

Which sessions did you attend?

PI: Collaborative Research	15.9%	13
I.A. Plato and Public Life	8.5%	7
I.B. Political Epistemology	13.4%	11
I.C. Political Participation, Contestation, and Transformation	17.1%	14
I.D. Theories of Political Identity and Patriotism	13.4%	11
I.E. Rights and Revolutions	15.9%	13
II.A. Sovereignty and International Relations	9.8%	8
II.B. Violence and Political Judgment	28.0%	23
II.C. Trust and Faith in Locke's Political Thought	11.0%	9
II.D. Morality, Motivation, and Civic Education	8.5%	7
II.E. Public Discourse, Political Participation, and Virtue	8.5%	7
III.A. Int'l Justice, Cosmopolitanism and Non-State Actors	13.4%	11
III.B. Conflict and Strategy in Machiavelli's Thought	6.1%	5
III.C. Liberalism after Rawls	11.0%	9
III.D. Religion and Legitimacy in the Liberal State	15.9%	13
III.E. Political Struggle and Change	12.2%	10
PII. Politics without Politics (Jodi Dean)	52.4%	43
IV.A. Historiography, Republicanism, and Revolutions	32.9%	27
IV.B. Environmental Theory: Consumption and Conservation	8.5%	7
IV.C. Power, Identity, Narrative	12.2%	10
IV.D. Liberalism and Its Critics	17.1%	14
V.A. Justice, Freedom, Rights	17.1%	14
V.B. Political Psychology / Anthropology	9.8%	8
V.C. Marriage, Family, Care	13.4%	11
V.D. Capitalism and Its Critics	20.7%	17
V.E. Law, Institutions, and the State	9.8%	8
VI.A. Race and Justice: Reform Liberalism or Reject It?	22.0%	18
VI.B. Uses of History	11.0%	9
VI.C. Freedom and Political Judgment in Democratic Politics	9.8%	8
VI.D. (Mis)Representation and (Il)legitimacy	9.8%	8
VI.E. Beyond Reason: The Politics of Beauty, Love, and Pain	15.9%	13

What is your general impression of the quality of the presentations and of the discussion at the sessions you attended?

1. I joined the conference on Saturday. I really enjoyed the two panels where I did not present. But my own [deleted] seemed to me like a very disjointed one, where even the commentator said he had found no common line or theme among the 4 papers presented.
2. The quality of the presentations varied, with a few being quite weak. But the ensuing discussions were excellent.
3. Very good
4. Overall very good
5. I saw few actual presentations (having arrived late), but those I saw were generally decent and the discussions were good.
6. Excellent & excellent.
7. Very good
8. [comment deleted]
9. They were great. The presentations were well prepared and the discussions were engaging, energetic, and extremely thoughtful.
10. Excellent.
11. Very good
12. Very good. I did notice a general incoherence on each of the panels I attended, however. There were usually at least two different discussions directed towards two different papers in each panel.
13. The panels were uniformly excellent. What stood out for me most was the consistently great job the discussants did this year.
14. Excellent, especially the discussions.
15. very good
16. Excellent
17. It was overall good, but I was able only to attend two panels -- mine and one other, so my sampling really is rather small.
18. Excellent
19. The quality was mixed within each session. Some very good papers were presented alongside quite weak papers, and that showed in the discussion afterwards. I would suggest a maximum of three papers per session.

20. I didn't attend any, so I can't say. (I was at the book exhibit the whole time.)
21. Pretty good. Presents are generally good about 1) keeping their remarks short and 2) NOT READING THEIR PAPERS!
22. Overall, quite strong.
23. On the whole, the presentations were of a high quality, though the quality of the discussions varied depending on the competency of the chair/moderator and the audience dynamics.
24. [comment deleted]
25. very high quality for every session except [comment deleted].¹
26. The discussions were generally interesting, though the papers and presentations were of very uneven quality.
27. so-so
28. Generally good, both presentations and discussions. Discussions generally superior to other conferences. Presentations similar to other conferences.
29. Excellent. A very high quality of presentation and discussion.
30. Generally high, however, I was disappointed in several of the graduate student presentations. Both substantively (seminar papers?) and in terms of presentation (reading papers, failure to plan remarks that would fit within time constraints), there were real problems. (That's not to say that there weren't some excellent grad student presentations. There certainly were. But I thought, on the whole, there were more problematic ones than previously.)
31. Seriously, probably the best conference panel i have ever attended. The time for discussion was excellent, and the seriousness of discussion was at a very high level - respectful and probing disagreements. Staging the conference in an academic setting is a huge plus.
32. I thought the presentations were at a very high level. I especially like that junior and senior scholars are brought together in ways that is not possible at APSA.

