

This document contains the results from the survey distributed at PLDI'09. 93 attendees returned the survey. The high level observations are included below, which includes in parenthesis the values from PLDI'08 as comparison. This is followed by the raw data. For each question we give the percentage for each answer and the actual number. (Some attendees did not answer all questions.) After the raw data are all written comments grouped by type of comment.

Observations

PLDI'09 Technical Program

- 94% (92% in PLDI'08) found the paper interesting (Q2)
- 87% (91%) found the talks well presented (Q3)
- 94% (88%) found the technical quality of papers high (Q4)
- 84% (86%) found the papers in their area relevant (Q5)
- 84% (89%) found the number of papers accepted to be the right amount (Q6)
- 78% (76%) of submitting authors found their reviews thorough and fair (Q7)
- 83% (80%) thought the committee did a good job selecting papers (Q8)

General PLDI Technical Policies

- 58% (47%) are for PC submission, (20%) 20% are against (Q9)
- 88% (89%) are for rebuttals (Q10)
- 81% (71%) are for double-blind reviewing (Q11)
- 95% are for external review committee (Q12 – new question in 2009)
- 44% (66%) want to consider invited speakers; 23% (13%) do not want to consider invited speakers (Q13)
- 33% (25%) want best presentations; 36% (27%) do not want them; 32% (48%) are neutral (Q14)
- 73% want distinguished paper award, 16% do not, 11% are neutral (Q15)
 - The 2008 survey asked the same question, but referred to it as “best paper”. The results were 55% want best paper award; 19% do not; 32% are neutral (Q14)
- 29% (22%) want 30 min talks; 48% (48%) want 25 min talks; 15% (28%) want 20 min; 8% (3%) want 15 min (Q16)
- 23% (70%) want 2.5 days; 77%(23%) want 3 days;
 - The 2008 survey also gave “2 days as an option), 7% selected that option (Q17)
- 64% want future PLDIs to have a FIT session, 6% do not, and 30% were neutral (Q18)
- 73% want future PLDIs to have an outing, 11% do not, 16% have no opinion (Q19)
- 34% think PLDI should consider offering electronic-only proceedings, 35% are opposed, 31% are neutral (Q20)

PLDI'09 Location

- 51% agreed that the PLDI'09 location (Dublin) made it more likely they would attend, 23% disagreed, 26% were neutral (Q21),
- 47% (75%) found the food satisfactory (Q17)
- 78% found the conference facilities met their needs, 16% did not (Q22)
 - 2008: 68% found the hotel and service amenities satisfactory (Q19)
- 57% of attendees stayed on campus (Trinity College), 30% stayed at the conference hotel; 13% stay elsewhere (Q24)
- 68% found the accommodations met their needs (Q25)
 - 2008: 79% found their conference hotel room satisfactory (Q18)

General PLDI Organization Policies

- 69% (67%) prefer “interesting/higher cost” locations (Q26)
- 37% (37%) will not attend PLDI if hotel costs are above \$200; 64% (50%) could tolerate higher costs or it doesn't matter; 14% (14%) won't attend if it is above \$150 (Q27)
- For 45% (39%) registration costs will not impact their attendance, others have a variety of thresholds (\$450 -12 (16%), \$500 – 10% (20%), \$550 – 12% (11%), \$600 – 22% (13%)) (Q22)
- 75% (70%) prefer the option of paying \$10/day for room internet access (Q29)
- 47% (38%) will likely attend PLDI'09; 47% (55%) are not sure; 5% (7%) are unlikely to attend (Q31)

PLDI'09 Feedback Survey Results

1. I am primarily associated with

Student	Academia (non-student)	Industry	Gov't Lab	Other
37% (33)	43%(38)	19%(17)	1%(1)	0

PLDI'09 Technical Program

2. The papers presented **interesting** material

strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
33%(30)	61%(55)	4%(4)	1%(1)	0

3. The talks were **well presented**

strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
32%(29)	55%(51)	11%(10)	2%(2)	0

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

strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
39%(34)	55%(48)	6%(5)	0	1%(1)

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

strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
40%(36)	44%(40)	12%(11)	3%(3)	0

6. The **number** of papers accepted were too many about right too few

11%(10)	84%(76)	4%(4)
----------------	----------------	--------------

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

strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree	NA
11%(10)	33%(29)	9%(8)	2%(2)	1%(1)	43%(37)

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

strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
22%(18)	61%(51)	14%(12)	2%(2)	0

General PLDI Technical Policies

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

strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree
24%(22)	34%(32)	22%(20)	15%(14)	5%(5)

10. PLDI 2009 allowed authors to write **rebuttals** to reviews. I think that author rebuttal is

Very useful	useful	not useful	harmful
41%(38)	47%(44)	12%(11)	0

11. PLDI 2009 used **double-blind reviewing** (reviewers did not know author identity before the PC meeting). I think double-blind reviewing is

