



Feedback from ICIQ-03 Participants

In the spirit of continuous improvement, we would appreciate your feedback to help us make a better conference next year. Please answer the following and provide any helpful suggestions. Thank you very much!

1) What did you like most about ICIQ-03?

- Networking, getting ideas, meet friends
- The range of topics and case studies
- The increased number of panels
- The focus on a research agenda via a panel session and the informal research meeting
- The quality of the papers increases every year
- Wide diversity of presenters
- The opportunity to learn about other companies and network with other industry workers
- Case studies
- Identify the universities that have a data quality presence
- Hear about the trends and theories behind data quality
- Hear real world examples of how to address data quality issues
- Variety of talks
- Great presentations
- Well organized (stayed on time with agenda)
- The ability and time to network with others
- Attention and organization. Pretty good
- Variety of topics and backgrounds of the people presenting their materials
- Keynote briefing was excellent
- Most of the presentations were quite good
- Logistics of the conference was excellent – Karen, Tony, and Rich (as guru) did a great job.
- The case studies. It was great to see actually what others are doing in the industry. Not just the what and the result but the how (process)
- Good variety of topics
- Mixing academia and practitioners
- Meeting people in the field
- The good mix of academic and industry practitioners, both in papers and in attendees
- Good forum for exchanging ideas
- The diversity of speakers and presentations
- The variety of attendees for networking--both cultural variety and academic/business
- I also enjoyed Boston!
- Hearing about specific research projects related to real-world experience
- The federal government panel session – very informative to my needs
- The entire conference was wonderful. I particularly enjoyed the keynote address
- Short and sweet, on a weekend, didn't impose on away work schedule
- Good sync between practice/research and industry/academia
- Continues to be a great mix of applied and theoretical presentations, as well as networking opportunities

- Excellent panels
- Excellent papers (great combination of academic work and case studies)
- Plenty of refreshments (nice variety also)
- Simple registration process
- The quality and types of presentations
- Well run, all sessions kept on time
- Speakers got to the meat of the topic quickly because of the tight schedule
- International
- Academic – business – government – mix
- Atmosphere of cooperative participation
- Cross fertilization of ideas
- Interesting topics
- Good facilitation of presentations
- Good time management
- Congeniality of all participants
- Good research papers
- The name tents with names on both sides, given the larger size of the conference, were a great idea.

2) What did you like least about ICIQ-03? How should we improve this for ICIQ-04?

- Make the pizza and informal Sunday discussion a continuing part of the conference
- The Hotel @ MIT was too far away
- The room for the keynote was too small
- The crowded facilities. Keynote talk added very little until last 3 slides. However, those slides were great
- Large part of keynote speech was too general, outdated, and boring
- The academic presentations really were not applicable or relevant to the industry. In fact, the academic studies are way off-base from the issues and challenges facing those of us actually *doing* data quality on a day-to-day basis. You need more presentations from businesses (industry)
- First conference without PowerPoint support. Too difficult to understand for foreign people
- Too many concurrent sessions. Would be nice if conference were a little larger. E.g. finish Sunday afternoon instead of morning, to be able to attend more sessions
- Hotel @ MIT too far away from the conference. The Marriott, if not the official conference hotel should have been identified as a closer alternative. If you flew here, you most likely did not have a car and the walks were too far especially when you were new to the area. (Especially, at night walking in the dark after the social)
- The paper of conference is different from the book (CD) than the presentations
- More attention to how each idea will be implemented in an IS application. I am personally in need for the conclusion of each study – Final Chapter – tie to industry etc.
- Quality and relevance of several presentations was unacceptable
- Too many presentations that were lengthy expositions of problems without offering any solutions or even approaches to solutions. Industry participants are looking for help, not “neat” research topics
- The tight quarters for networking, lunch, keynote assembly
- The keynote address (would have made a better “seminar” than a keynote/jumpstart to the conference)

- Could not find my way – needed to be sent a map of the area when conference registration confirmed
- Could not find rooms once I got here – signage would be helpful
- The only thing that comes to mind was the lunch meal. However, I did not come to the conference for the food
- Liked the lectures on Entry, Manipulation, Usage – how, what, why
- Good session durations
- Most of the speakers were very good
- Use an additional ½ day out with only two parallel sessions
- Only a small part of Europe represented. i.e. D, I, UK, CH. How about, for instance, Eastern Europe. Other European countries. Why aren't they participating?
- Too small room for opening sessions. Need to assure room with chairs for all registered attendees
- E51-149 still too small!!! (The good news is: attendance is increasing)
- In general, the rooms are not very friendly
- The first floor was better than the 3rd floor, but is it time to move again to a larger place (hotel?)
- The coffee
- Facilities were crowded (but, this facilitated networking!)
- Late participants list
- Practitioner papers must be published in the proceedings as narrative papers instead of PPT
- The PPT charts are small and hard to read, but more important are incomplete. Too much is omitted in PPT. This is VERY important!!!

3) Other suggestions for ICIQ-04

- Great conference
- More panels, or even little workshop where we can discuss a real problem coming up from a project
- This continues to use a great forum for the interaction of academics and practitioners – the number of case studies this year seemed to be up. However, they need to add new information, not just prove that methods work
- The Internet session was not very good. Everyone knows data on the Web is questionable – why did we need two presentations to tell us that? Next year, you should really push for REAL Internet studies that look at data extracted from the Web or at tools developed to produce high quality Internet data (Internet data is NOT the same as Website content)
- To organize working groups about subjects decided before, depending on the interests. For example, I suggest: “Different methods to match record and compare the results.” We could organize a benchmark of the methods, sending samples of data before MIT Team could compare the results and we have a discussion about the results
- Group discussions/more panel sessions. If panel sessions ran concurrently, one could select topic to attend. As it is, I did not get to attend any panel sessions
- Larger rooms for the big group discussions. It was too crowded
- More real world examples
- Expand your academic “core” group to areas outside the east
- Invite Halvarian from UC Berkeley to do the keynote – good effort if he is available
- To provide the e-mail addresses of the participants on the participant list. You may not be able to reach each individual you'd like to personally
- More practitioners!
- Increase quality of presented work

- Should include more detail (e.g. exec. Summary) in program! Many presentations had misleading titles
- Need larger meeting room for plenary sessions
- Staff was really helpful. Great job!
- There was not quite enough time for some of the presentations. Perhaps by starting a little earlier and stealing some time from the lunch session. Each speaker could be given five more minutes
- More clarity in the “tracks” – differentiation between the topics
- The practical application of DQ theory for organizations to improve DQ – very helpful
- Could the conference be larger rather than 1.5 days – so we can have less overlapping sessions and shorter days? I traveled a long way, so a longer conference would be more worthwhile
- Could the conference be during the week?
- Selection of some of the papers were not up to the mark for the conference
- Look for additional industry sponsors?
- Market to grad students with reduced fees to get more dissertation idea germinated
- More shoulder room
- Be sure to AVOID influence (too much influence) of one or more consultants