

4). Please make suggestions for improving the conference.

Need always to have as invitees certain individuals who are particularly aggressive in asking question and thus stimulating debate—e.g., Margo, Fishback, Collins, Mokyr.

I'm not sure that I have any real insights for improving the conference. The format of inviting a combination of young and established scholars and putting them together for two days is unique and valuable. I certainly would not do anything that jeopardizes that structure. I'm sure than some will suggest sexier places than Binghamton or LaCrosse or Raleigh, but I think it is good that the conference takes place in venues where there are not a lot of distractions. It keeps the group together and interacting on a deeper and more personal level than if participants all dispersed at the end of the day.

It would be great if someone could take notes for each presentation. The feedback is very helpful and it is difficult to note the comments while answering the questions. Perhaps, each presenter could take notes for the next paper. I had a friend take notes during my session and the notes were helpful as I was revising my paper.

It was a great conference. I don't have any suggestions for improvement.

I thought the 2006 clio meeting was outstanding; however, it would be nice if participants did not have to wait five years before participating again. Compared with my memories of the last two times I attended, which were in the late eighties, early nineties, I think that the institutional memory of how clio works and ongoing conversations, often between rivals, that extend from one year to the next, increase the intensity of the experience and make it more stimulating. Perhaps we should try to increase their frequency, so that participants can attend them more regularly. I know there is also the international clio, but the greater enforcement of prior preparation in this clio meetings produces a significant qualitative improvement that should be replicated, if possible.

move it closer to where I live.

I deeply enjoyed the conference and am grateful to have been invited. I could think of more enjoyable location but this misses the point.

I think it is a good format. Stick to it.

The Clio conference is perfect. Don't change anything. Especially, keep sending out the Clio booklet. Downloading the papers from a website wouldn't be nearly as useful - too bulky, less likely to read them.

I have none.

Keep it from raining? I don't know what to say. The conference model works brilliantly as far as I am concerned and it needs no real improvement.

4). Please make suggestions for improving the conference.

Frankly, I find this very difficult! Perhaps a tiny thing that might save you money and would be good fun for the conference participants: In my case, a number of people drove up from New York City, while I went there by public transport. If I had known their travel arrangements in advance, I could have joined them already on the way to Binghamton and I could have had a most pleasant conversation as we had on the way back to NYC. Also, this sheet lacks the question what we really liked! I thought the invitation on the first evening was really very nice and personal and certainly added to the nice memories I took away from the Clio conference. Thank you for taking the time to fill out the survey. Your feedback will help us improve the conference.

None. Keep up the fine work.

I really enjoyed the conference, very well organized!

I think it would be good to try to invite one or two presentations from active senior scholars with the understanding that the paper is grade A and not bottom drawer stuff. I think the junior folks would actually appreciate and benefit from this. Also given the short period between the initial Jan 1 deadline and the submission for printing deadline, it might be useful to request abstracts and full (if not final) draft papers. That way papers that are just in the idea stage can be so judged. Thank you for taking the time to fill out the survey. Your feedback will help us improve the conference.

At Binghamton the accommodation facilities could have been better. Understanding it was a student dorm, there is no reason for not having the heating on and having to make up your own bed upon arrival! Otherwise a great conference.

I find that Clio is always a valuable conference with a very high level of exchange of ideas and lively but civil discourse. I suppose if I had one MINOR quibble with the Binghamton meeting it was that I would have preferred a slightly higher proportion of papers by senior scholars in the field: the mix has swung a bit toward grad students and new scholars. But this obviously has its virtues in terms of developing the discipline.

think the format, time tested, is about right.

I found that several of the papers presented in May 2006 at Clio were then presented again at EHA in September 2006. I think that can make the EHA meetings then less interesting.

Some one at the conference suggested moving from 1 hour to 45 minute sessions. That would allow about 3 more papers to be presented, which I think would be good. In the two years I was on the selection committee there were certainly 2 or 3 more papers I thought would have been worthwhile.