Very useful	useful	not useful	harmful
-------------	--------	------------	---------

37%(34) 44%(40) 14%(13) 4%(4)

12. PLDI 2009 used a 51-person **external review committee** to provide 4th reviews for all papers. I think this is

Very useful 44%(41) useful 5%(5) not useful 0 harmful

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

strongly agree 16%(15) agree 28%(26) neutral 32%(29) disagree 18%(17) strongly disagree 5%(5)

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

strongly agree 11%(10) agree 22%(20) neutral 32%(29) disagree 24%(22) strongly disagree 12%(11)

15. In addition to the 10-year retrospective award, PLDI should give out **distinguished paper awards**

strongly agree 25%(20) agree 48%(39) neutral 11%(9) disagree 11%(9) strongly disagree 5%(4)

16. The **length** of PLDI presentations (including questions) should be

30mins 29%(26) 25 mins 48%(44) 20 mins 15%(14) 15 mins 8%(7)

17. This year PLDI was 3 full days for the first time. The length should be

2.5 days 23%(21) 3 days 77%(69)

18. Future PLDI's should have a FIT (Fun Ideas and Thoughts) session

strongly agree 32%(29) agree 32%(29) neutral 30%(28) disagree 5%(5) strongly disagree 1%(1)

19. Future PLDI's should have an outing/social event, even if it increases the registration cost by \$35

strongly agree 32%(29) agree 41%(38) neutral 16%(15) disagree 9%(8) strongly disagree 2%(2)

20. Many conferences are switching an electronic-only proceedings distributed on a memory device. PLDI should consider doing the same.

strongly agree 13%(12) agree 21%(19) neutral 31%(28) disagree 21%(19) strongly disagree 14%(13)

PLDI'09 Location

21. The location of PLDI'09, Dublin, Ireland, made it more likely that I would attend

strongly agree 29%(27) agree 22%(24) neutral 26%(20) disagree 13%(12) strongly disagree 10%(9)

22. The conference facilities (internet, location, etc.) met my needs

strongly agree 21%(19) agree 47%(43) neutral 16%(15) disagree 11%(10) strongly disagree 5%(5)

23. The **meals and break food** met my needs

strongly agree 7%(6) agree 40%(36) neutral 22%(20) disagree 22%(20) strongly disagree 10%(9)

24. I stayed

On campus 57%(52) at conference hotel 30%(28) other 13%(12)

25. My accommodations met my needs

strongly agree 24%(22) agree 44%(40) neutral 20%(18) disagree 7%(6) strongly disagree 5%(5)

General PLDI Organization Policies

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

Interesting/higher cost	less interesting/lower cost
69%(59)	31%(26)

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

\$150	\$200	\$250	\$300	doesn't matter
14%(12)	23%(20)	14%(12)	7%(6)	43%(37)

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

\$450	\$500	\$550	\$600	doesn't matter
12%(10)	10%(8)	12%(10)	22%(18)	45%(37)

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

\$10/day access	no access
75%(66)	25%(22)

30. SIGPLAN is considering expanding its travel grants for conference participants in need of child care assistance. Would such care be of interest to you?

Yes	Maybe	No
10%(9)	18%(16)	73%(66)

If yes or maybe, **what age groups** of children are most appropriate to cover and **what types** of child care assistance costs might facilitate your participation in more SIGPLAN-sponsored events."

<2 day care; 0-3; 0-5 child care costs; <= 5 on site day care; 0-6; 0-11; 1-8; 0-16; 6-10; 6-7; 7-9

31. Do you plan to **attend PLDI'10** in Toronto, Canada?

Yes	Probably	Not Sure	Unlikely
23%(21)	24%(22)	47%(43)	5%(5)

If unlikely, why not?

- need to have paper accepted,
- Only if I have a publication (or a poster or something) there. I can't afford attending a conference without a contributions
- I consider to attend more specialized conferences (POPL, ICFP) instead
- Out of my primary research area
- PLDI less relevant to my research since I work more in embedded systems now – will probably to go ESWEKK instead
- Travel costs (I'm from Europe)
- Will no longer be a student
- Over-atlantic flight, visa, attend <-> have paper

32. Other suggestions/comments

PLDI'09 location, food, amenities

- Please use a mic for audience questions
- Locate conference hotel closer to the meeting rooms
- The breakfast was too sugary. Bagels would be nice. It would also be nice to have water jugs.
- The location this year was **awful**. (The worse location for a ACM conference I have ever been to.) The distance between hall and lunch was too far, dining facilities were poor (food, quality, tables, room for laptop and proceedings). The lecture hall was conducive to sleeping, there was no ???? for informal discussions, there were too few seats. Sorry to be so negative, I appreciated the difficulties the GC fixed.
- Fitness facility is lacking for on campus accommodations

