W-FACE 2013
Participant Feedback

1. Was the information discussed in the W-FACE 2013 event relevant/informative?

    1. Yes – good takeaways from other solution seekers as to common interests, e.g., parallelization needs, GPU's, and from the professors on Fri morning. Solution provider presentations were not as helpful.
    2. Yes. I thought it was particularly useful to mix researchers, solution "consumers" and solution providers in the way you did. That gave a variety of perspectives that is very unusual to get at a conference. It also allowed me (as a representative of a solution provider) to see what other solution providers are doing in a very nice, friendly and cooperative environment.
    3. Very much so. Also great networking opportunity.
    4. Yes – I learned a lot about what computation potential is available
    5. Yes, I learned a lot about DEM, material handling, and other industries that I hadn't known before. In addition, I found out about PareTO.
    6. Yes
    7. Yes, I enjoyed every presentation.
    8. Yes
    9. Yes, the information on GPU processing was very enlightening. I am impressed by the quality of the work.
    10. Very. Quite interested in Suresh's matrix-free work. Made many good contacts. Chris P&G, Bill, LMS, Holger, Radu, etc.
    11. I think so. The material presented showcase very relevant and real/state-of-the-art problems in modeling, simulation and visualization. A lot of these approaches presented by faculty are not typically known or publicized outside of academia. It would be great to learn more about challenges in distributed computing in addition to parallel computing, as those are real challenges we face.
    12. Yes. However, the hindrance is that time is short for each presentation.
    13. Very informative

2. Do you have any suggestions as to how the W-FACE event can be improved for future years?

    1. Would love a short course on how to use some of the tools that are ready for deployment or from some of the solution providers.
    2. No. However, as Dan has pointed out, the format will have to adapt, as none of the participants will have significant updates to provide every year. I just don't know the solution.
    3. First, keep it going! Both with similar events but also with something. In between, perhaps newsletter.
    4. More company participation from smaller (venture) companies to compare with larger corporation efforts.
    5. The event was well organized and run. The first day got a little long, but that was preferable to extending it another day.
    6. Increase the discussion, professors should talk more about the methods/comparisons/reviews, have modeling/algorithms/correlation together.
    7. No, keep the good job!
    8. Only have professors speak once (second day) on their research. Some material was presented on both days for the most part. Leave more time on the 1st day for questions and short discussion after each presentation.
    9. I wish you could expand the talks from 10 minutes, is it possible to have 2 full days instead of 1 ½ days to allow a little longer talks. Maybe a little longer round table discussion.

10. Have a newsletter that members can subscribe to. This can be used to keep members informed of the work done by UW researchers, and can help everyone prepare for future events. Also, maybe have tutorials on parallel computing tools offered by W-FACE labs.
11. Allow more time for topics/discussions. Technical content of presentations can be improved with proper guidance. Several presentation did not contain a high level of technical content.
12. Tell the presenters to stick to 12 min +3 min (QA); Grease the seats. They squeak a lot!; Make one student to present. (kind of a contest).; Invite more people. This is good stuff

3. What are some aspects that of the W-FACE event that we should keep for future years?

1. Inviting a different spectrum of attendees – academia, industry, etc.
2. Faculty presentations and the 10 min talks. I would like to see research issues that industry speakers see as relevant. This could be a 'modeling slide' so that everyone is tuned to how W-FACE can be a medium of communicating these problems.
3. I actually like that you asked a specific question – perhaps next year you can do something similar?
4. I liked hearing from all the vendors and professors about their work, so keeping all the talks is good.
5. Really liked the format (rapid fire)
6. Between W-FACE events, we should have a forum with active discussions.
7. Keep all you have
8. The small size of the workshop enabled much interaction
9. Open discussions and open bar
10. I liked the organization
11. Keep the mix of participants. I know that Jay complained about the lack of depth, but I think his opinion is atypical.
12. Like the presentations from the company reps. Would like to see a broader section of company reps covering areas like fluid dynamics/CFD, computational chemistry, etc. I understand this gets outside the ME focus, but I think could overlap well with some of the goals here.
13. I like it the way it is.

Additional Comments:

1. Forum can be improved. How much will it be different next year? Change theme? Needs more interaction/discussion
2. Bring in more of the activities in the University that are engineering related. E.g., Comp Eng, chemical eng, etc. Perhaps at the poster session.
3. Excellent, Thank you!
4. I enjoyed the discussion about present and future of parallel computing!
5. Cut out marketing material during rapid fire presentations!
6. Maybe have a theme for the conference then only have people talk who have input on this specific subject talk.
7. Union south is great, SBEL treats us very well.
8. No boiled potatoes please
9. Does the lab have a registered/published set of tools for us to grab? Have the students to grab the business card of the people who visit their poster presentation.