

Indiana, PA 15705  
412-357-2575  
grlong@grove.iup.edu

Faculty Coordinator:  
Dr. Lindy Harrison  
Department of Chemistry  
York College of Pennsylvania  
York, PA 17405-7199  
717-846-7788 X1210  
harrison@ycp.edu

Listserv Manager:  
Dr. Donald Rosenthal  
Box 5810  
Department of Chemistry  
Clarkson University  
Potsdam, NY 13699-5810  
313-265-9242 or 268-2352  
rosen2@clvm.clarkson.edu

Those interested in participating during the spring '98 semester should complete and submit the pre-registration/interest form at:  
<http://www.py.iup.edu/college/chemistry/chem-course/olcc2.htm>

by December 5, 1997. All registered schools will be contacted and asked to reconfirm their participation between December 5, 1997 and January 16, 1998. Late registrations will be accepted, but registration by December 5, 1997 is preferred. A list of participating students will be due by January 31, 1998.

## EVALUATION OF CHEMCONF '97 BY CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Donald Rosenthal, Chair CCCE  
Department of Chemistry  
Clarkson University  
Potsdam NY 13699-5810  
rosen@clvm.clarkson.edu  
and

Thomas C. O'Haver  
Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry  
University of Maryland  
College Park MD 20742  
to2@umail.umd.edu

An Information and Evaluation Form was distributed

to all registrants of the 1997 summer on-line Conference entitled "General Papers in Chemistry and Chemical Education". (The papers and discussion are available on the Conference Web Site (<http://www.wam.umd.edu/~toh/ChemConf97.html>)). 63 forms were filled out and returned. This represents eight to nine percent of the 700 to 800 registrants. This article contains a summary of the responses.

## STATISTICS

To obtain a better understanding of the degree of participation a number of questions were asked.

Question 6: How many of the 11 papers did you read?  
Average = 7.5 SD Average = 0.42  
SD Average is the standard deviation of the mean  
31 % of respondents read all eleven papers  
1.6 % (one person) read none of the papers!  
3.1 % read one paper

Question 7A: How many papers did you look at?  
Average = 9.2 SD Average = 0.33  
57 % looked at all eleven papers  
1.6 % (one person) looked at one paper

Question 7B: What percentage of the papers you looked at did you read?  
Average = 79 SD Average = 3.2  
45 % read 100 %

Question 8: Total Time Spent Reading Papers (in hours)  
Average = 5.6 SD Average = 0.53  
3.4 % spent 20 hours (the maximum time spent)  
5.1 % spent 1 hour (the minimum time spent)

Question 9: Average number of times participant accessed the discussion each day  
Average = 2.3 SD Average = 0.24  
1.7 % accessed the discussion 10 times/day  
16.9 % accessed the discussion 2 times/day  
3.4 % accessed the discussion 0.5 times/day

Question 10A: Total amount of time devoted to the discussion (in hours)  
Average = 13 SD Average = 1.3  
1.9 % devoted 50 hours (the maximum time)  
3.7 % devoted 0.5 hours (the minimum time)

Question 10B: What percentage of the discussion did you read for the papers which you looked at?  
Average = 80 SD Average = 2.9  
30.5 % read 100 %  
3.4 % read 20 % (the minimum)

Question 11: Total time devoted to the conference (in hours)

Average = 22.5 SD Average = 1.9  
3.5 % devoted 60 hours (the maximum)  
1.7 % devoted 2 hours (the minimum)

#### EVALUATION

Evaluation scale 1 to 5 - 1 is Poor, 3 is Average and 5 is Excellent

Question 12: Overall evaluation of papers

Average = 3.8 SD Average = 0.082  
10 % Indicated the papers were 5 (Excellent)  
60 % Indicated the papers were 4  
25 % Indicated the papers were 3  
1.7 % Indicated the papers were 2 (minimum)

