

This document contains the results from the survey distributed at PLDI'08. 73 attendees returned the survey. The high level observations are included below, followed by the raw data. For each question we give the number of replies and percentage for each answer and also partition the replies according to the respondent category (student, academia/non-student, industry, gov't lab/other). This is followed by the written comments grouped by type of comment.

Observations

PLDI'08 Technical Program

- 92% found the paper interesting (Q2)
- 91% found the talks well presented (Q3)
- 88% found the technical quality of papers high (Q4)
- 86% found the papers in their area relevant (Q5)
- 89% found the number of papers accepted to be the right amount (Q6)
- 76% found their reviews thorough and fair (Q7)
- 80% thought the committee did a good job selecting papers (Q8)

General PLDI Technical Policies

- 47% are for PC submission, 20% are against (Q9)
- 89% are for rebuttals (Q10)
- 71% are for double-blind reviewing (Q11)
- 66% want to consider invited speakers; 13% do not want to consider invited speakers (Q12)
- 25% want best presentations; 27% do not want them; 48% are neutral (Q13)
- 55% want best paper award; 19% do not; 32% are neutral (Q14)
- 22% want 30 min talks; 48% want 25 min talks; 28% want 20 min; 3% want 15 min (Q15)
- 70% want 2.5 days; 23% want 3 days; 7% want 2 days (Q16)

PLDI'08 Location

- 75% found the food satisfactory (Q17)
- 79% found their conference hotel room satisfactory (Q18)
- 68% found the hotel and service amenities satisfactory (Q19)

General PLDI Organization Policies

- 67% prefer "interesting/higher cost" locations (Q20)
- 37% will not attend PLDI if hotel costs are above \$200; for 50% could tolerate higher costs or it doesn't matter; 14% won't attend if it is above \$150 (Q21)
- For 39% registration costs will not impact their attendance, others have a variety of thresholds (\$450 -16%, \$500 - 20%, \$550 - 11%, \$600 - 13%) (Q22)
- 70% prefer to the option of paying \$10/day for room internet access (Q23)
- 38% will likely attend PLDI'09; 55% are not sure; 7% are unlikely to attend (Q24)

PLDI'08 Feedback Survey Results

1. I am primarily associated with

Student 28 (38%)	Academia (non-student) 20 (27%)	Industry 22 (30%)	Gov't Lab / Other 3 (4%)
---------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------

PLDI'08 Technical Program

2. The papers presented **interesting** material

17 (25%) 5,8,3,1 strongly agree	46 (67%) 17,10,17,2 agree	5 (7%) 2,1,2,0 neutral	1 (1%) 1,0,0,0 disagree	0 (0%) 0 strongly disagree
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------

3. The talks were **well presented**

15 (22%) 4,8,3,0 strongly agree	47 (69%) 17,10,17,3 agree	6 (9%) 3,1,2,0 neutral	0 disagree	0 strongly disagree
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------	------------------------

4. The **technical quality** of papers was high

16 (25%) 6,6,3,1 strongly agree	41 (63%) 13,12,14,2 agree	7 (11%) 2,0,5,0 neutral	1 (2%) 1,0,0,0 disagree	0 0 strongly disagree
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

5. The presented papers in my area of work were **relevant**

15 (22%) 3,6,4,2 strongly agree	43 (64%) 17,11,15,0 agree	5 (7%) 1,1,2,1 neutral	4 (6%) 3,1,0,0 disagree	0 0 strongly disagree
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

6. The **number** of papers accepted were

3 (5%) 2,0,1,0 too many	59 (89%) 20,15,21,3 about right	4 (6%) 1,3,0,0 too few
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------

7. As a submitting author, the **reviews** I received were thorough and fair

8 (24%) 3,3,1,1 strongly agree	17 (52%) 9,3,4,1 agree	7 (21%) 3,1,3,0 neutral	1 (3%) 0,1,0,0 disagree	0 0 strongly disagree
--------------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

8. With the possible exception of my submission(s), the committee did a good job of **selecting papers**

11 (21%) 1,6,3,1 strongly agree	31 (59%) 13,7,10,1 agree	9 (17%) 3,3,3,0 neutral	2 (4%) 2,0,0,0 disagree	0 0 strongly disagree
---------------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

General PLDI Technical Policies

9. PLDI should permit paper **submissions by PC** members

11 (16%) 1,4,5,1 strongly agree	21 (31%) 9,5,7,0 agree	21 (31%) 6,4,10,1 neutral	9 (13%) 5,3,0,1 disagree	5 (7%) 2,3,0,0 strongly disagree
---------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	--

