Results of Feedback Survey for 2012 Aerodyne Mass Spectrometers Users Meeting in Minneapolis

Compiled by Jose from SurveyMonkey results
27-Oct-12
What is your OVERALL RATING of the usefulness to you of the 2012 AMS Users Meeting?

Answered: 35  Skipped: 0

- 5 (extremely useful): 25.71%
- 4 (very useful): 68.57%
- 3 (quite useful): 5.71%
- 2 (somewhat useful)
- 1 (a little useful)
- 0 (not useful at all)
Rate the IMPORTANCE & USEFULNESS OF THE VARIOUS TOPICS discussed at the 2012 AMS Users' Meeting:

Answered: 35   Skipped: 0

- Hardware and instrument software: 4.23
- Data Analysis Software: 3.94
- Calibrations, CE, intercomparis: 4.06
- User Presentations & Open Mike: 3.57
- Meeting Other Users and Learning: 4.26
- Establishing or Continuing Collaboration: 4.23
Rate the various ORGANIZATIONAL ASPECTS of the meeting:

Answered: 35   Skipped: 0

- Organization immediately after a major: 4.11
- Location in Minneapolis: 3.91
- Meeting Rooms: 4.54
- Order and Time Allocation: 3.94
- Discussions during and after: 3.74
- Parallel Sessions: 3.54
- Length of Meals and Coffee Breaks: 4.23
- Open Mike Sections: 3.54
- ARI Dinner: 4.24
Please enter any additional comments about the organizational aspects of the meeting here

• Open Mike should be really on new developments, new analyses with the ARI instruments, not on general science.
• The hotel wasn't the greatest, but it was nice and cheap.
• I was impressed that we started on time and kept to the schedule pretty well. I got bored of the lunch food pretty quickly, sandwiches every day gets boring (and so-called wraps are still just sandwiches). The snacks were pretty good. I'm glad fruit was a prevalent option. At first I didn't like the first meeting room but the format grew on me. The neighborhood was o-k, but there wasn't that much great food nearby. There was just barely enough choice for me to not go crazy. And I was surprised there were no supermarkets. The hotel breakfast sucked but that's how all those hotel breakfasts are I suppose.
• I thought it would have been nice to have a longer time for discussion. I really liked splitting up the sessions so people could focus their attention on the instrument most important to them. The dinner was very nice, as always. Actually all of the food in general was excellent. I was not expecting all of the lunch and breakfast foods, and as a graduate student I really appreciated it!! These User meetings are so well organized science-wise and logistics and food wise!!!
• Longer coffee breaks would be useful to be able to talk with more users.
Do you have any feedback on the PARALLEL SESSIONS (new this year) vs. alternatives (a longer meeting, separate sub-meetings later, etc.) (Leave blank if no comments)

- I did not like the parallel sessions because I knew I was missing something I wanted to hear. Maybe need to have separate meetings?
- Miss a lot of potentially interesting info, but keeps meeting shorter.
- Avoiding parallel sessions of AMS and ACSM issues would be excellent.
- Parallel sessions are o.k. Otherwise the meeting gets too long.
- The parallel sessions might work for some people but not for others - the overlap of CIMS and SPAMS was personally inconvenient.
- I liked the parallel sessions and thought that it could maybe have done with having more time split up (especially regarding CIMS), but that said, it did make pinning Doug down even more difficult than usual.
- I think the parallel sessions are a good idea. I don't want to have to sit through topics that don't greatly affect me so overall it was good.
- I would say that more time is needed for CIMS parallel sessions. I felt this was a bit neglected for me and my students. Longer sessions and more discussion on data analysis, software and hardware issues related to the CIMS would have been preferred.
- Same as above, I thought this was a great addition so people could focus on instrument issues, development, and data that matter to them the most.
- Parallel sessions are probably the only alternative in my opinion.
Do you have any SUGGESTIONS for the CONTENT or ORGANIZATION of NEXT YEAR's and future meetings? (Leave blank if none)

- Almost no time was left for open mike. I have liked the poster sessions in previous years where people put up AAAR posters and we could have more discussion about different projects people are working on.
- Portland would be an interesting place for the next years meeting.
- I would like to have more discussion about ACSM, especially about the instrument rather than the analysis of the ACSM results.
- Talks regarding hardware and operation should have been during the first two days, when there were more people there.
- It would be nice to have it in Europe
- I think you guys did a great job as usual. Thank you very much for the productive meeting.
- same as above.
- More parallel sessions for users who are exclusively using the SP-AMS and MOVI-CIMS would help.
- Perhaps it would be useful to have a session where people have time to ask questions and play with data analysis (like a mini-clinic). I was able to help some new users and work on collaborations via email and breaks, but it would be nice if there was a time for this, so it wasn't squeezed in.
- session for beginners (e.g., demonstration of data analysis using small data set)
- I prefer if the meeting can take place in europe after EAC
Which ARI INSTRUMENT VERSION(S) do you work with currently? Which ones do you hope to work with in 1-2 years? Mark ALL that apply. (This info will help plan the parallel vs combined sessions)

Answered: 35  Skipped: 0

- Q-AMS: 3
- C-ToF-AMS: 7
- HR-ToF-AMS: 24
- ACSM: 14
- ToF-ACSM or Mini-AMS: 9
- LS-AMS: 7
- SP-AMS: 6
- LAAP-TOF: 3
- TAG-AMS: 3
- API-TOF: 5
- Gas-phase CIIMS: 7
- MOVI-CIIMS: 4
- IMS-CIIMS: 7
- Other: Brazil