful	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 33%	4 67%	2	4.67	0.47

Table 8. Student program participants' overall satisfaction with conference program

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/No response	Mean	SD
My goals for attending the conference were achieved	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.25	0.83
	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%			
I have a better understanding of XSEDE as a result of this experience	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.50	0.5
	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%			
I have a better understanding of ARCC as a result of this experience	0	0	2	1	0	5	3.33	0.47
	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%			
I am interested in doing research involving advanced computing resources	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.50	0.5
	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%			
My background knowledge & skills were a sufficient foundation for participation in the Modeling Day	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1.22
	0%	25%	0%	25%	50%			
My background knowledge and skills were a sufficient foundation for participation in the tutorials I attended	0	1	1	1	0	5	3.00	0.82
	0%	33%	33%	33%	0%			
My background knowledge and skills were a sufficient foundation for participation in the overall conference	0	0	1	3	0	4	3.75	0.43
	0%	0%	25%	75%	0%			
The student activities I attended were well-organized.	0	0	0	0	4	4	5.00	0
	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%			
I enjoyed the format of the student activities	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.50	0.5
	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%			
I connected meaningfully w/ scientists/researchers using high performance computing systems	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.50	0.5
	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%			
I connected meaningfully with other students at the conference	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.50	0.5
	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%			
I would recommend this conference to other students.	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.75	0.43
	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%			
Overall, I would rate my experience as success	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.25	0.83
	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%			

Table 9. Student satisfaction with student mentor program

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/No response	Mean	SD
My goals for participation in the student mentor program were met	0	0	0	0	4	4	5.00	0
	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%			
I had enough information to select a mentor that fit my needs	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.75	0.43
	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%			
My mentor was knowledgeable and could answer my questions	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.75	0.43
	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%			
I had enough time to talk to my mentor at the conference	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.75	0.43
	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%			
I have a plan for keeping in touch with my mentor after the conference	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.25	0.83
	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%			
I would recommend that other students participate in the student mentor program in future years	0	0	0	0	4	4	5.00	0
	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%			

Student Mentor Program

Participants who submitted the Student Mentor Survey expressed generally positive attitudes about the Student Mentor Program (Table 10), with many agreeing or strongly agreeing that it was successful in its mission (31/40, 79%), and that they would recommend the program to others in the future (35/40, 90%). Nonetheless, mentors seemed to view the program as a one-off, conference activity, with about one-third of mentors indicating they were neutral to in strong disagreement when asked if they were likely to stay in contact with their mentee (13/38, 34%), and over one-half reported similar attitudes toward staying in contact with other mentors (22/39, 56%).

Respondents provided the following comments:

- It gives students awareness of realistic career paths and the ability to talk at length with the story owners.
- I think the dinner and lunch events were successful since they gave the mentees the opportunity to interact with other mentors and expand their network.
- It's a good idea to give students someone to talk to and connect with. It will help them make connections and feel confident navigating the conference.
- A very good opportunity to affect positively a younger person.
- My experience last year was all good. I enjoyed meeting with the mentee, she was well prepared, and had great questions that I was able to answer from personal experience.

Table 10. Mentor satisfaction with student mentor program

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/No respons	Mean	SD
My goals for participation in the mentor program were met	3	1	5	14	16	0	4.00	1.15
	8%	3%	13%	36%	41%			
I am satisfied with the mentee/mentor matching process	2	0	4	13	20	0	4.26	1.01
	5%	0%	10%	33%	51%			
I had enough time to talk to my mentee at the conference	2	3	5	16	13	0	3.90	1.1
	5%	8%	13%	41%	33%			
I engaged meaningfully with my mentee	2	1	5	15	16	0	4.08	1.05
	5%	3%	13%	38%	41%			
I plan on keeping in touch with my mentee after the conference	2	2	9	17	8	1	3.71	1.02
	5%	5%	24%	45%	21%			
I engaged meaningfully with other mentor(s) at PEARC	3	4	10	19	3	0	3.38	1.03
	8%	10%	26%	49%	8%			
I plan on keeping in contact with other mentors after PEARC	4	5	13	15	2	0	3.15	1.05
	10%	13%	33%	38%	5%			
I was given sufficient guidance to adequately prepare for my mentor role at PEARC	2	2	17	11	6	1	3.45	0.99
	5%	5%	45%	29%	16%			
The mentor/mentee program was successful	2	1	5	20	11	0	3.95	0.99
	5%	3%	13%	51%	28%			
I would recommend that others participate in the mentor program in future years	2	1	1	17	18	0	4.23	1.00
	5%	3%	3%	44%	46%			

RECOMMENDATIONS

Participant feedback suggests that the PEARC17 was very well received, with respondents noting only a few inconveniences and offering largely-constructive suggestions focused on incremental, targeted and high-level improvements and expansion of existing components. Feedback from PEARC17 attendees informs the following recommendations, which may help to further focus and refine the planning of future PEARC conferences:

- Continue to establish ARCC-type relationships and make efforts to incorporate, rather than co-locate, program content into the PEARC program.
- Continue efforts to increase diversity across all areas of the conference, not only in terms of minority representation, but also in terms of content, attendee background, academic/institutional affiliation, and research interest.
- Establish a higher bar for the quality and consistency of content. A more rigorous review process may increase parity, in terms of quality and consistency, of papers and presentations.
- Where possible, prioritize technical content for both tutorials and conference sessions, and hands-on (rather than lecture) content for tutorials.
- Consider accommodating more tutorial sessions, as well as longer and day-long sessions and having them spread throughout the week.
- Reevaluate the visualization showcase and the inclusion of more visualization content in track sessions.

- Continue the student and student mentor program, with an eye toward expanding the number of students and reducing conflicts between student program activities and the formal conference program. Further, the facilitation of advanced preparation and post-conference interactions for students and mentors may produce greater, and longer-lasting impacts.
- Continue to prioritize networking by allowing for extended breaks and social activities. Consider revisiting the idea of an off-site social activity.
- Make an effort to reduce schedule conflicts where possible. Consider adding longer sessions for some topics, reducing the number of parallel sessions, and, perhaps, extending the conference by a day in the future.
- Actively seek opportunities to improve the conference web site and registration mechanisms. Strive to update the web site with meaningful content on a more frequent basis, incorporate a more user-friendly, interactive mobile site, and add the ability to accept American Express corporate cards that are used by many institutions.
- Reduce the barriers to submission and improve communications with content contributors by providing clearer submission instructions and more frequent, proactive communications regarding deadlines and submission status.
- Continue to improve the overall conference environment and experience by providing food options to accommodate all dietary restrictions; securing reliable Wi-Fi; regulating the temperature in session rooms; reconfiguring session rooms to ensure ample “leg room” for increased physical comfort, and making available spaces for ad hoc, informal meetings.
- Include all student attendees in the student program survey sample population, rather than only those funded by the formal program, assuming all students are eligible to participate in program activities. While student attendees were included in the full conference survey, only those students who were officially part of the funded student program were invited to participate in the student program survey. This resulted in very few responses, with data insufficient to draw any accurate findings. Further, program leaders may wish to require survey completion by funded students.