¹ A note about deletions. In the past, the Governance Committee has deleted negative comments about particular panels or panelists from the published survey results, while keeping in negative comments about the Association or conference itself. We have stuck to this policy for the most part this year, although we realize this leaves a skewed view of the survey results and, more problematically, may stifle discussion and lead respondents to feel that their concerns have been ignored. In response, the Governance Committee is considering ways to bring more transparency to this process, perhaps setting up an online forum for people to discuss matters related to the ideas presented at the meetings. If you are interested in this possibility, please email a member of the Governance Committee.

33. Best year ever. I heard that there were a few panels heavy on grad students, but none of mine were (and the grad students I heard were really good).
34. Excellent.
35. Very strong, and stronger than last year's conference.
36. Presentations were all good to excellent. Discussions varied more; one was very, very fruitful, most of the others less so, one in particular was fairly bad.
37. Not sure if I got all the panel titles right and without my program can't verify if these are the exact ones I attended. I thought the quality of presentation and discussion was higher than APSA, MPSA and on par with theory at WPSA
38. Excellent!
39. Very good.
40. [comment deleted]
41. Quality of presentations was in general high. Quality of discussions was mixed: some quite high, some scattered and of less value
42. Very good. I thought the discussants were especially well chosen and did good work.
43. Varied
44. The panels were all excellent as usual. [Comment deleted]
45. Everything went very well. I like the format and I enjoyed the discussions.
46. Great!
47. I appreciate the high quality and diversity represented at APT.
48. Quite high but uneven (both within and across panels)
49. mixed - some excellent, others not very good
50. Best yet.
51. Excellent. The best was IV.C; excellent format with presentation by discussant and response by panelists.
52. Pretty good -esp. In the commentators. One session seemed cobbled together, though.
53. the presentations were better than papers at apsa or wpsa
54. Some good, some not so good.
55. The format is very productive and leads to good discussions.

56. A little surreal. Everyone very, very smart, but managing, somehow, not to talk about anything -- not really.
57. I thought the quality of presentations was high, in general. There was a problems with several that tried to cram too much into 10-15 minutes. I think that it would actually be better to give the presenters longer time and possibly have less papers.
58. Very good.
59. excellent.
60. the quality of presentations greatly varied, although the discussion was generally good.
61. Presentations were mixed, as always (but still much more interesting than at APSA). Discussions were always engaging.
62. Both the presentations and the discussion afterwards was very strong.
63. mostly quite good, with a few sub-par
64. The quality of the presentations was rather high (higher certainly than the quality of presentations at other conferences). The discussants were all STELLAR. Very, very good.
65. While I saw some variation in quality among the papers, I thought some of them were among the most interesting presentations I've ever seen. Plus, the discussions were uniformly excellent across all the panels I attended.
66. Excellent all around.
67. They were all very good. There was ample time for discussion.
68. excellent--The papers were provocative, the "official" comments worthwhile, and the audience discussion very interesting.
69. Excellent, I heard two brilliant papers, by Aziz Rana and Ivan Ascher, and the first was on a panel that actually shared questions and concerns.
70. variable
71. Decent
72. Absolutely top-notch. Far and away the best set of presentations and discussions I've seen.
73. good
74. The quality was high and many presentations were innovative. The discussion sections were, for the most part, very useful.
75. The papers are often of very different quality (from tenured professor's book projects to young grad students' seminar papers) but the discussions are always great!

76. they were generally good.
77. [comment deleted]
78. VERY high, very impressive!
79. overall, great

What is your evaluation of the conference? Specifically, what do you think about: A) the program -- the panels, plenary sessions, breaks and meals, and book exhibit; and B) the organization and logistics of the conference, including the facilities at Wesleyan and accommodations at the Crowne Center Cromwell?