Question 13: Overall evaluation of the discussion

Average = 3.5 SD Average = 0.084  
4.9 % Indicated the discussion was 5  
41 % Indicated the discussion was 4  
42.6 % Indicated the discussion was 3  
3.3 % Indicated the discussion was 2 (minimum)

Question 14: Overall evaluation of the Conference

Average = 4.0 SD Average = 0.092  
1.7 % Gave a 6!  
16.7 % Gave a 5  
56.7 % Gave a 4  
20.0 % Gave a 3  
1.7 % Gave a 2

#### COMMENTS

For the most part these comments are unedited. A few comments were omitted - often because the meaning wasn't clear. Some respondents did not include answers to every question. Each comment is numbered and those comments having the same number were sent in by the same person.

Question 15: What Did You Like Most About the Computer Conference?

1. Advantages of a meeting without the time and expense of travel
2. The papers covered a variety of topics - multimedia presentations, use of spreadsheets, testing procedures, etc.
3. The chance to attend a conference even without travel money
4. The papers showing use of new digital electronic media in teaching, presentations, and inter-faculty communication
5. The concise and thoughtful discussions and questions
6. The papers addressed timely issues and the

- discussion uncovered several new perspectives.
7. Ability to discuss papers with the authors
  8. Web access to papers and freedom to pick and choose among topics
  9. The free exchange of ideas
  10. Combined papers and discussion, and immediate feedback
  11. Wide variety of ideas - very well organized and run
  12. I could access the papers and discussion at any free time I had during the day. Travel was not necessary.
  15. Several good ideas presented and good discussions took place. I enjoyed getting a sense of what is going on at other institutions with respect to pedagogy and administration.
  16. I liked the informality as well as the self-paced nature. I could get to it when it was convenient. The level of discussion was often quite high. I also like some of the digressions.
  17. I "meet" colleagues and "speak" with them while at "home".
  18. Van Bramer paper
  19. Topics covered by papers I read
  20. The wide range of authors and "attendees" made for an interesting mix.
  21. Easy access to lots of very exciting and new educational projects - some new ideas in forming of chemical curriculum (e.g. SI)
  22. It was interesting to see other comments from people not at my institution. It was one method of learning what is out there and what others are doing. I spent a fair amount of time just lurking. This was my first on-line conference.
  23. I was one of the 700+ "lurkers" in the conference. As I am a graduate student I haven't had an opportunity to teach lecture courses and don't feel my knowledge and experience base is sufficient to make any "real" contributions to the discussions. However, I very much enjoyed the OPPORTUNITY to gain insights from people who are in the field of chemical education and are pioneering new ways of teaching. I obtained a lot of information from the conference and am looking forward to applying that knowledge when I teach students. Most of my educational experience has been via the standard lecture format. I was pleased to learn about the success and possibility of other approaches in chemistry.
  24. Asynchronous access to papers and discussion
  25. Good way of exchanging ideas nationally and internationally at nearly no cost
  26. Being able to participate without leaving

- town
27. The ease with which I could come or go as I chose
  28. A great opportunity to exchange ideas about teaching chemistry
  29. Access to the on-line sites and an opportunity to play with multimedia (e.g. in Paper 1)
  30. Reading the papers
  31. Wide variety of topics - ability to "attend" everything and participate when free
  32. It's a chance to "listen in" and share ideas with others doing things I am interested in. The format is convenient. I was able to print copies of two or three papers and take them with me during my travels.
  33. Lively discussion and timely responses
  34. The sharing of ideas in the discussion gave me an opportunity to see how those at the university level address some of the same concerns that I have at the high school level. I also got some valuable hints about how I might improve my teaching and more importantly the understanding of my students.
  35. The new ideas and viewpoints which were generated - The Conference is great if you do not have the time or money to attend an on site conference.
  36. Some of the ideas presented in the papers were very interesting.
  38. The convenience of participating from my office
  39. New ideas
  40. It gave a feeling of being connected to the rest of the world which is hard to duplicate in any other way.
  42. Flexibility, in all respects
  43. I think the topics covered were relevant to current teaching needs.
  45. Discussion of actual classroom experiences with newer teaching methods
  46. Contact with a large group of colleagues
  47. The experience
  48. Good dialog, no need to travel
  49. I liked the flexibility of paying as much or as little attention to the papers as I wanted and yet having a variety of topics available.
  50. Ease of access and a variety of perspectives
  51. Some quite vibrant discussion
  52. Good ideas and time to consider and formulate ideas
  53. Remote access - the discussion of virtual office hours and news groups
  54. The ability to participate without money/time constraints - the discussions about computers in undergraduate education and visualization in the classroom