- Never ever serve such a bad breakfast, except the fruits. Lunch in Trinity College dining room is nice, but there food really sucks!
- Way too few tables [in meeting room]
- This year there was limited out-of-presentation-room seating – much of PLDI happens outside of presentations, but outside ... I'm very disappointed ☹
- Social area outside conference theatre should be large and perhaps should include a bar
- Provide a printer on location for printing papers from electronic-only proceedings
- Lunches were fine. The breakfast/break apple tarts and choco-coated cookies were fine, but monotonous by the 2nd day and depressing by the 3rd day. Variety is the spice of life.
- I would have liked better breakfast and snack foods.
- [PLDI'09 location more likely to attend] agree = interesting location; disagree = higher cost
- Healthier food, especially breakfasts, would be appreciated, as well as non-cookie snacks at breaktime. More fruit would be good.
- Shampoo would have been nice, or a reminder email to bring some.
- Need much more water
- Overall, very satisfied with PLDI'09. However, lunch/break food was quite bad.
- No real place to talk, connectivity problems, conference hotels too far away
- Best Western hotel is not competent in providing internet
- At the venue – keep mingling area away from presentation room, to avoid disrupting speakers as people come and go; sessions too long – shorter talk, longer breaks!
- Conference facility setup needs **major** work. No mics for questions makes them useless to the wide audience. Discussion area way too close to auditorium, opening the doors makes talks inaudible. Uncomfortable chairs (extremely important with 3 full days!)
- The lecture hall was horrible (noise, bad air, acoustics, ambiente)
- I arrived a day early, but was unable to get wifi access until the 1st day of the conference, which was a little disappointing. The conference itself was fantastic.

PLDI'09 technical program

- The program is a little full
- The talks were very tightly packed. It would be nice to have more/longer breaks to allow more mingling.
- Do not (or at least try not to) make 4 presentations sessions – It's way too long. Well, if as a hypothesis you consider people only go to which of interest to them, why not. But, so far I've been to all sessions and the last presentation of the day are really hard to attend with attention
- 3 talks per session better than 4.
- [paper selection] I have no idea of which were not selected anyway
- [paper selection] I don't like this question – how do I know the quality of the papers that the committee rejected?
- [paper selection] Hard to tell w/o seeing the submission
- Excellent program this year. I really liked the novelty and variety of research topics
- Lunchtime talks take away from time talking to colleagues and should not occur. Also, the NSF talk was inappropriate. There are many non-US researchers and it was awkward to force them to sit through that lunchtime presentation. It should have been done as an optional extra session at the end of the day. (Otherwise PLDI was great!)
- People asking questions after talks should introduce themselves first
- Some talks were impossible to hear or presented very badly (e.g., monotone). Whoever is supposed to tell the speaker this, sucks at their job.

General PLDI technical policies

- PC submissions is not food for a survey; in theory it should not be allowed, but in practice needs to be
- A "best student paper" award would be nice
- [best presentation award] at least for students
- [best presentation award] early end of last day = no problem (+ vote only afterwards)
- Maybe having a 1-year year retrospective award, (in lieu of distinguished paper)
- [memory devices] are way too fragile and not time-robust
- [memory devices] yes, if costs are cut. No otherwise.
- [invited speakers] disagree we should have them because it would make it last even more and it's already hard enough (8:30-6:00 is tougher)

- [memory devices] better – easy internet access to ACM Dig. Library during conference
- A stronger “D” in PLDI would make the conference more attractive to me
- Release the papers – especially FIT and student contributions – earlier through the conference site, so we can read papers a couple of days before the conference
- It would be nice to be able to find out what the reviewer ratings were before and after rebuttals to have a better understanding of the extent to which the original submission addresses the necessary points and how the rebuttal contents changed the understanding of the paper.
- Capture PDF of presentation and attach to digital library copy. (I worry about recording the talks because students are still learning to talk in public and a bad talk on the recording would kill academic jobs prospects.)
- [rebuttals] waste of time if paper won't be discussed at PC meeting
- [rebuttals] very useful, but all must be read and reviews updated if erroneous
- [Fit session] A HOT PL sort of venue should be even better

General PLDI Organization Policies

- [location question]: I don't care. It should be pleasant with no regard to cost at first, and preferably original/outstanding
- [location question] more important – convenient to get to
- [highspeed internet in hotel rooms] I don't know. I pay 6 Euro/day at Davenport, instead of 12 euro/day, which would have been way too high cost
- [highspeed internet in hotel rooms] \$10/day, but prefer conf to make a better deal
- [highspeed internet in hotel rooms] I would like the pay option rather than the no option, but would not pay \$10 every day
- [highspeed internet in hotel rooms] I prefer it to be free as this is in 2009

Misc

- I don't go to countries that take my fingerprints
- Strongly opposed to sitting PLDI in SE Asia – very low # of PL researchers from/in SE Asia, remote = expensive
- Congrats!
- I support virtual PC meeting give proper software/phone conference support/solution