1. Some other conferencists agreed that while some panels were really interesting, some seemed to be thrown together by no common topic or rationale. I thought meals were very good and the logistics excellent.
2. the program was excellent--timing and meals especially. logistics were also well done.
3. I enjoyed the conference very much. I especially appreciated that the papers were made available ahead of time and that panelists were encouraged to not read their papers. Not only did these leave more time for discussion, it forced us to present the basic argument of the paper, which also seemed to foster more reaction and discussion. As for accommodation, it would have been nice to be less reliant on the shuttle service to get between the conference and hotel, though I gather hotels in Middletown are scarce.
4. Book exhibit needed a more central location, papers overall of high quality, but some spent too much time reading rather than just framing a discussion, discussants and discussion overall very good Wesleyan/Middletown beautiful, hotel fine,
5. A) I can't evaluate very well since I missed half the conference this year, but my overall feeling was positive. The discussions after panel presentations and opportunities for connecting at breaks and meals remain the best part of APT, overcoming sometimes less than stellar panels. I enjoyed the Dean plenary, and in general like the idea of an academic plenary with broad appeal (as opposed to *only* having professional plenaries, e.g. on publishing). B) Informational emails about the conference were very helpful (Dennis is amazing). I was very pleased to see the strong encouragement/guidance in emails about preserving time for discussion (and how to foster it). Facilities and accomodations were fine. Registration and lodging were both a bit pricey, but I imagine that's hard to control. One logistical complaint is that the announcement of the program came out fairly late, making it hard to plan ahead for the semester (I teach Thursday nights, and had to decide between omitting a week's worth of class on the syllabus or skipping part of the conference before I knew what I would be missing).
6. The food was good and copious. Transportation from the airport to the hotel and from the hotel to the conference location was inconvenient and expensive.
7. A) concurrent sessions should NOT be of a similar topic, since people giving presentations are naturally interested in also attending the other sessions B) Wesleyan and Crowne Center were good facilities
8. [comment deleted]

9. The program was well thought out and provided ample opportunities to hear good papers. There were so many great submissions that it was hard to decide which talks to go to, which is a fantastic problem to have, especially since the accommodations gave you the opportunity to later meet with people at a session you didn't attend and still hear the ideas presented. The facilities were great, and with the blog it was really easy finding people to share rides and rooms with.
10. A little hard to navigate at first, but got used to it quickly.
11. The book exhibit was somewhat isolated. The session locations were too spread out.
12. The conference is exactly the right size and the correct mix of panels and social events. The facilities were fine. I thought the plenary worked well. We might be able to do two of these a conference. One Friday; one Saturday.
13. Wesleyan was ok--it would have been nice to have water for panelists.
14. Very good, though it would have been nicer to have accommodation within walking distance of the conference facilities.
15. Wesleyan University was wonderful, but I did not care much for the hotel--nothing within walking distance. Book exhibit was not proximate to major activities. Panels spread out too far apart physically, and could be improved by more panels with 1.5 hrs instead of 2 hrs. Food was good.
16. Nice accommodations at Wesleyan (the University--I cannot vouch for the Crowne Center, as I did not stay there). Conference was, as usual, excellent.
17. Excellent, as always.
18. Everything was great, except the fact that the hotel and the college were so far apart. Because I didn't bring a car, I had to wait for the shuttle, so I attended fewer panels than I would have liked. I don't think participants really get out to see the campus, so I hope in future years, APT organizes the events out of the hotel, or has them very close to the hotel. It would make attendance easier and more convenient.
19. The accommodations generally were quite nice, though the hotel was located rather far away. The exhibit room was fine, except that its location did not conduce to many people actually finding their way there.
20. Good program. Correct amount of plenary session/roundtable stuff. Good to have long sessions and breaks. Book exhibit hard to enjoy given how spread out everything was. Hotel was very nice. Duckpin bowling could have been better organized. (I missed it.)
21. Everything seemed well-organized and seemed to go smoothly
22. Panels were good; plenary sessions were also good, as well. The breaks and meal sessions were well-timed, but not as nice as last year. Book exhibit was excellent. The conference was well organized and the facilities and accommodations were great at Wesleyan, with the exception of the food, which was only mediocre. Conference organizers did an excellent job this year.