APPENDIX

Full Conference Survey

Part I - Overall experience—To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding the conference?

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/No response	Mean	SD
1. The knowledge/skills I gained during the conference will significantly contribute to my work/research.	1 0%	5 2%	19 8%	113 50%	87 39%	8	4.24	0.74
2. The information on the conference website was sufficient for planning my time at the conference.	3 1%	5 2%	12 5%	101 44%	108 47%	4	4.34	0.79
3. In general, the conference activities I attended were well organized.	1 0%	0 0%	7 3%	86 39%	127 57%	12	4.53	0.61
4. I am satisfied with the merger of the ARCC workshop series and XSEDE conference series into PEARC.	1 1%	2 1%	29 16%	56 31%	94 52%	51	4.32	0.82
5. The merger of the ARCC workshop series and XSEDE conference series into PEARC is appropriate.	1 1%	0 0%	24 13%	59 32%	103 55%	46	4.41	0.75
6. The conference schedule allowed sufficient time for breaks and informal meetings/networking.	1 0%	4 2%	15 7%	74 32%	136 59%	3	4.48	0.73
7. The paper/abstract/poster submission process was efficient.	2 1%	7 4%	20 12%	58 34%	83 49%	63	4.25	0.90
8. Submission deadlines were reasonable.	2 1%	3 2%	14 8%	67 39%	84 49%	63	4.34	0.80
9. Presenting at this conference will enhance my career.	2 1%	1 1%	25 15%	67 41%	70 42%	68	4.22	0.81
10. I plan to submit to this conference in the future.	1 0%	2 1%	22 11%	90 43%	94 45%	24	4.31	0.74
11. The conference was well advertised (i.e. User News, Facebook/Twitter, PEARC17 Committee emails, etc.)	1 0%	5 2%	40 19%	101 48%	65 31%	21	4.06	0.79
12. The online conference registration process was efficient.	1 0%	6 3%	12 6%	88 41%	108 50%	18	4.38	0.75
13. The onsite conference registration process was efficient.	1 1%	2 1%	8 6%	53 37%	81 56%	88	4.46	0.73
14. There was an adequate variety of sessions.	2 1%	7 3%	12 5%	110 49%	94 42%	8	4.28	0.78
15. I was satisfied with the food and beverage provided at the conference.	5 2%	8 3%	12 5%	69 30%	135 59%	4	4.40	0.91
16. I was satisfied with the conference venue (location, hotel, meeting rooms, etc.).	1 0%	4 2%	10 4%	67 30%	144 64%	7	4.54	0.71
17. The scheduled social activities helped build comradery among attendees.	1 0%	7 3%	22 10%	90 41%	98 45%	15	4.27	0.81
18. I plan to attend PEARC18.	2 1%	3 1%	18 8%	73 33%	127 57%	10	4.43	0.77
19. My goals for attending the conference were achieved.	1 0%	3 1%	11 5%	94 41%	120 52%	4	4.44	0.69
20. For the amount I invested in the conference, I am happy with what I've gained.	1 0%	4 2%	7 3%	90 40%	125 55%	6	4.47	0.69
21. I would recommend this conference to others.	1 0%	1 0%	11 5%	84 37%	129 57%	7	4.50	0.65

22. If you “strongly disagree” or “disagree” with any of the previous statements, please explain here:

- The conference was well-organized and helped me understand many technical as well as organizational parts of XSEDE and related efforts/organizations. I hope to be able to volunteer/work to be able to contribute to the technical program and see if/how it can be broadened/improved.
- Wonderful staff and people to work with. While I did not complete all the sessions with time conflicts but that was expected.
- I found out about the conference through word of mouth. Perhaps consider advertising to the SIAM CSE list or of other societies.
- Jim Basney was da man.
- Great value in this conference for "in the trenches" workers.
- No vegan choices during breaks. No vegan choices at the receptions.
- Food: food poisoning at Tuesday lunch - need to watch time and temperature. Venue: too many rows too small - lack of classroom setup in rooms. Schedule/track-time misalignment and number of tracks made track hopping hard to impossible worst yet.
- It's great to co-locate ARCC and PEARC (XSEDE) since there is a lot of overlap in topics/attendees and it makes less travel.
- The ARCC joining with PEARC helped with the ability to attend both, since budget is always a problem if we have to attend more than one conference a year!
- I think the merge of ARCC w/ XSEDE into PEARC breathes new life into this conference. Otherwise, I fear that this becomes a novel gazing (sic) activity for XSEDE participants as opposed to an opportunity to invite the world to Advanced RC. Venue great. Food, great. Sorry all this is 'agree/strongly agree'.
- I feel more connected with this community as a byproduct of this conference.
- For long sessions such as from 9 - 12:30 or 11 - 6 you need a break every hour.
- I had to work at my "real job" during the social events.
- Deadlines were pretty early, and it was unclear what was required - many conference do not couple presentations with paper submissions, so I had to scramble to put in a paper.
- Great conference. Wonderful opportunity to collaborate with colleagues we would not normally meet in other venues and we can help each other pursue goals.
- Social activities - Champions reception was great as was poster session and viz showcase. Good venue. Easy to access and get to and move about. A little expensive.
- I think portable microphones would be ok for presenters.
- Need stronger technical talks.
- The judging of posters before the conference is not acceptable. Based on the abstract, the review process was not necessary.
- The venue was very good and the city was a good choice. There was a good variety of sessions to cover topics relevant to my work and interests. My goal of building networks and relationships was facilitated by the breadth of sessions provided.
- Registration process unclear for ARCC esp. Monday meetings.
- The website (especially on mobile devices) was difficult to navigate. I could not find the schedule on my phone at all. Also, the name change to PEARC seemed to throw off a lot of people. I did not realize that this was the same as XSEDE. Otherwise, great!