My only comment is that I really missed having coffee available in the breaks and even at the meals. It wouldn't have been a problem if coffee was available to be purchased on the resort but it was only available at certain times. Other than that everything was great.

4). Please make suggestions for improving the conference.

Need always to have as invitees certain individuals who are particularly aggressive in asking question and thus stimulating debate—e.g., Margo, Fishback, Collins, Mokyr.

All in all, I thought that the conference was great. The short presentation-long answer period format was useful for focusing on the big picture (not as much for the nitty-gritty of how estimations were conducted) but, in some sense, that is the conference's strength and it shouldn't be changed. I had ample time to talk to everyone. The setting was conducive to meeting new people.

The Clio conference is ideal. The level of engagement with the papers exceeds that at any other conference, and the small size is conducive to building relationships with colleagues.

Keep doing what you're doing. It's worked well for a long period of time.

I think there needs to be a little more attention to the acoustics of the room. It was hard for everyone to hear some of the discussion. Otherwise everything was fabulously well done.

I HAVE ATTENDED CLIO OFF AND ON FOR MORE THAN 20 YEARS, AND FOR THE ADVANCE OF SCHOLARSHIP, I THINK IT'S THE BEST CONFERENCE I ATTEND.

Overall, a very nice conference. A great way to improve one's paper and a wonderful opportunity to talk shop with others in the profession.

There were one or two papers that clearly did not measure up to the standards that I have come to expect of this conference. I think that selecting participants on the basis of an abstract only leaves the door open for more variability than would be desirable in the quality of the papers presented. In a large multi-session conference this is acceptable. In a conference with an in-depth study format such as clio, there is a high cost of accepting papers of inferior quality. This could be avoided by requesting full papers together with the abstract submission. The preliminary selection could be done on the basis of the abstract, with the full paper used to ensure that quality standards are met. Other than that, I think the format and organization of the conference are absolutely fantastic; I always consider Clio among the best intellectual fora I have the privilege of attending.

I did like the format of the panel sessions. I liked the fact that we had almost no presentation (only 5min) but we had 55min of discussion. The fact that everyone was asked to read the papers also contributed a lot for the richness of the discussions.

Two very minor things: I would suggest is not to have 7 papers on the Saturday. It is really difficult to keep up the concentration and focus at the last paper session. Why not have one more paper on Sunday (3 instead of 2) or Friday (4 instead of 3)? Second, could you provide a webpage where authors can post the papers or appendices etc? Given the page constraint of the booklet, it would be great to answer details on data etc. before coming to the conference. Otherwise - just keep up the great work!

4). Please make suggestions for improving the conference.

If possible in terms of participants travel times, it would be better not to cluster quite as many papers into one day. In depth discussion of 7 papers in one day stretched the resources of most participants and was probably close to cruel and unusual punishment for jetlagged Europeans.

I thought the Conference was very well-executed. The presentations and comments from the floor were on point, perhaps more so than most other conferences I've attended in the past. From my perspective the Conference was flawless. The only suggestion I would make, and it has been made before, is that a poster session be organized to give some visibility to the work of the students who attend.

Please strictly enforce the rule about not arriving late or leaving early.

I have just one single suggestion: the schedule on the second day was rather tightly packed with back-to-back presentations, and some feeling of conference fatigue set in in the afternoon. It might be helpful to schedule presentations more evenly across the three days. Just extending the Sunday presentations to 2pm would probably help.

Everything was fine.

I think the presence of economic historians who have positions (or are graduate students) outside of economics departments is critical.

This was a great conference!! Keep it at this size! I would drop one paper on Saturday and try to add an additional paper on Friday.

A FORMAL DISCUSSANT (5-10 MINUTES) MIGHT BE HELPFUL, TOO?