23. [comment deleted]
24. Adequate
25. I thought both the program and the organization of the conference were well done.
26. I thought the whole thing was very well done. My only qualms were with things that likely were outside the control of the organizing committee: it would have been nice if the hotel were within walking distance, and the meals were not particularly good. These aren't major complaints, and were outside of APT's control, I am sure.
27. very good!
28. Well-organized -- good job! Facilities generally excellent, but some panel rooms were inappropriate lecture halls. Some minor inconveniences: dispersal of rooms; no water in panel rooms; parking difficulties Friday; difficulty finding one's way around (especially upon initial arrival). Hotel was fine; seemed a bit pricey for what it was and where it was. Really excellent meals, breaks. Jodi Dean's talk would have been better suited as a panel paper than a featured address. Also, its level of parochialism was questionable for a plenary session at a general political theory conference.
29. I loved this conference. I have been to many, and APT was one of the best. It would be nice to order books authored by presenters. The RPA does this at their conference, and I think it is an excellent idea. The food was great, in my opinion. I am vegan, so I really appreciated that APT and Wesleyan had accommodations.
30. Ideally, lodging would be closer to the campus. But sometimes that's not possible, and I think people coped with that fairly well. Great program!
31. I did not stay at the Crowne Center, but the facilities at Wesleyan were superb, and the program was very well organized. Some trouble with the way panels were scattered across campus. On the other hand, that added to the feeling of working in an academic environment.
32. So I enjoy the program and I enjoyed Wesleyan, but more needs to be done in terms of picking locations that are a bit more exciting and accessible. That the hotel was located in the middle of nowhere was really an issue. Not having more shuttle service was another issue. But this could be avoided by selecting better sites. I encourage the University of Virginia as a possible site.
33. Great. It's nice to stay in a conference center, but not everyone has one. Lovely rooms. Weakest aspect was the book exhibit.
34. Since I was on the program committee, I'll leave comments on the panels to others. The chairs and discussants on the panels I attended for the most part did a great job at keeping remarks away from the papers and limited to allow for audience participation, although more work could be done to encourage panelists not to commandeer the sessions in the discussion period after the presentations and discussant responses. Some of the 'answers' to questions from the audience in one panel I attended were longer than the author's original presentation. I do think it's worth having a plenary on the Thursday before the first full day of the conference; it's

just unfortunate that Falk bowed out so late in the process, though I thought Bettina and the panel did a very good job in his stead. If we could make sure that we got a 'big name', and could lock in his/her commitment, the plenary/opening reception is a great way to kick off the program. The second plenary went very well; though I disagreed with most of Dean's argument, she sparked a lot of discussion. If possible I would try in the future to avoid the kind of space for the plenaries that we had for Dean's talk; it was too large and impersonal, and Dean was really physically distant from the audience. The facilities on campus were great; the conference rooms we had at the hotel for the first night, not so much. The HVAC system overpowered the voices of the panelists, and the room for the reception was pretty dreary. The hotel rooms themselves were superb (and the price was amazingly low for the quality), though I was surprised at how small the restaurant and bar were for the size and quality of the hotel. Don Moon and Lisa Sacks did a wonderful job arranging rooms for the panels; except for the ones in the Public Affairs Center, they were very good spaces for the panels assigned to them. Arranging the wireless access was a very good idea. I thought the food had been better at previous conferences, but the food this year wasn't bad.

35. A) Overall good; less text based than I would have liked; meals, etc. were quite good. B) Very good.

36. I was satisfied.

37. Panels, plenary, breaks and meals excellent. Didn't visit the book exhibit. Facilities at Wesleyan were great. Too bad the Crowne was so far from the conference site but it was adequate as a hotel.

38. The program was excellent, as always. The logistics of the conference were not as good as they'd been in years past. Driving back and forth between the hotel and the conference site, finding a place to park, and then locating the building and the rooms took extra time and effort, and I was much more exhausted by the end of the conference than I've been in years past. The breaks and meals weren't quite as good, either; there was less choice and what was there was often sub-par.

39. Very good.

40. [comment deleted]

41. A) Program was generally strong, though as usual, some panels had such disparate papers (either in topic or in general approach to issues) that it was difficult to get strong discussions going B) excellent overall--a very nice conference to attend, especially with meals provided that encourage further networking and informal interaction

42. The program was well organized. The facilities at Wesleyan were terrific. My only complaint was the inability to walk from the hotel to the facilities or to any restaurants; it would be better to have accommodations nearer to the conference location.