55. Being able to participate
56. It allowed me to "lurk" and read the papers at my own pace. I am a high school teacher working on an MS in grad school this summer, so free time has been at a premium.
57. Reading things on my own time when my schedule allowed instead of "right away"
58. the experience
59. I especially liked Mary Swift's and Theresa Zielinski's paper and other information about what chemistry majors should be able to do with computer technology.
60. The ability to proceed at my own pace - easy access to discussion of all papers since there were no time conflicts that result from simultaneous presentations in live conferences - no direct cost, this makes the information available to someone like me who is working outside the field
61. The mode of delivery (over the Internet) allows the Conference to fit into my busy schedule. I also liked the opportunity to link to references and resources on the WWW where I am constantly looking for materials and ideas for my classes.
62. the experience
63. The ability to read the papers

Question 16: What Did You Like Least About the Computer Conference?

2. Most of the responses were from college professors. Pre-college teachers (including myself) seemed to keep quiet.
3. It took too much time and extended over too long a time period.
4. The pace of the paper reading schedule was difficult to fit into a full-time employment situation.
- 5,8,9. The massive amount of e-mail
6. The high likelihood of misunderstanding that comes from on-line discussion. Comments cannot be clarified without a significant time lag and, even then, may be missed. This problem is unavoidable but might be reduced by establishing a better mechanism for tracking threads.
10. Too much mail at the beginning
11. Some papers carelessly written, a lot of downloading problems
12. I found it was very time consuming and lots of the information seemed almost redundant.
15. It lasted a bit too long - I ran out of steam about 3 weeks ago.
16. I am still printing hard copies of everything. I wish I was disciplined enough to read it directly off of the Web (to save paper,

printer toner, etc.). I sometimes found it difficult to keep up if I missed a day because of other commitments. Also, I joined the discussion late because I was out of town for the first two weeks; so I missed participation in discussion of some of the early papers.

17. There is no Chairman who manages the discussion as at usual conferences.

18. Separation of questions and discussion

19. Amount of time that would be necessary to ferret out all of the information

20. Frankly, there were too many papers and the conference went on too long.

21. Redundancies in some of the responses - lots of rehash - Discussion and responses by some of the participants clearly stated my position and I did not fill the bandwidth with "more of the same".

22. It took a while to get used to following the discussion threads. Obviously, the discussions are not as good as those in real life, but I found them useful.

23. The difficulty of accessing some of the sites - I did not make major efforts at this and I think this is due solely to high traffic on the web.

24. Retrieval of the papers - In one case I wasted hours trying to get a paper.

25. Paucity of interaction - on the other hand, I did think that a number of very passionate folks contributed way too much - it's not quite right to say that too much involvement is bad, because passion for ideas is important - maybe moderation is the key

26. Too long - same responders to every paper - I did not have enough time to devote to the Conference.

27. There seemed to be some confusion between short questions and general discussion.

28. It was a bit too long, after the first seven papers, my interest dropped way down.

29. A lot to read - I often trashed without reading unless I was really interested in a paper.

30. The large volume of e-mail and the fact there was a lot of repetition in the discussion

32. My own slowness with the medium and the fact that I'm in my office and subject to the usual interruptions that occur in a day - Neither of these has anything to do with the conference itself.