I would suggest that the questions/comments sessions should be started by graduate students and recent graduates, at least for 10 minutes or so. All the cliometric superstar professors can still provide very useful feedback after that, but letting the junior attendees start the sessions would probably force them to prepare comments and read the papers more carefully. Also, it would probably lower the bar and intimidation levels. Just think how intimidating it would be for a grad student to ask something after Greg Clark, Bob Margo, and Price Fishback have already killed the paper. Or even worse, let's say you hated the paper and you have tons of comments and you hear Bob Margo saying he "really like the paper" (and meaning it). Then you are going to think twice about your comments. I would also recommend that the sessions are organized a bit better by time period and/or topic. I know this is particularly hard, but I thought in the meeting I attended there were good opportunities to do this. For instance, why not have all the medieval and early modern papers in one day or one session. Many of the issues were very similar and it would be easier for non-specialists to focus on the issues at hand, rather than having to jump from slavery in the U.S. to taxation after the Glorious Revolution. I understand that the objective of the meeting is perhaps more methodological than topic-oriented, but then we could also have the sessions grouped by methodological approach. For instance, all the IV people should have one session, then the more time series-oriented people could be in another session, and the no-regression people could have one spot (perhaps the first session of the meeting). I would also encourage the organizers to request more complete submissions rather than abstracts. I didn't submit a paper because I didn't have one finished and I didn't want to present

4). Please make suggestions for improving the conference.

something half-done. When I realized that a lot of people presented work in progress (some actually not even “in progress”) I realized that I could have submitted something. Anyway, the idea is not that, but to say that I think we all have more to gain if the papers are in a more advanced stage. Now, a few people presented highly polished papers that were already submitted or were in the process of submission. I don't know how much the meeting benefited from having these papers that have been presented everywhere. The contributions for improving those papers are marginal and speakers tend to focus on defending what is done, rather than taking feedback into account. For me the ideal moment to present is when you have a draft, but you have either not presented it at seminars or you have only presented it once or twice.

The Tucson one was one of the best I have attended--it was a nice balance of young scholars and more mature members of our field. I enjoyed the handful of non-economists who were there. The papers were well selected with a nice balance of U.S. and non-U.S. It was great!

I would be better to have a few more senior scholars presenting to raise the quality a bit.

More time for presentation; at least 15 minutes rather than only 5.

I think it could be useful for presenters and participants to have a central website where authors could post fuller versions of their papers, additional tables and graphs, etc. prior to the conference.

No specific suggestions, but I want to note that I have attended Clio conferences in the distant past (> 10 years) and found this one to be much more useful and more enjoyable. There seemed less ‘old boys’ networking and more different participants bringing exciting ideas; all participated.

I think it would be good to try to invite one or two presentations from active senior scholars with the understanding that the paper is grade A and not bottom drawer stuff. I think the junior folks would actually appreciate and benefit from this. Also given the short period between the initial Jan 1 deadline and the submission for printing deadline, it might be useful to request abstracts and full (if not final) draft papers. That way papers that are just in the idea stage can be so judged. Thank you for taking the time to fill out the survey. Your feedback will help us improve the conference.

The conference format is excellent. There is no more constructive mode of presenting research than the “Clio” format. Everyone learns a tremendous amount. I would appreciate brief biographical information about all conference participants, e.g., name current affiliation, date of PH.D. and where completed included in the conference book.

It was well organized and operated and the facilities were fine, so suggestions are useful at the margins. It's good, as this conference arranged, to have some people from other countries.

I can't think of any. A minor point would be clearer guidelines what a conference paper should be about, e.g. references should be included etc. But honestly, presenters will always find a way to circumvent space restrictions, so better never mind.

4). Please make suggestions for improving the conference.

I CAN'T THINK OF ANY.

1. All papers should be double spaced. The last one was not and it was hard to read. 2. If any papers come in printed lightly, have the printer that is making up the books darken the type in those papers. One or two of the papers were very light. 3. Announce to all participants that it is (at least it used to be) a tradition for them to bring copies of their work if they want to circulate them to the attendees.

Some one at the conference suggested moving from 1 hour to 45 minute sessions. That would allow about 3 more papers to be presented, which I think would be good. In the two years I was on the selection committee there were certainly 2 or 3 more papers I thought would have been worthwhile.