43. Excellent program generally. [Comment deleted] Breaks and meals were good. Book exhibit should be more prominent and easy to get to. Good facilities; better if hotel is closer to the meeting and if panels, registration and book exhibit are in close proximity. There was far too much wandering around and that minimized informal interactions.

44. The hotel location was less than ideal. One would like to be in an area where it is safe to walk.
45. a. I have no complaints. b. I would have preferred to have the hotel within walking distance of the campus, but, other than that, everything was fine.
46. i could attend only the session in which i was presenting. It run smoothly.
47. I didn't stay at the hotel. All the rest, fantastic.
48. Honestly, I was happy with the organization of the conference. The only concern that I heard voiced (particularly among those without cars) was that the Crowne Center was too far from a lot of food options.
49. Panels were generally good, although in some cases papers could have been grouped more coherently, i.e., a paper on one panel would have fitted much better on another panel. [Comment deleted]. Friday meals both good, especially the dinner. Sat lunch was poor - very bland stir-fry! Wesleyan facilities good except that my login/password for internet access did not work. Hotel was fine, although a bigger bar would be handy as a place to congregate in the evening.
50. A) Panels were generally fine, but variable in quality among and within the panels that I saw. The breaks and meals were a nice chance to socialize in between sessions. I never found the book exhibit. B) Facilities at Wesleyan were fine, but it would be nice to have the meeting and hotel closer together.
51. The program was good. The shared meals continue for me to be the highlight of the gathering, because they are occasions for people to meet and talk about their mutual interests. The distance of the lodgings from the sites of panels was not good. [Comment deleted]
52. I thoughts the panels were excellent. [Comment deleted]
53. A nice setting. It's unfair to make people pay the full fee, though, if they can attend only a day. Remember, people teach!
54. I thought wesleyan was great, but not so wonderful for people with bad knees. the organization was wonderful, and promoted a lovely atmosphere. Jodi Dean was great, but the plenary speech should be shorter.
55. Overall it was well done. Some of the papers in the sessions didn't fit well together. Having the hotel be in walking distance or accessible by public transport would be preferable.
56. A) I liked it. B) Really nice facilities.
57. Program was good (if surreal), well organized. Book exhibit not so good. Wesleyan was too far from the airport. But the shuttle from the hotel to campus was good.
58. The program was very well done, meals were excellent, I didn't know there was a book exhibit until it was too late. The logistics were a bit chaotic with the conference hotel so far off site and the rooms all over campus.

59. The details of conference fees, travel arrangements etc were sent out VERY late and many of them were surprising (no airport shuttle). It was disappointing to not have a shuttle from the airport to the hotel. It added a level of "complexity" and stress that should have been avoided. The cost of taxis was very high (80\$ each way) and conference organizers assumed that most participants would have their expenses covered. I wonder if that was really the case!? To operate on that assumption, however you look at it, is problematic. The book exhibit was small.

60. Please move the book exhibit closer to the main conference action. It would have been nice if the sessions had been closer together.

61. The program was excellent, but Saturday afternoon/evening was too packed. Organization and logistics were generally very good. One of the rooms at Wesleyan was a disaster and the lunch food on Saturday was awful, but apart from these rather insignificant details, everything was wonderful. My one gripe was the distance between hotel and conference. That made it difficult for those of us without cars and it also made the long Saturday more difficult.

62. great.

63. I think it is important to have more panels on feminism and gender. More panels on race and sexuality would be good too.

64. My one complaint was the distance between the Hotel and the conference site. The hotel was in a bad location, but the shuttle bus service was excellent. Wesleyan was a great location for the conference.

65. The program was good. Definitely keep a small number of parallel sessions. I enjoyed the panels and the plenary sessions. Breaks and meals were fine. I did not visit the book exhibit. Perhaps if it had been in my way I would have.

66. The food was awful. I didn't like having to drive back and forth to the campus.

67. Excellent.

68. I thought the conference was extremely well organized and coordinated, and everything was top notch.

69. excellent. Lovely meeting rooms for the most part. Nice to have lunch there together.

70. The conference was the perfect size. The panels got good sized audiences, and it was invigorating to walk from building to building. I like that much better than being scrunched into one hot, crowded space. The plenary session was interesting. Unfortunately, there wasn't enough time for a full audience discussion. The meals were delightful. Wesleyan was a very good site. I loved the room in which we ate. The receptions were very fun. Great wine choices. The hotel was perfectly nice.