- Many papers were extremely poor. Some papers were really good. Too much difference in quality.
- Great food, conference committee, great hotel.
- Amazing student program - met students, networked with organizations, learned how to model systems also good experience presenting research.
- I enjoyed my time here. The conference was well organized.
- Had to register with two email/addresses to use two different reg codes.
- PEARC/XSEDE is a great introduction to national CI and HPC in general, especially for new people. (Much more accessible than SC'xy).
- Better time enforcement between concurrent sessions.
- The food was problematic. Breakfast was continental. Lack of protein at most meals and ALL snack breaks. I am ketogenic, my food options were extremely limited. Nuts and cheese for snacks. Bacon and eggs for breakfast would be nice.
- Hotel is very good.
- Submission of a paper for the proceedings was not obvious for posters that had already been submitted. My paper was submitted by the deadline, but was declined because it was only possible to submit as a separate submission.
- I'm not a fan of southern cooking.
- There was little schedule change which was not on the paper menu but updated online.
- There was a ridiculous process for abstracts, in my opinion. Anything that gives you a 111-page document to describe how to get your paper in the right format is too long. The templates helped, but they weren't obvious to me.
- Easy to read schedule. Schedule handout with badge was great.
- Info on the specific PEARC17 conference seemed to be missing for some of June. Vegetarian first breakfast was not good.
- Conference was well planned and in combination with ARCC provided an excellent resource and value. (I know this wasn't the question.)
- The venue and their hospitality was extraordinary. Loved being in New Orleans. Loved the Cajun Music.
- ARCC program details need to be explicitly spelled out. (presentations).
- The online registration process was complex and somewhat confusing. It should be simplified. It should also be mobile friendly with iOS and Android devices.
- Poster submission was in a time zone very different from ours, which caused us to nearly miss the deadline. Additionally, there was no way to also submit the proceedings version of the poster without making a separate submission. Even so, we submitted both on time, but were told our poster would not be in the proceedings due to "late submission."
- The conference was very well organized and I didn't witness any problems.
- The "new" conference has a great beginning so thrilled to be at the inaugural event
- The quality of the conference was high, and fills an important gap relative to the other HPC conferences.
- Good conference for HPC practitioners.
- I loved merging XSEDE and ARCC.
- Could not use AmEx to pay for registration.
- Registration did not accept our grant AmEx card.
- Lack of acceptance of AmEx for registration fee payment was an issue since my institution only has a corp. AmEx card.

Part II: General Conference Activities—How valuable were each of the following events to you?

Statement	Not at all valuable	Not very valuable	Somewhat valuable	Valuable	Very valuable	NA/No response	Mean	SD
Q23. Plenary Session (Tues. 9am): Paula Stephan	2	7	16	82	82	44	4.25	0.84
	1%	4%	8%	43%	43%			
Q24. Poster Reception (Tues. 5:30pm)	2	3	20	95	84	29	4.26	0.77
	1%	1%	10%	47%	41%			
Q25. Plenary Session (Wed. 9am): Paul Morin	0	1	18	66	86	62	4.39	0.69
	0%	1%	11%	39%	50%			
Q26. Visualization Showcase and Reception (Wed. 5:30)	4	9	39	98	51	32	3.91	0.89
	2%	4%	19%	49%	25%			
Q27. Student-Exhibitor Speed Networking (Wed. 4pm)	4	2	20	14	35	158	3.99	1.16
	5%	3%	27%	19%	47%			
Q28. Lunch and Awards Ceremony (Thurs. 12:30pm)	0	2	51	83	68	29	4.06	0.79
	0%	1%	25%	41%	33%			

29. If you found any of the activities to be “somewhat” or “not at all” valuable, please explain here:

- Paula was a very dull talk; not really upbeat at all.
- The speed networking was mostly for recruiting of jobs so for an undergrad going to grad it was not worth my time.
- Speed networking were only looking for highly experienced people.
- Vis showcase was interesting, but it was hard to judge without a lot of background in what was being visualized.
- Having only one talk at a time is risky, imho [in my humble opinion]. The plenary sessions didn't apply to me therefore I didn't attend.
- Paula's presentation was fairly interesting but delivery was dry. Not my favorite.
- The plenary sessions were mildly interesting, but not "actionable" for me.
- Plenary sessions really good.
- Vis needs to be presented as a session in lieu of showcase.
- Did not attend viz or speed networking.
- I didn't understand the purpose of the session [visualization showcase]. There were no presenters when I stopped by.
- Have lunch end before hotel late checkout time (2pm).
- Plenary - it would have helped to give some thoughts on how the problems can be addressed. Otherwise, it is eye opening and need to be brought to academic/research community and leaders.
- [Plenary Session: Paula Stephan] The talk was presented in a somewhat boring fashion. Content was great.
- [Visualization Showcase and Reception] Having members of the team next to the visualization.
- [Student-Exhibitor Speed Networking] Pace, interactivity.
- [Student-Exhibitor Speed Networking] Not much time for networking.
- Would help if visualization students were present. Many did not have sufficient explanation.
- [Lunch and Awards Ceremony] Necessary but not very interesting.
- Paula Stephen's talk was great!

30. What improvements would you suggest for the PEARC18 conference?

- Room temperature regulated better. Not everyone is tea drinker; maybe give some amounts of water.
- Repeat talks that are popular.
- Work to eliminate/reduce parallel sessions.
- Greater diversity, more students.
- Volunteers should use another application for communication. A free application, such as groupme or whatsapp, to talk to group. The slack program did not give good notifications. Also, an ice breaker at some session would be nice.
- A/V recording for the talks.
- Get paid more.
- More technical people at speed networking.
- More HPC training.
- Better acoustics in sessions. Some extremely difficult to hear. The gluten free and dairy free food options were awful.
- More workshops and less overlap of workshop sessions.
- None, keep it up.
- Vegan choices are also suitable for vegetarians. No need to provide both but with no vegan options you exclude some people.
- Improve logistics of student program.
- There were Wi-Fi issues on the last day.
- Fix time misalignments in tracks. Stretch out to minimize conflicts. Add back (sic) of large rooms with partial classroom setup.
- Keep the current format.
More update to online schedule and talk descriptions. Too many overlaps on BoFs. Please allow more flexibility. Less really loud music. Try to get some of the talks to be more about general approaches; less XSEDE/services commercials. A little bit of swag, please?
- USB not organized. No idea which file was relevant. Presentations not on USB.
- Verifying conference location was difficult.
- I'd like to see more software demos and opportunities for engineering discussions.
- If tracks can be better defined (i.e. expectations), the movement between rooms/wings can be reduced. Based on talk title it was common to not get what I expected from the sessions.
- Perhaps have a few workshops/tutorials spread out over the length of the conference, e.g. mornings from 8-10am for three - four days.
- Continue to push for more paper submissions to improve overall quality of papers/talks.
- Better food.
- Break sessions should be included more.
- Classroom setup for some sessions like training.
- Maybe track on ARCC on campuses, organizations, governance, collaborations. How campuses manage to recruit and retain staff.
- More space between seats. Easier website schedule. It was hard to use.
- The tracks weren't super clear in scope.
- Add a day - hard to choose sessions.
- Put the floor location for the rooms on the pocket guide.
- I wanted to attend multiple sessions held at the same time. Hard to choose and feel I missed out.
- More social activity in the evenings.