33. Messages were from only a small fraction of the participants

34. Because my schedule did not allow me to be involved on a daily basis, it was some times difficult to follow discussions.

35. Finding time to read the e-mail, but that is part of the platform we are using - It is great to use this platform, participate in the conference and still take care of our other responsibilities, commitments and vacation plans.

36. The time required to read and participate fully in the conference

38. One of the papers was not of the same quality as the rest of the papers in the conference.

39. Too few participants in the discussion

40. Only two or three of the 11 papers were interesting to me. One paper appeared to be almost a duplicate of an earlier paper, and I had heard another given at an ACS meeting. Also, the discussion seemed to me to wander pretty far from the papers at times. I had the feeling that people were just using the conference as a forum for grinding their usual axes.

42. Please encourage authors to keep papers simple. Graphics greater than 10k (?) should be discouraged, especially if they have no content. The 600k PDF file was inexcusable. These comments are not meant to discourage legitimate use of technology. . . . I did get much out of this - lots of stimulating discussion. I shared some messages with colleagues, and had some private conversations with other participants. So overall, I feel it was worthwhile. The schedule seems rushed. I am looking forward to the more relaxed schedule you announced for the session beginning in January 1998. Maybe you can continue that for future summer sessions.

43. I could not devote enough time to keep current in the discussion, hence I did not participate as I would have liked.

45. Interjections from the organizer admonishing the audience to answer the questions posed by the authors and exhortations for lurkers to participate more actively; this would be very unusual at a traditional conference and surely each individual should be able to involve themselves as they choose

46. It moved very slowly.

47. Very time consuming - I would have liked to put in more time for each paper.

49. Some of the topics seemed a bit abstruse to me - for instance, discussions about simulations.

50. Repetition of some comments - the Conference was too long - by the end I was tired of it.

51. Rather low signal to noise ratio at times

52. I was out of town over a week and there was a huge pile-up of e-mail. I had to lurk mostly.

54. Dragged on too long

55. That it ended
56. The flood of "unsubscribes" mistakenly sent to ChemConf rather than the Listserv.
57. Much of the discussion was after regular semester classes had ended and I wasn't necessarily near my computer to participate as fully as I might have during the regular academic year. Some of us do not live especially close to our campuses.
58. We were still in classes when the conference started and it was difficult to keep up with the discussion. The volume of messages made using e-mail time consuming.
59. I was somewhat overwhelmed - Where will I ever get the time and expertise to do some of the things which were suggested.
61. Some irrelevant discussion that did not relate to the topic of the papers - It was somewhat tiresome to repeatedly hear the same opinions from the same participants.
63. Some of the discussion seemed to be very specific about some tiny concept in the paper.

Question 17: What Changes Could Be Made to Improve Computer Conferences? (Schedule, Papers, Short Question Sessions, Discussion Sessions, etc.)

1. Require all authors to be present and respond to questions immediately.
2. Timing is off a little - Some people are away on summer vacations.
3. Keep the schedule to a shorter time frame. If I had had teaching duties this summer, I would never have been able to access all the conference notes. It would be helpful to schedule all the discussion of a particular paper at the same time — I tended to get lost when discussions were mixed.
4. For me, increase the spacing between papers to last the full summer
5. The initial comments were voluminous, and lots of e-mail piled up. This is the nature of conferences like this, I think. Maybe we should space the first few papers farther apart, so there is time to deal with the volume.
6. In the interest of time and continuity, I would eliminate the Short Question sessions and add a day of discussion to the papers. The Short Question time turned into discussion anyway, and the time between reading the paper and discussing it seemed to reduce the interest in the topic. The overall length of the Conference should be reduced. Interest wanes after a couple of weeks and it's not quite fair to "later" authors to not have the animated