71. very well organized, good program

72. The program was largely good -- the panels were surprisingly tightly focused, which led to good conversations during (and after) the panels. Plenary sessions never make much sense to

me and, much as I like Jodi, this was no exception. The food was unexceptional but inoffensive. The book exhibit was pretty minimal. The organization was as good as it was going to be, but hamstrung by the lack of housing on campus and nearby airport. The campus was charming, but a touch remote. The hotel was fine; the rooms were better than the bar, and, especially at theory-heavy conferences, the bar is where the action is.

73. a) the panels were interesting, however, I wish the discussants would have done more to help the authors and the audience get feedback. The meals were very nice, but I did not see the book exhibit. I didn't even know there was one. B) the logistics were not well done. Navigating the campus was a little difficult -- especially for the first panel. I also thought that the travel from the airport to the conference hotel was not well thought out. The cost to get from the airport to the hotel was astronomical, and between airfare, hotel and then the added costs for rental cars or shuttles was very difficult for me.

74. A) I was overall very impressed with the organization of the program and its structure. B) The location of the Crowne Center Cromwall was not ideal for those of us without a car. The Wesleyan facilities were excellent.

75. I always love the organization of APT - the way that all breaks and meals are together, and that the location is usually not great (which means everyone attends all of the panels.) I was very happy with Jodi Dean's plenary session this year - great choice. The facilities and hotel at Wesleyan were great. My only quibble is that it would have been nice to have all of the panels in one or two locations.

76. [comment deleted]

77. I attended only my panel (I had a window of but one day), and I spent the rest of the time that day interacting with other theorists outside the panels. But everything I attended seemed well run and engaging.

Concerning the Business Meeting: A) Did you attend the Business Meeting? B) If not, were you interested in attending? C) Are there any ways we could make the Business Meeting better or more accessible?

1. I did not attend, it is my first conference and I was involved in a very interesting discussion after the last panel.
2. Yes. As we discussed, I think it would be better to hold the meeting earlier in the schedule, and not during dinner time. Folks are tired at the end of two days of conferencing.
3. Did not attend
4. I did not attend, though I was interested and meant to, only because I got involved in talking with some colleagues. Moving it from Sunday morning significantly increased my willingness to attend.
5. Yes, I attended the business meeting. The start time was too soon after the previous panel. Saturday morning might be a good time for the business meeting. That way people who aren't interested in attending can sleep in without missing a panel.
6. A) No B) No
7. I did attend the business meeting. This having been my first time at the conference, I do not have much to compare with, but the general feeling seemed to be that there were more in attendance at the night one than when it was held in the morning. It seems though that a speaker at that time would be useful as well. Perhaps there is a way to have both a business meeting and a speaker in the final night since flight plans often seem to conflict with the morning one, but that would result in possibly losing a panel. Perhaps the best way to do it, especially since so many hung around later into the concluding reception, would be to have the business meeting, then have the speaker in the same room as the closing reception but have it be a shorter speech and have the speaker stick around during the closing reception for more chatting.
8. I attended
9. The business meeting worked well on Saturday. I was able to attend for the first time ever. Travel will always be difficult for me because of the ruralness of my campus. My hope is that the Saturday business meeting will be a regular feature of the conference now (although that might limit the plenary to one on Friday).
10. Did not attend.
11. did not attend
12. Attended. Saturday meeting much better attended than Sunday a.m.
13. I did not, but wish I had, and plan to in the future.