10. PLDI 2008 allowed authors to write **rebuttals** to reviews. I think that author rebuttal is

24 (39%) 12,6,4,2 Very useful	31 (50%) 8,8,15,0 useful	7 (11%) 2,3,2,0 not useful	0 0,0,0,0 harmful
-------------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------

11. PLDI 2008 used **double-blind reviewing** (reviewers did not know author identity before the PC meeting). I think double-blind reviewing is

29 (41%)	21 (30%)	17 (24%)	4 (6%)
11,11,7,0	9,1,9,2	6,6,5,0	2,1,1,0
Very useful	useful	not useful	harmful

12. PLDI should consider having **invited speakers**

23 (32%)	24 (34%)	15 (21%)	4 (6%)	5 (7%)
11,6,5,1	6,4,12,2	6,6,5,0	2,2,0,0	3,2,0,0
strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree

13. PLDI should have a **best presentation award** (It is difficult to make this fair for the last talks)

2 (3%)	15 (22%)	33 (48%)	14 (20%)	5 (7%)
1,0,1,0	4,2,7,2	13,8,11,1	4,7,3,0	3,2,0,0
strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree

14. In addition to the 10-year retrospective award, PLDI should have a **best paper award**

10 (15%)	27 (40%)	22 (32%)	8 (18%)	1 (1%)
3,2,4,1	10,7,9,1	8,5,8,1	3,5,0,0	1,0,0,0
strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree

15. The **length** of PLDI presentations should be

15 (22%)	33 (48%)	19 (28%)	2 (3%)
7,4,4,0	5,14,11,3	11,1,7,0	2,0,0,0
30mins	25 mins	20 mins	15 mins

16. Currently, PLDI is 2.5 day conference. The length should be

5 (7%)	49 (70%)	16 (23%)
2,1,2,0	17,13,17,2	7,5,3,1
2 days	2.5 days	3 days

PLDI'08 Location

17. The **meals and break food** was satisfactory

13 (19%)	38 (56%)	10 (15%)	6 (9%)	1 (1%)
4,5,4,0	18,6,12,2	1,5,3,1	1,2,3,0	1,0,0,0
strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree

18. My **conference hotel room** was satisfactory

39 (57%)	22 (32%)	2 (3%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	4 (6%)
15,13,10,1	7,3,11,1	1,1,0,0	0,1,0,0	0,1,0,0	2,0,1,1
strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree	didn't stay at conf. hotel

19. The **hotel service and amenities** (internet, room service, etc.) was satisfactory

24 (35%)	23 (33%)	12 (17%)	4 (6%)	2 (3%)
11,8,5,0	7,3,11,2	3,6,3,0	1,0,3,0	0,2,0,0
strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree

General PLDI Organization Policies

20. Given a choice of an "interesting/higher cost" location or a "less interesting/lower cost" **location**, I would prefer

40 (67%) 17,7,14,2	20 (33%) 6,7,7,0
Interesting/higher cost	less interesting/lower cost

21. Regardless of the location, I will not attend PLDI if the **hotel costs** are above

9 (14%) 1,5,3,0 \$150	23 (37%) 9,7,6,1 \$200	10 (16%) 5,2,3,0 \$250	6 (10%) 3,1,2,0 \$300	15 (24%) 5,1,8,1 doesn't matter
---	--	--	---	---

22. Regardless of the location, I will not attend PLDI if the early **registration costs** for PLDI only are above

10 (16%) 6,3,1,0 \$450	12 (20%) 6,4,2,0 \$500	7 (11%) 1,4,2,0 \$550	8 (13%) 1,3,3,1 \$600	24 (39%) 7,2,14,1 doesn't matter
--	--	---	---	--

23. Given a choice of **highspeed internet** access in my room for \$10/day or no access, I prefer

45 (70%) 12,14,17,2 \$10/day access	19 (30%) 12,3,4,0 no access
---	---

24. Do you plan to **attend PLDI'09** in Dublin, Ireland?

7 (10%) 0,2,3,2 Yes	19 (28%) 7,7,5,0 Probably	38 (55%) 19,9,9,1 Not Sure	5 (7%) 0,1,4,0 Unlikely
---	---	--	---

If unlikely, why not?