- discussions accorded "early" authors.
7. Chat room discussions might be an interesting approach, but overall not much need to be changed.
9. Short Question sessions and a break between each discussion period for at least a day
10. I didn't see much value in breaking things up into short questions and discussion - combine somehow.
11. Set higher and tighter standards for the papers
12. I enjoyed most of the papers that focused on something that was actually being done and the evaluation of it rather than those that emphasized an expression of philosophy about actual experimentation or methods.
15. Hard to say - maybe fewer papers
16. I don't think the short question session was that useful (probably because most of us didn't use it properly). It seemed to be much the same as the regular discussion of papers. I think I would prefer a slightly longer discussion time for each paper.
17. New topics for discussion - we all agree on the main goal of using computers in teaching - what about changing teaching - what may we omit in chemistry courses when we use computers? It would be interesting to discuss some definitions in chemistry - substance, heat, energy, reactions, etc.
18. Change the separation of short questions and discussion.
20. Fewer papers
21. Merge the short question - discussion sessions together. There was some confusion about where the responses belonged.
22. I suppose a better set of discussion guideline would help. Also, some information for complete novices would be useful (What is a Listserv, how it works, how discussions are carried out). I don't know if it is possible but some method of threading the discussion would help. I have seen threads used on WWW pages and perhaps this approach could be considered instead of a Listserv.
23. I enjoyed the discussion sessions more than the actual papers. I found the frank exchange of ideas by different people refreshing. I suggest making the discussion sessions a little longer.
24. Make papers available by more convenient means (perhaps e-mail for text, ftp for other parts).
25. That's a toughie - I do like the idea of a "Central Office" that looks at responses, but not from the standard "censorship" viewpoint - rather, as a way to make sure that the most

meaningful responses get posted in a reasonable order. "Freedom of discussion" doesn't necessarily mean anarchy. That is, giving direction to discussion is a valid role of a discussion organizer - in fact, it is a paramount role. That may mean editing responses to guarantee that they have the most impact (not changing words - just slicing out the fat). Most responses are too long. They can be more concise and this is a valid function of the discussion leader.

27. Fewer papers in about the same amount of time - It seemed there was some burnout at the end.

28. The format seems to be working very well.

30. For those who don't wish to receive a large volume of e-mail, a summary of the main points made in the discussion would be helpful.

33. Develop means of stimulating more discussion

38. Schedule a group of papers (5 papers maximum, 3 to 4 might be better) on a common topic. The conference format seems to be satisfactory otherwise.

40. I think you need to begin to exercise some selectivity with the papers and discussion. I don't know exactly how to manage this, but you might give it some thought.

43. The time frame for discussion should be expanded so that more people may participate as they are able.

45. The recesses seemed to have a large inhibitory effect - perhaps papers could be paired thematically so that an entire mini-session fit in one week (e.g. reading of papers on Monday and Tuesday, short questions for both papers on Wednesday, and general discussion of both papers on Thursday and Friday).

46. Help with problems with Adobe PDF format and needed plug ins - Some way to continue discussion beyond the two scheduled days when this is needed on a particular paper

47. Less papers per session and a bit more time for each paper - Maybe a break between papers - I noticed that the discussions were not as intense in the later papers.

50. This Conference seemed to work very well - no real changes

53. Conduct discussion on a web page through a chat mechanism or a customized Java interface

54. Run during middle of the summer (when schools on the quarter system have finished) - I was grading final examinations as I read the first papers and questions.

55. Maybe a little more time for discussion of papers and general discussion since some discussions were just warming up when the next one started

56. I thought the Conference was very well done and especially convenient!

57. 11 papers were a lot - I read most papers as the discussion was on-line - It would have been difficult for me to read the papers, follow the discussion and respond in a timely fashion.

58. Have fewer papers and an extra day for questions and discussion - Perhaps split the Conference into two conferences of 6 papers each.

60. I would suggest short conferences illustrating innovative teaching of a specific topic or module such as equilibria and molecular modeling.

61. The conference was very well organized and schedules. Thanks for a job well done. I would like to see more papers with simultaneous discussion so that one could choose which discussion to become involved in (as is the case at most conferences with many simultaneous sessions). Smaller discussion groups may encourage more individuals to participate in the discussions.