- More international.
- Enforce chairs to stick to scheduled slots.
- Stronger tech track.
- Encourage more students to submit posters. No need to review posters. Only abstract for formatting and scientific content.
- I'm too new to the field to know.
- Add a map to schedule. Allow BoFs to publicly pitch.
- Strengthen the paper and poster sessions.
- A better breakfast selection. It was a bit heavy on pastries.
- Have one of the plenary talks given by a technologist. Option for attendees to purchase a PEARC t-shirt. :)
- Invite NIH projects that connect to HPC centers for an idea of competing interests/directions.
- ARCC should be integrated, not co-located. Many tech program talks would have attracted and would have been useful to ARCC folks and vice versa.
- For volunteers, I recommend print out of schedules. Also, less emails (emails start going to junk mail after excessive emails).
- Try to include areas for impromptu meetings.
- Stronger orientation toward the needs of the CI professional community.
- Less overlap between sessions/missed out on sessions I wanted to attend.
- Bigger student program.
- More detail from presenters. I felt many just gave summaries and overviews. Needed more depth in almost all (i.e. more rigorous review process.)
- Better technical content "across all sessions!"
- It would be great if there were more technical content.
- Rethink tracks.
- Closing plenary sessions. Feel odd that lunch is the last session.
- More time in speed networking.
- Make more undergrad friendly talks. Some were very difficult to understand.
- Mobile app with interactive schedule.
- More papers.
- Identify and strengthen opportunities for recruitment of professional staff.
- Student rewards for the modeling day.
- More tutorials.
- I suggest not using badge ribbons, they create have and have nots. Creating barrier to interaction.
- I'm interested in seeing how "creativity" is defined.
- More tutorials.
- Better schedule and room size to session.
- Continue the same.
- Recruit participants from local institutions.
- Make certain presenters show relevance of their work to PEARC mission.
- More room in session rooms between chairs. Very cramped this year.
- Food options! Full breakfast and protein options at breaks.
- Extend past XSEDE, more talks, full tracks.
- Better separation between research talks and system "ads" (i.e. please use our HPC system/software.)

- Make signing up for events more centralized. Rather than sending e-mail, have events - like student modeling day - be included in the online registration.
- The introduction event for student program should be better prepared. I'd suggest a demo session alongside the poster session.
- Less fancy food, less emphasis of local cuisine types.
- 1. Code of Conduct. 2. "People" track for campus research computing. 3. More fully merge ARCC into it so it is PEARC.
- Deeper technical. More full day tutorials.
- Have the training in different day, instead of all on Monday.
- Soda at lunch :)
- More consistent Wi-Fi.
- Small program guide was great, some session titles were very unclear in this short format. Perhaps some guidelines would help.
- Keep on keeping on.
- A little more for system admins.
- Mix tutorials with lecture sessions.
- Don't offer free drinks, but make registration cheaper.
- Online registration should generate email receipt.
- Pick a better hotel to stay at. Provide daycare for young children traveling with family.
- A few session times had less variety in topics. If possible, a little more staggering but may not be feasible.
- More applications of HPC vs (sic) development.
- It seemed there was a lot of competition in terms of what to attend. But I'm not sure fewer tracks is the solution. BoFs at one hour is too short.
- More people, organizations.
- More students, cheaper tutorials.
- Submission and review process for tutorials was a problem. No official notification of rejection. Instructions were vague.
- Better schedule. Parallel sessions were confusing.
- Ensure room numbers are correct on the schedule. Additionally, how the visualization showcase panel prior to the reception and voting.
- More industry companies.
- Central audio for last minute announcements. More student volunteer recognitions/awards.
- EasyChair - provide an additional column for presenters for convenient tracking of users.
- Give some basic presentation advice to the students. Speak into the microphone. If using colors on a graph present the data with something else to differentiate it as well some attendees are color blind.
- No real change
- Food menu. More importance to student events
- Keep it with ARCC, more down time
- Have tables in the meeting rooms. Have the mobile website be more friendly.
- Accept AMEX so we can use our corporate card.
- More tables for working.
- Change color coding of the conference schedule handout to improve readability. Different days could be different colors. Add page breaks so times can align on page boundaries (sic).
- Use an online form or something for student - mentor lunch/dinner for more organization.

- I don't know how many others do not have a strong affiliation with XSEDE or ARCC, but one could imagine drawing on the wider audience might draw people into ARCC if not XSEDE (less likely if they are not in that environment).
- Temperature in some rooms was "freezing" on Monday. It could be increased couple of degrees.
- More hands-on sessions (I attended the tutorials.)

31. What were the strengths of the PEARC17 conference?

- Student program was very fun and beneficial.
- Good networking. Layout of conference rooms were good. Food was excellent. Invited talks/plenaries were excellent. Overall content of talks was far superior from previous XSEDE conferences.
- Lots of students, meticulous planning, venue perfect for conference size.
- Pulled in big name sponsors, made a successful conference for first year name change.
- A broad variety of topics: technical talks/presentations, organizational info, sessions and workshop (bias diversity) which make the conference relevant to a very diverse audience.
- Good balance of session/break/activities.
- Organization, student program, tutorials.
- Industry connections. Tutorials.
- Is smart.
- Great venue. Variety of talks/sessions.
- I met new people.
- Variety of people.
- Variety. Close networking opportunity.
- Community.
- Sessions/presentation ++ I was fortunate to sit in tutorials and BOF sessions on highly pertinent sessions. BOFs and tutorials.
- Great keynote talks and networking opportunities.
- Lot of emphasis on Research Computing, Cybersecurity, CI facilitation.
- The variety of talks.
- Reconnecting with technologies; new methods, lots of options for seminars.
- Everything in compact area. Well organized. Variety of sessions. Commitment of participants.
- Shared values and goals.
- Opportunity to talk to colleagues at different institutions. Opportunity to present work that is not quite relevant to the scope of my peer reviewed journals.
- Networking with colleagues and meeting others with common interests/challenges.
- The variety of tutorials.
- The tutorial was very good and useful.
- Being able to meet others.
- Tutorials, technical sessions.
- Networking, super supportive people.
- Focus on HPC (XSEDE) and research.
- Gathering of ARCC and campuses. Different from SC, conferences.

- insight into the HPC architecture.
- Variety of speakers. The small printed schedule was VERY helpful.
- Community - a great chance to get face time.
- Everything.
- Everything. Location/hotel/food/proceedings. Committee was awesome!!
- Diversity, breadth of sessions.
- The breadth and depth of topics from cybersecurity to diversity.
- Filling a niche that was needed.
- Networking. Great sessions.
- The variety, practicality of sessions and tutorials.
- Emphasis on practice, incorporation of ARCC.
- Venue layout was easy to navigate.
- PEARC17 was unifying in that it brought together experts from different disciplines under one HPC community.
- Friendly, lots of networking.
- Meeting colleagues and exchange. Interesting presentation.
- Well planned parallel sessions. Location, food and breaks are great.
- HPC user productivity (ops, dev, gateways).
- People, meetings.
- Networking with colleagues.
- Right mix of science and practical cluster administration sessions.
- Variety and strength of the presentations.
- Variety and academic HPC content.
- Having multiple communities together. One trip vs. two for ARCC and XSEDE.
- Interesting papers describing experience with new technology. Chance to network.
- Beginning of broader community coordination.
- Diversity of sessions/easily accessible speakers.
- Diversity of attendees' backgrounds.
- Personal interactions w/ others sharing same challenges.
- Networking was easy due to efficient flow and number of networking events.
- Collection of attendees.
- Love the live musicians on Wed night. All the presentations were very informative and the plenary speakers were fabulous!
- Food! Good student and technical programs.
- Great plenary talks.
- Organized, venue, food.
- Student program.
- Breaks and networking.
- Funding.
- Well-organized student program.
- Focused community and expertise on HPC. Diversity of participants.
- Open to CI community beyond XSEDE.
- Meeting people, informal opportunities to discuss work.
- Networking.
- Well organized. Good mix of content levels - beginner to advanced. Growing inclusion of arts and humanities.
- There's a user perspective, either from ops or system person, its "user-centric."
- Community and networking.