25. Other suggestions/comments

PLDI'08 location, food, amenities

- Location was nice, but very isolated (S)
- Excellent location this year! Great Resort! Main downsides to this location are (1) remoteness from offsite restaurants and city and (2) slow internet access.
- Not on the far edge of a city is preferred (S)
- This hotel is too isolated, there was no dinner and food here was **very** expensive (S)
- It took me 24 hrs to travel here. I would prefer a location to which it's possible to get direct flights from most main airports including London. (A)
- In general, hotel was great. Internet service (wired) in rooms was exceptionally poor. Very low bandwidth, high latency, frequent drops (I)
- This year's location was very good, especially given the high-quality, low-cost, relatively isolated (yet with things to do) hotel. (A)
- Choose a location that is connected to the public transportation system (I)
- Really, I'm enjoying PLDI'08 all things over well planned and I hope attending and participating in PLDI conference. Do keep going. Thanks for organizing. (S)
- Room was ok, but not the room I ordered. Hotel's room security sucks – I was given a key to an already occupied room! (A)
- Breaks were good, meals mostly fine, but not Tues lunch – vegetarian melas with protein are fine – but white flour + cream sauces + trace of veggies /= main course (A)
- Vegan food is good to have!
 - No butter, milk, cheese, etc. (S)
- Power strips for conference hall (S)
- Power strips for conference hall (laptop power) (S)
- No room internet access ok, if free access at conference (S)

- A good wireless internet is very essential (S)
- Hotel “highspeed” internet was overloaded by conference users during main conference. This would be unacceptable if we were really paying \$11/day (S)
- Even cheap hotels have free internet in rooms (S)
- Internet access was extremely poor (S)
- Re highspeed internet: willing to pay \$10/day, but it does need to be high speed. Access at this hotel is abysmal. (A)
- Internet access sucked! I never got more than 56K baud. Either from my room or from the wireless. PLDI should be in a place where T1 is available. (I)
- Internet connection was very slow (I)
- Internet slow (I)
- Good choice of tutorials this year (A)

PLDI'08 Program and technical tracks

- My general impression of PLDI is of a conference that publishes good ideas that have been demonstrated to work well in practice. This year, I thought the evaluation sections of several papers were subpar. Could next year’s committee contain someone who is an expert one evaluation? (Eechhout, McKinley, or Blackburn could suggest someone.)
- Would like to see more DSL work (e.g., microfluidics paper), dynamic lang. work, functional lang. work – language design not just impl and static analysis and concurrency (A)
Want more papers that remind me that prog. Languages are a means of “elegant” expression of solutions to problems in a domain (A)
- This year’s program seems to be dominated by security/verification papers. I am surprised to see so few papers in languages or systems for parallelism. (I)
- PC members (with the except of the chair) should be allowed to submit but be held to a higher standard and be subject to more external reviews.
- I think the PC should solicit high-quality external reviewers – preferably matching submissions to review(s) who have published in this area **and** have sound evaluation/methodology.
- It would be good to ask all submitters to evaluate the quality of reviews (S)
- Shepherd system for papers (like USENIX) (S)
- If a reviewer is aware s/he is not familiar enough with a paper’s research area to properly review the paper, then assign the paper to a different reviewer. (S)
- 25 min talks are great. Encourages speakers to focus on essential ideas while still being long enough to communicate ideas effectively. (I)
- Separate tracks! (I)
- Group papers into similar topic and give sessions a title (S)
- Get moderators that use mics, repeat questions, repeat answers, and clarify when appropriate. (I)
- Session chairs could show more enthusiasm and could be prepared better (I)
- Session chairs should announce what happens after their session as the session ends. “we now have a 25 minute break, and we will start back at 10:30”. “Next we have a lunch and it’s <location>” (G)

PLDI'09

- Not sure if attending PLDI'09 because it is in Europe (S)
- Not sure if attending PLDI'09 because of distance and only slightly relevant topics (S)
- Not sure if attending PLDI'09 because of visa issues (S)
- Unlikely to attend PLDI'09 because I would have to take my family on vacation, but can't spare the time. (I)
- Unlikely to attend PLDI'09 because of high cost of international travel (I)
- Unlikely to attend PLDI'09 because it is too far, too great a time commitment (I)
- Looking forward to “Fun Ideas” session at PLDI'09. Good idea. (A)

General PLDI Planning

- Have PLDI in Europe more often (I)
- Re location: Travel time (and travel cost) are important (A)
- Re Hotel costs: maybe good if there exists a choice of hotels. High costs → small number of students (A)
- Evening social events are fun (S)
- Have some social events (BBQ, any cultural event) (I)
- What do you get for \$600 registration fee? (A)
- Above \$150/night, I won't stay at the conference hotel, but I would attend the conference (A)
- I prefer "interesting" locations even with higher costs, but typically "interesting" means large tourists destination and there are few of those that haven't been overused for ACM conferences. (A)
- Best paper award is important for "keeping up w/ other communities"; need to promote ourselves (A)
- Consider a best student/postdoc paper award, such an award could help with hiring (A)