62. Having fewer papers with an extra day for both the questions and the discussion. Maybe split the conference into two conferences of six papers each.

63. Seemed OK to me

Question 18: Compare this Conference with the Usual On-Site Conference

3. Better than not attending anything, but on-site is more exciting - Face-to-face discussions are shorter, but allow for less blathering, which seemed to happen quite a lot

6. It's really unfair to compare because the two meet different needs. An on-line conference allows for more reflection on the papers and can produce more substantive comments. The on-site conference builds better networks of colleagues because of the hallway chats and face-to-face interaction.

7. I got far more out of this on-line conference than most on-site conferences.

8. Having the text of the presentation is better than the usual live conference. Also, there is a better chance to contact and discuss things with the author.

10. This is probably the only way I would see chem. ed. papers. At on-site chemistry conferences I need to spend my time attending research papers in my field.

11. On-line conferences are less expensive.

12. On-line conferences afford the participant more freedom and the ability to continue their regular work without interruption. I also feel

that the comments made in the discussion were more thorough than at a usual conference and attribute this to the freedom in scheduling and length of time allotted to participants for discussion.

15. Being able to access the papers and read them ahead of time is very good - one has time to consider what questions to ask and to absorb some of the ideas that are being presented. This is a real plus and certainly leads to improving my retention of these ideas. Also, it is very nice to be able to go to the Web site and review any paper and all that has been written publicly about it.
16. I think reading a paper is different from presenting a paper. It is a bit harder to get the same emphasis on important points and the author's enthusiasm is difficult to transmit. I think an on-line conference offers the opportunity for more people to participate than at an on-site conference, since there is often not enough time for answers to questions. It is nice to fly somewhere, stay in hotels, etc.
17. On-line and on-site conferences are very different events and comparing them is impossible.
18. Equally as good
19. Cost effective - good information - Some of the discussion is not as well thought out as discussion at an on-site conference. However, there is more time available to formulate a question and to give a reasoned response.
20. The authors were held to be MUCH more responsible for their work. The questioning at U. S. scientific conferences is seldom this intense. This is a plus.
21. This gave me the opportunity to participate and continue my summer research program without interruption!
23. It is easy to hear every person's point of view in an on-line conference. I believe discussions are more in-depth as people have more time to think about comments and think through their responses.
25. Time to consider ideas is available here. That is good.
26. Makes it accessible to those with limited budgets. Harder to get to know other conference "attendees" this way.
27. Not at all the same - here one has the opportunity to participate on an equal status with all others - paper quality was as good or better
28. An on-line conference provides a better opportunity to interact with a wide range of other faculty outside those I already know and would spend time with at a meeting - As a young faculty member on-line conferences provide me an excellent opportunities to network.
29. I liked it better - I could do things at my own pace - have e-mail chats with some of the authors and discussants - get hard copy of the things I was most interested in - come back to a paper to get more out of it - Discussion is much livelier than at on-site conferences where time is limited. Incidentally, I appeared to be a lurker in this conference but that didn't mean I wasn't interested. I didn't have anything to contribute that wasn't already being said by someone else. The last thing this conference needs is people doing a "Me too!". There is too much to read as it is.
31. The major advantage is being able to "attend" all sessions.
32. I prefer seeing people face-to-face, but this conference method is an excellent alternative and a good way to save money and still communicate. Idea exchange is slower on-line but the whole thing seemed to work very well.
33. Much longer time was an important feature - could catch up if you got busy with other things
34. Much more convenient and less expensive
35. The cost and time-saving are great, as well as hearing from a group of people which generally would not be able to be at the same site at the same time - Some spontaneity and collegiality are missing
40. This on-line conference was greatly superior.
42. The on-line conference is mostly superior due to the flexibility. At an on-site meeting you have to wait for someone to recognize you, and there is usually a limit to discussion.
43. Attendance, even reading the papers is definitely better than seeing only an abstract in a regular journal. One feels greater participation, even if only lurking. Like other lurkers, I do enjoy reading the discussion, though I felt inhibited from posting because I was always 2 or 3 days behind the postings - summer teaching, home responsibilities, need to use dial-up Internet connection - all contribute to this. (I regularly download the messages, then read them off-line to minimize tying up phone lines and minimizing on-line costs.) Some interaction is lost by not going to an on-site conference, but very often I can not afford the time or money. Those at teaching institutions don't get enough support to go off to conferences during the year.
44. In theory an on-line conference is better because it leaves me in better control of what and when I read the papers. Such conferences