- Was able to network with more professionals from HPC.
- Food, layout of rooms for conference - easy to get around.
- Student program, poster session.
- Diversity of domain sciences represented.
- Venue, networking, topics.
- Location and content.
- Filling a space between SC and domain-specific conferences.
- Diversity, accessibility to researchers.
- Strong attendance, variety, diversity of attendees/presenters.
- The greatest strength of the PEARC17 conference was the wise variety of disciplines of the attendees.
- Topic variety and diversity of attendees.
- I like the focus on practicing of research CI.
- Wonderful! Loved how the ARCC content provided specific content for campus based
- venue for practitioner. Diversity.
- Meeting and listening to many HPC guru.
- You guys knocked it out of the park with the food, both in quantity and quality. The sessions were great too.
- Content well targeted to my interest. Not too big. Amazing food.
- Organized, energetic.
- Good size, good location.
- Networking.
- All good!
- Diversity of info.
- Variety of session offers and excellent tutorials all day.
- Organized.
- Community, networking, information.
- Nice venue, great topics.
- Poster session.
- Location, range of topics.
- Broader participation from non-XSEDE staff.
- Diversity with fields represented.
- Interdisciplinary community.
- I have attended some valuable presentations and the ARCC session. Networking with others.
- Great keynote. Great venue/location. Great invited talks.
- The community.
- People from diverse organization.
- Good quality paper/posters.
- Student program, tutorials, opportunities to meet and interact with colleagues, diversity and inclusion talks.
- Community.
- Networking. Learning what others in similar organizations are doing.
- Campus champion meetings. Mixture of attendees.
- Have members of the vis teams present during showcase.
- The large numbers of attendees and variety of talks.

- PEARC17 provided an excellent venue to networking, as well as panels designed to foster interest in HPC and related fields.
- Posters, presentations and tutorials.
- Well organized.
- Student - mentor activities.
- Networking opportunities. Researchers experience.
- Committee, band, diversity.
- Student program was a great success that promoted great diversity and enabled many students to attend the conference.
- Well-organized, operated smoothly.
- Organization, venue, food. Strong tech programs.
- Wide variety of topics, a lot of great talks, and plenty of networking.
- The diversity and the people who attended and the scale of conference.
- Meeting other people.
- Networking and practice focus.
- Over XSEDE16, moved with ARCC.
- Well scheduled, great food, great venue.
- Networking.
- Good food, well organized.
- Networking and organization.
- The opportunities to network; the training opportunities, especially the tutorials.
- Exposure to others work/challenges in the field.
- Organization.
- Materials and diversity.

32. How would you like to see PEARC change or develop in the future?

- Students work hard, too. Give some recognition.
- Continue establishing ARCC-like relationships.
- Same as above (greater diversity, more students).
- International presence.
- Better.
- Just keep it up and help more students to get travel grants.
- More involvement from national labs and government.
- More hands on HPC admin workshops/training.
- Keep it up!
- Allow ARCC program to overlap less timewise. Perhaps start ARCC one day earlier so that I don't miss too many XSEDE talks.
- Improve/enhance student program.
- To succeed in its mission to bring together everyone with interest in advanced research computing, is it too late to find a better acronym?
- More job opportunities.
- More students.
- Better food.
- More viz!
- More clarity, more tutorials with more tangible take-home deliverables (not just lectures.)

- Add a workshop on diversity and inclusion, maybe working with NCWIT. Also have the diversity presenters do a lightning 30 sec advertisement in the plenary.
- Not grow too big. Continue to focus on community.
- I would like to see more people from different government agencies involved, especially DOD (NRL, ARL, AFRL, ERDC) and NASA HEC.
- Reflect the full diversity of computational science.
- See 31 (I'm too new to the field to know).
- Clear focus on engineering.
- Need to integrate ARCC more. It still felt like mostly an XSEDE conference. Perhaps because of the short timeline. I expect this to evolve in the future.
- See above (ARCC should be integrated, not co-located. Many tech program talks would have attracted, and would have been useful to, ARCC folks and vice versa.) Fewer "peer reviewed" papers, more BoFs and panels.
- More presentations about center operations.
- Needs involvement from broader community. Strongly NSF oriented. Need to reach not only to other agency communities but also to campuses.
- More plenary speakers, fewer smaller talks to prevent overlap.
- Add workshops and panels.
- More talks on operational issues for campus CI.
- Possibly add more talks or have more timeslots so it's easier to attend more talks.
- Self-sustained.
- Looks good to me.
- integration with ARCC and CARC/CASC.
- More undergrad involvement. Possibly include hackathon.
- Students missed lot of talks because of tutorials and modeling day. Tutorials and Modeling Day is invaluable, too.
- Become nexus of ACI/XSEDE/OSG/CARC/ARCC activities to support research cyber-infrastructure.
- More cloud content.
- Separate track for arts and humanities.
- More applications and science results.
- More scientific focus, i.e. HPC/CS Research.
- Stronger technical program.
- ARCC should be more technical.
- Stay mid-size. Don't get too big (i.e. SC.)
- Bring back the off-site social gathering,
- More mentoring for staff and networking for staff,
- Move ARCC or other workshops to separate days,
- More panels introducing attendees to HPC would be welcome,
- I don't have any particular suggestion.
- More emphasis on CI professionals. The "people" track shouldn't require evaluation (and therefore IRB approval).
- PEARC can be the primary meet-up for academic (and more) research computation professionals with champions, ACI-REF, CARC, etc. confluence.
- The conference for the CI practitioner.
- Not always located in East or SE.
- Continue diversifying beyond XSEDE focus.
- More hands-on technical tracks.

- More attendance from faculty researchers.
- More sponsor integration.
- Help affiliated groups pair workshops or meetings before/after the conference.
- Higher impact talks.
- Have experts select focus matters for future HPC.
- More education, more diversity.
- More educational activities.
- Better schedule.
- Reschedule the student program to allow students to attend more of the panels without being forced to compromise their student program attendance.
- Programming/hacking competition.
- More diversity.
- Bring in more industry that is using HPC.
- Invite data scientists and library sciences. They have a lot to add to the conversation.
- Wider variety of papers.
- Come to Buffalo :)
- More structure to networking event. The conference was amazing.
- A break in one of the afternoons.

33. Which conference track did you *primarily* participate in?

Track	N	%
Accelerating Discovery	29	12%
ARCC	43	18%
General/Plenaries	44	19%
Software and Data	42	18%
Student Program	44	19%
Technology	64	27%
Tutorials	47	20%
Workforce Diversity & Evaluation	25	11%
No response	35	15%

34. Mark all of the following statements that apply to you:

	N	%
This is my first time attending PEARC or a prior XSEDE or ARCC conference	87	37%
I am an XSEDE Campus Champion	55	24%
I am an XSEDE-funded staff member	55	24%
I use XSEDE-allocated resources for my research/work	62	27%
I use XSEDE-allocated resources for my work in education	39	17%
I operate or support campus research computing resources	94	40%
I operate or support NSF-funded research computing resources	88	38%
I operate or support research computing resources funded by some other organization (please specify organization)	33	14%
I am part of a cyberinfrastructure organization other than XSEDE (please specify):	33	14%
No response	24	10%

35. Did you stay at the conference hotel (Hyatt Regency New Orleans, 601 Loyola Ave, New Orleans, Louisiana)?

Conference hotel	N	%
Yes	191	82%
No	17	7%
No response	25	11%

If no, why:

- Brought my whole family. Stayed at an Airbnb.
- Change of scenery
- Expensive, don't like huge hotels
- Hilton member/Points (2)
- Prefer French Quarter (2)
- Price (8)
- Registered too late

36. What were your primary reasons for attending the conference?

Reason for attending	N	%
Make a presentation	83	36%
Attend presentations	109	47%
Attend tutorials	65	28%
Network with colleagues	144	62%
Meet with funding agencies	6	3%
Attend exhibits	14	6%
Get technical information/specifications	39	17%
Demo/exhibit projects/products/participate in an exhibit	10	4%
Meet with vendors	10	4%
No response	27	12%
Other (please specify)	12	5%

- Publish a paper
- XSEDE staff training
- Conference committee member
- Professional development
- To become and XSEDE champion
- Student modeling day

37. Job title/academic status:

Status	N	%
Executive leadership (e.g., director, CIO, etc.)	38	16%
University faculty or equivalent	22	9%
Research Staff	35	15%
Research computing operations/support (non-exec. leadership)	54	23%
Postdoctoral Fellow	1	0%
Graduate Student	26	11%
Undergraduate Student	19	8%
High School Student	0	0%
No response	35	15%
Other (please specify):	3	1%

- Funding agency staff
- Non-profit staff

38. Race/ethnicity (select all that apply):

Race	N	%
American Indian or Alaska Native	11	5%
Asian	37	16%
Black or African American	20	9%
Hispanic or Latino	11	5%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	5	2%
White	128	55%
No response	35	15%
Other:	10	4%

- First Generation
- Indian
- Middle Eastern

39. Gender

Gender	N	%
Male	130	56%
Female	47	20%
Other (please specify):	1	0%
No response	55	24%

40. Please note any additional comments you would like to make regarding PEARC17, ARCC or the XSEDE project.

- Thank you :)
- Great job! :)
- Jim Basney
- Great conference
- Great job on a really good first year. Can't wait for next year!
- Plenary room temp was penguin friendly.
- On the very first meeting, we should have a dinner like the other dinners.
- Great job, organizers!
- Great meeting. Need more variety for breakfast - maybe more protein? Awesome. sessions - figure out how to repeat some? Wanted to attend more.
- Good conference.
- Personally, I don't like big(ish) meetings, so my responses are muted, and perhaps unrepresentative. Best!
- Find a way to co-locate PEARC, CASC, CARC.

- I thought it was very well planned.
- Thank you to the whole conference team!
- Love the NOLA flavor - bands, food, etc.
- <3 Kim and KGB Staff.
- Nice job this year.
- Local food selections are always good, but you went a little too cheaply for snack and events.
- Demo track.
- This survey is too long :)
- Survey too damn long.
- It was overall a fun time, and the choice of venue was excellent. The live bands were at times a bit too loud.

Student Program Survey

1. How valuable to you were each of the following sessions and activities?

Statement	Not at all valuable	Not very valuable	Somewhat valuable	Valuable	Very valuable	NA/No response	Mean	SD
Student Welcome Event (Sun. 4:30pm)	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.17	1.46
	17%	0%	0%	17%	67%			
Student-Mentor Dinner (Mon. 6:30pm)	1	0	1	0	3	3	3.80	1.60
	20%	0%	20%	0%	60%			
Student Modeling Day (Tues. all day)	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.67	0.47
	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%			
Plenary Talk by Paula Stephan (Tues. 9am)	5	0	0	1	0	2	1.50	1.12
	83%	0%	0%	17%	0%			
Posters Reception (Tues. 5:30pm)	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.83	0.37
	0%	0%	0%	17%	83%			
Plenary Talk by Paul Morin (Wed. 9am)	5	0	1	0	0	2	1.33	0.75
	83%	0%	17%	0%	0%			
Student Mentor Lunch (Wed. 12:30pm)	1	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	1.53
	17%	0%	17%	0%	67%			
Student-Exhibitor Speed Networking (Wed. 4pm)	2	0	1	2	1	2	3.00	1.53
	33%	0%	17%	33%	17%			
Visualization Showcase and Reception (Wed. 5:30pm)	3	0	1	1	1	2	2.50	1.61
	50%	0%	17%	17%	17%			
Student Modeling Day Presentations (Thurs. 11am)	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.17	1.46
	17%	0%	0%	17%	67%			

2. If you selected “not at all” or “not very” valuable, please explain here.

- The speed networking felt like more of a speed recruiting. little information was shared and it was too fast.

3. What improvements would you suggest for the PEARC18 student program activities?

- Modeling Day awards.
- More hands on.

4. Did you participate in the Student Modeling Day?

- Yes 6/8, 75%
- No, but considered -
- No, and did not consider -
- No, I didn't know about -
- No response 2/8, 25%

5. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements regarding your experience in the PEARC Student Modeling Day?

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/No response	Mean	SD
My goals for participating were met	0	0	1	4	0	3	3.8	0.4
	0%	0%	20%	80%	0%			
The range of experience of members on my team was balanced	0	0	1	2	3	2	4.33	0.75
	0%	0%	17%	33%	50%			
The range of interests of members on my team was balanced	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.67	0.47
	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%			
The senior student on my team had sufficient experience to lead our group during the event	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.67	0.47
	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%			
I felt as though my team was collaborative	0	0	1	3	2	2	4.17	0.69
	0%	0%	17%	50%	33%			
My team members were supportive of each other during the event	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.67	0.75
	0%	0%	17%	0%	83%			
I enjoyed the immersive experience of the event	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.83	0.37
	0%	0%	0%	17%	83%			
I prefer the immersive experience of the event over traditional conference tutorials	0	0	3	2	1	2	3.67	0.75
	0%	0%	50%	33%	17%			
The set of available questions were interesting to me	0	0	1	4	1	2	4.00	0.58
	0%	0%	17%	67%	17%			
It was easy to select an interesting question	0	0	2	3	1	2	3.83	0.69
	0%	0%	33%	50%	17%			
My programming skills were sufficient for participating in this event	0	1	3	1	1	2	3.33	0.94
	0.00%	16.67%	50.00%	16.67%	16.67%			
I am confident I can incorporate the knowledge/skills I gained during this event in my work/research	0	0	0	5	1	2	4.17	0.37
	0%	0%	0%	83%	17%			
Overall, I would rate my experience in the event as successful	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.67	0.47
	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%			

6. If you disagree or strongly disagree with any of the statements above, please explain here.

No responses were provided to this question.