- also allow for more discussion, which I think is more interesting than the papers themselves. Everyone has a chance to be heard.
45. The signal to noise ratio was a bit lower than for a traditional conference, but this is more than offset by the ability to participate at essentially no cost (only time, and how much of that one spends is entirely up to the individual).
46. It is easier to participate on-line. It could be better, but participation and the discussion was not outstanding this time.
47. Participation in an on-line conference does not require me to leave my place of work and family. However, participation more than doubled my workload. Many times keeping up was left until late in the evening.
49. It seems to me there is a lot more communication and thought which occurs in an on-line conference.
50. On-line conferences are less expensive for a participant and more convenient. However, it is more difficult to talk and get into deep conversations by e-mail. At an on-site conference everyone hears the questions and answers at the same time so there is not so much repetition of the discussion. Also, it is nice to put faces with names. But I think this is an excellent way to have conferences. I just wouldn't give up the on-site ones.
51. The inability to "walk away" from discussions means that one has to sit through a lot of discussion in which one is not interested. The use of the subject line to categorize comment works only to a limited degree. On the other hand, discussions are often more far-reaching when an interesting topic arises, because of the number of people who contribute to the discussion.
52. On-line conferences are much more productive.
53. I participated in my pajamas! I didn't have to worry about insulting a discussion contributor when I skipped his or her comments.
54. On the plus side - time and money saved by not traveling - not having to choose between simultaneous sessions - easier for me to ask questions or provide comments  
On the minus side - Professional interactions with others limited - attention divided because of local concerns
55. An on-line conference saves time in travel as well as the dead times during the normal conference. Far less stressful
56. The extra time to reflect upon and review a paper is wonderful for slow thinkers like myself.
57. I think we miss a lot of the connection we need doing this on-line. Perhaps more people from all over can participate, but the comfort level necessary for responses, questions, discussion, etc. is missing. Maybe that explains why so many lurk. There isn't the follow-up interaction to inspire.
58. Interesting but not intense
59. I prefer this on-line conference because it allowed more discussion and was less expensive.
60. No "simultaneous presentation time conflicts" - no travel or registration costs as with on-site conferences - no direct contact with colleagues is a negative but is mitigated by access to the participants list and their e-mail addresses - The "social" interactions associated with on-site conferences is less or at least of a different nature on-line.
61. More access to the discussion and papers which I could read at my leisure - Even my vacation did not interfere. - Much less choice in papers and sessions than at an on-site conference. I also miss the valuable opportunity to interact with those attending the sessions as well as the presenters. There didn't seem to be too many different individuals participating in the discussions (especially the last couple of weeks). I also miss the freely disseminated ideas and resources that occurs during an on-site conference. In a sense, e-mail and written discussion seems to limit communication.
63. Compares favorably

#### FURTHER DISCUSSION OF ON-LINE MEETINGS

A discussion of the format and nature of on-line meetings will be held on the CHEMCONF Listserv during November. The organizers of the 1997 Conference would be interested in any further comments or suggestions from those who participated in the Summer 1997 or earlier Conferences. If you wish to participate or monitor the discussion and are not presently subscribed to CHEMCONF, send the message:  
SUBSCRIBE CHEMCONF your-first-and-last-name  
To: LISTSERV@UMDD.UMD.EDU