7. Did you participate in the Student Mentor Program?

- Yes 5/8, 63%
- No, but considered 1/8, 13%
- No, and did not consider -
- No, I didn't know about -
- No response 2/8, 25%

8. To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding your experience in the Student Mentor Program at the conference?

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/No response	Mean	SD
My goals for participation in the student mentor program were met	0	0	0	0	4	4	5.00	0
	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%			
I had enough information to select a mentor that fit my needs	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.75	0.43
	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%			
My mentor was knowledgeable and could answer my questions	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.75	0.43
	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%			
I had enough time to talk to my mentor at the conference	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.75	0.43
	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%			
I have a plan for keeping in touch with my mentor after the conference	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.25	0.83
	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%			
I would recommend that other students participate in the student mentor program in future years	0	0	0	0	4	4	5.00	0
	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%			

9. If you disagree or strongly disagree with any of the statements above, please explain here.

No responses were provided to this question.

10. To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding your overall experience at the conference?

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/No response	Mean	SD
My goals for attending the conference were achieved	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.25	0.83
	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%			
I have a better understanding of XSEDE as a result of this experience	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.50	0.5
	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%			
I have a better understanding of ARCC as a result of this experience	0	0	2	1	0	5	3.33	0.47
	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%			
I am interested in doing research involving advanced computing resources	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.50	0.5
	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%			
My background knowledge & skills were a sufficient foundation for participation in the Modeling Day	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1.22
	0%	25%	0%	25%	50%			
My background knowledge and skills were a sufficient foundation for participation in the tutorials I attended	0	1	1	1	0	5	3.00	0.82
	0%	33%	33%	33%	0%			
My background knowledge and skills were a sufficient foundation for participation in the overall conference	0	0	1	3	0	4	3.75	0.43
	0%	0%	25%	75%	0%			
The student activities I attended were well-organized.	0	0	0	0	4	4	5.00	0
	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%			
I enjoyed the format of the student activities	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.50	0.5
	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%			
I connected meaningfully w/ scientists/researchers using high performance computing systems	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.50	0.5
	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%			
I connected meaningfully with other students at the conference	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.50	0.5
	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%			
I would recommend this conference to other students.	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.75	0.43
	0%	0%	0%	25%	75%			
Overall, I would rate my experience as success	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.25	0.83
	0%	0%	25%	25%	50%			

11. If you disagree or strongly disagree with any of the statements above, please explain here.

No responses were provided to this question.

12. Which presentations at the conference did you enjoy the most and why?

- Modeling day presentation
- Visualization tutorial- it taught me how to use the Visit software which will aid me in my future work

13. How did you hear about the conference? (select all that apply)

Statement	N	%
Another conference	0	0%
College	3	38%
Department	1	13%
Faculty advisor	0	0%
HPCUniversity.org website	0	0%
Shodor website	0	0%
Student organization	0	0%
ARCC Workshop Series	0	0%
XSEDE Regional Workshop event	0	0%
XSEDE Training event	0	0%
XSEDE website	0	0%
Other	0	0%
No response	4	50%

14. In addition to the student program, in which conference track did you *primarily* participate?

Track	N	%
ARCC	0	0%
Software and Data	1	13%
Technology	1	13%
Tutorials	2	25%
Workforce Diversity and Evaluation	0	0%
No response	4	50%

15. Please select all of the following statements that apply to you.

Statement	N	%
This is my first time attending an XSEDE conference.	4	50%
This is my first time attending an ARCC event	2	25%
I use XSEDE resources (computational, training, outreach, etc.) for my research/work.	0	0%
I am an XSEDE scholar	0	0%
I am part of the Advanced Computing for Social Change Program	0	0%
No response	4	50%

16. Job title/academic status:

Status	N	%
Postdoctoral Fellow	0	0%
Graduate Student	0	0%
Undergraduate Student	4	50%
High School Student	0	0%
No response	4	50%
Other (please specify):	0	0%

17. Race/ethnicity (select all that apply):

Race	N	%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0%
Asian	0	0%
Black or African American	3	38%
Hispanic or Latino	1	13%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0%
White	0	0%
No response	4	50%
Other	0	0%

18. Gender

Gender	N	%
Male	3	38%
Female	1	13%
Other (please specify):	0	0%
No response	4	50%

Student Mentor Survey

1. To what extent do you agree with the following statements regarding your role as a mentor at PEARC?

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/No respons	Mean	SD
My goals for participation in the mentor program were met	3	1	5	14	16	0	4.00	1.15
	8%	3%	13%	36%	41%			
I am satisfied with the mentee/mentor matching process	2	0	4	13	20	0	4.26	1.01
	5%	0%	10%	33%	51%			
I had enough time to talk to my mentee at the conference	2	3	5	16	13	0	3.90	1.1
	5%	8%	13%	41%	33%			
I engaged meaningfully with my mentee	2	1	5	15	16	0	4.08	1.05
	5%	3%	13%	38%	41%			
I plan on keeping in touch with my mentee after the conference	2	2	9	17	8	1	3.71	1.02
	5%	5%	24%	45%	21%			
I engaged meaningfully with other mentor(s) at PEARC	3	4	10	19	3	0	3.38	1.03
	8%	10%	26%	49%	8%			
I plan on keeping in contact with other mentors after PEARC	4	5	13	15	2	0	3.15	1.05
	10%	13%	33%	38%	5%			
I was given sufficient guidance to adequately prepare for my mentor role at PEARC	2	2	17	11	6	1	3.45	0.99
	5%	5%	45%	29%	16%			
The mentor/mentee program was successful	2	1	5	20	11	0	3.95	0.99
	5%	3%	13%	51%	28%			
I would recommend that others participate in the mentor program in future years	2	1	1	17	18	0	4.23	1.00
	5%	3%	3%	44%	46%			

2. If you disagreed or strongly disagreed with any of the statements above, please explain here.

- I did not see this as being an ongoing relationship after the conference.
- I was unable to participate in one of the two mentoring activities during the conference.
- I don't know who the other mentors are/were beyond their faces. I focused on the mentee.
- My mentee had no idea what the program was really about, and may simply have been unprepared for the experience.
- The student-mentor dinner was in such a loud venue that I found it difficult to communicate with my mentee. I think we could have had even more productive conversation if this hadn't been the case.
- Interaction time was somewhat short (although the two pre-arranged dinner/lunch times helped).
- The "disagree" ratings were entirely my fault. I had work commitments that prevented me from engaging at times scheduled. I should have, but did not, schedule a separate time to meet.

3. What are some of the strengths of the PEARC mentor program?

- Ideal environment to discuss about HPC and its usage in research for students.
- Both times I have one it whoever selected the match did a great job.
- It gave my mentee someone to hang out with at the conference. I thought the matchup right before the dinner was a very good idea.
- This is a good opportunity to talk to someone of your experiences and potentially inspire somebody.
- The matching was well done this year! The check-in process was a significant improvement over last year's program - we had no trouble finding each other. The schedule (dinner) worked out well.
- It exists! It's a chance to swap experiences and share career lessons.
- Inspiring early stage researchers to prepare for their Ph.D. journeys, linking the students to their potential employers.
- The dinner/lunch were excellent and allowed for focused discussions.
- Direct contact between mentors & mentees.
- Great way to expose students from HBCUs to mentors. They may need a little coaching in advance. OTOH, I met other mentees who were much more on the ball.
- Give the students an opportunity to hear from others perspective and also to receive career advice.
- The multiple opportunities we had to meet with the Mentees. Great idea so we could really get to engage.
- Provided space for meaningful one-to-one interactions with mentees. Provided a group of peers to connect with among the mentees.
- Helps guide future computational scientists prepare for a career.
- It seemed to do well with including traditionally underserved students. It was a diverse group and I find that to be a great strength in any program.
- I thought that the dinner was really great for a first meeting with the student. It gave space for interaction and had some "official" program. That was a nice mixture.
- It is a good way to meet students. The social setting really helps.
- Connecting people of different backgrounds to promote bigger ideas and thought processes.
- Fun to provide perspective to the students. Good for students to form connections and see the diversity both in scientific computing and the community.
- My experience last year was all good. I enjoyed meeting with the mentee, she was well prepared, and had great questions that I was able to answer from personal experience.
- A very good opportunity to affect positively, a younger person.
- It's a good idea to give students someone to talk to and connect with. It will help them make connections and feel confident navigating the conference.
- I think the dinner and lunch events were successful since they gave the mentees the opportunity to interact other mentors and expand their network.
- It gives students awareness of realistic career paths and the ability to talk at length with the story owners.

4. How can the PEARC mentor program be improved?

- I am not sure if the following is already being followed. The mentor mentee matching can be improved by letting the students choose from a list of mentors with their resumes.
- Not sure how to follow up... my mentee is interested in some things, but his campus doesn't have the resources he needs.
- Perhaps the program should encourage the pair to attend sessions together and exchange ideas more specifically about common interests, starting with identifying at least a couple before getting to the conference.
- The location of the dinner was not ideal - could barely hear the speaker. I would expect a stronger speaker lineup in future programs.
- An introduction to all the mentors and mentees before pairing off for the rest of the conference. Maybe even a brief filtered email as an introduction?
- The organizer interrupted the meals with speeches too many times. If next time the organizers have to say anything, please say it before or after the meal. It is very rude that keep interrupting someone's meal. The entry just became cold and not relevant any more after all those speeches.
- Ask students to prepare the questions list to answer during event.
- A more "mixer" like format where we could move around and meet more mentors/mentees might be useful.
- I wasn't a great fit for my mentee this year -- she is looking to change fields, while I could give her some advice, someone in the field she is looking to go into would have been better.
- Provide some resources to mentees to help them prepare. The speakers were so soft-spoken, and the space so loud, that they were completely ineffectual.
- If students are presenting a poster a paper... it will be a great idea is the mentor gets an opportunity to work with the student before deadlines.
- Perhaps a short conference after the lunch, and a peer mentor group or panel would be an excellent addition.
- Perhaps add some conference sessions for the students that are more career development oriented. For example, mentor panels where there is discussion about pursuing graduate degrees in fields relevant to XSEDE (how to find the right programs, how to apply, etc.) and/or how to become involved in research projects.
- A better orientation, "what to expect", examples of mentoring would be helpful.
- A mic for speakers at the dinner would have been nice.
- There was a lot of time spent waiting for the one-on-one match before being seated which was wasted time. The students who were volunteering at the event didn't end up sitting with their mentors anyway. Maybe instead of doing the matching before the conference, do the matching at the first event.
- I'm not sure. More interaction with student modeling contest?
- A little more information about what was expected would be useful. ;)
- Encourage online connections between mentors and mentees on professional website such as LinkedIn. Both the program and the conference are great, this was my first time as a mentor and I learned a lot from this experience. It would've been great if there were a short intro meeting for the mentors where the admin of the program can discuss the expectations and areas of interest, this is helpful especially for young professionals who volunteered to be mentors but have minimal

mentoring experience. Maybe if there were a checkbox on the conference registration form that asks the mentor if they are new to this or not. It was a great experience altogether and I would do it again for sure. I've been to other workshops where they would do a speed dating style meeting between mentors and mentees, that would help the mentees to build a larger network of mentors. Thank you for all the hard work.

- I think it is great as is, and feel bad about not holding up my end.
- Great start. No comments now.
- The initial email contact laid out a major time commitment and said not to participate unless we could make the commitments. I could not, so I did not reply to the email. The next email assigned me a student - I was surprised, as was the other mentor on my team. This could be more clear in the future.
- I was switched from a mentee with whom I had a similar set of interests to one with whom I didn't and who didn't seem to value the mentor/mentee program. I was concerned my first mentee may not have ended up with a mentor, and that mentee was also not aware they were being switched when I contacted them about it. I am not sure why we were switched; I would recommend better communication when switches need to be made; please let us know sooner and why.
- I think creating a LinkedIn group is a good idea. If attendants want to be mentors or mentees, they should join to this group. This way, it will be easier for mentor program committee to look-up mentor backgrounds and also encourage students to create profiles for their future career.

5. Please note any additional comments you would like to make regarding the PEARC mentor program or the conference itself.

- It would have been good to have more contact with the mentee before the conference. Last year I had considerable contact via email with my mentee. This year I sent a couple notes to my mentee but never got any response, so I had no idea what his interests were until the dinner on Monday night.
- The dinner was fantastic, but could be reduced a bit. Programs to increase the participation together would be beneficial.
- The mentor dinner was great for me, but seemed to intimidate my student.
- "This is a note for the Sponsors: Thank you very much for supporting this event. Please continue to do so, I know students greatly benefit by just simply having a conversation with their mentors."
- This is my first time serving as a mentor. I began to relate to students, their struggles, aspirations, etc. However, I am quite disoriented as to how to interact with the student (especially my mentee) and what useful word or advice to give the student(s). I was able to get the contact info of some students, which I plan to keep in touch after the conference. I think it is important for us to keep in mind not only our peer network (for our institution's or our own benefits), but also to build a network with the younger generation to (1) attract them to our fields and (2) establish connection with the future scientists, practitioners, ... Despite less-than-stellar ratings I gave above, I am very happy to have served as a mentor, at least to learn to be one.
- None for now

- Please keep the mentor program going; it's great for students! The conference is a great opportunity for them to get engaged with the ARC community.
- I strongly support that the conference and the mentor program should continue.