14. Didn't attend.
15. NA
16. I attended. Worked fine.
17. Yes; attended.
18. I attended and thought it was fine. No way to improve it as far as I can tell.
19. No. Yes. N/A
20. I did not attend but I wanted to. Travel plans came in the way of me attending. Could the business meeting perhaps happen first (when enthusiasm is high)?
21. Couldn't attend, though I wanted to.
22. Didn't attend. Not interested unless I become involved in the workings of the APT.
23. I did not attend the business meeting. Maybe rename it? "Business meeting" is very unappealing. That was not my reason for not attending it, but just a thought.
24. Yes. I've wanted to attend in the past, but holding in on Sunday mornings made that very difficult. I strongly support having it Saturday evening as we did this year.
25. Did not attend.
26. No
27. yes; Saturday business meetings are a good idea.
28. I did attend the meeting. Except for that we need to make sure next time that everyone knows who the candidates for governing committee are ahead of the meeting, I thought it went reasonably well, and I was glad to see that discussions for an updated website, publishing, and institutional/disciplinary outreach are starting. I like meetings to be more informal and observe a looser application of Robert's Rules, but the meeting did threaten to spin out of control at times, and I wonder whether if the meeting got any larger a looser approach would be unworkable. I liked having the meeting Saturday, though I was prepared for the Sunday meeting had the original schedule held. I just don't know how to incorporate a Saturday meeting into an already packed schedule without forcing people to choose between the meeting and the panels, or inserting the meeting between the end of the program and the closing reception. The latter I thought encouraged people to leave the campus to find food, drinks, and entertainment, and probably a number of them did not come back for the reception. Just throwing it out as a suggestion: what about going ahead and planning for a common dinner Saturday in the program, and having the business meeting during it/right after it? I can think of problems with the idea, but maybe considering it would encourage someone to come up with a more creative solution.
29. A) No. B) No, because it was my first time. C) N/A
30. A, yes I attended

31. I attended and thought it was very well-run, efficient. Thought the timing was very good.
32. I attended the business meeting, and I liked having it on Saturday night instead of on Sunday morning.
33. A and B: no
34. Did not attend.
35. A) Yes B) N/A C) No. But by attending the Bus Meeting I missed many colleagues who left early for dinner, and that was a real loss. Maybe move to Sunday?
36. NA
37. a. no b. no c. no
38. i did not make it.
39. I did not attend and feel quite guilty about it. You made it very accessible.
40. I attended the Business Meeting and thought it was scheduled at an appropriate time. I also attended the Foundations Business Meeting at APSA this year, and I have to say, there were about 20 people at that meeting; the APT Business Meeting attendance was comparatively very impressive.
41. No, no.
42. Did not attend - by the end of the meeting, I was too spent to attend another session.
43. No, I have a flight schedule that precluded attending. I have enjoyed the business meetings that I've been able to attend at earlier sessions.
44. I attended the very end and was impressed by the seriousness and lack of ego of the participants. I would suggest it replacing the Friday night plenary (someone suggested that at the business meeting). We should give a plug beforehand about the importance of participating in APT.
45. I did not attend.
46. no
47. Couldn't attend.
48. Did not attend.
49. I thought the biz meeting was fun and good.
50. No, but I am interested.
51. I did not attend the business meeting.
52. I attended.

53. Did not attend due to lack of interest and sense that more senior people should run the association. I will attend as soon as I land a tenure-track job.
54. didn't attend. i might if it involved a meal or drinks.
55. Didn't make it.
56. Yes. I thought the meeting was accessible. Perhaps we could do online elections in the future and use the meeting more for long term planning.
57. I did not attend the business meeting because I left Middletown right after the last panel.
58. Tell us what we would get out of it by participating. Is there committee work that needs to be done? Why do you want us to attend?
59. not really.
60. na
61. Yes. It was a very productive meeting.
62. did not attend
63. Nope, and nope. I was shocked at how many people went.
64. n/a
65. A) No. B) Did not thik about it. C) Explain its nature, role, and accessibilty in APT.
66. I did not attend the business meeting but would like to in the future.
67. A) Yes
68. I didn't attend the business meeting.

Are there any other suggestions that you would like to make for improving future conferences?

1. To organize panels according to general topics that are thought about after reviewing the available abstracts. It seemed to me that the general topics for panels were thought of before knowing what the presentations would be about and this made some be thrown into groups that would appear to have some commonalities, but in the end this was not the case.²
2. More/continued workshops on pedagogy. I realize this is a trade off, but I would prefer fewer papers on panels so that people can have *both* a decent amount of time to present and a lot of time for discussion. I think this would be worth the price of having more panels competing at the same time, if there's space to do that. I'm not sure if it would be worth significantly reducing the acceptance rate.
3. Hold it in places that are accessible by means of public transportation. The number of cars that ended up being rented for this year's conference was an economic and ecological scandal.
4. It is time to give serious thought to a journal coming out of the organization. I know we've discussed this.
5. More coherence on the individual panels.
6. I'd appreciate a slightly more accessible location. Even last year's conference was much easier to get to.
7. more panels. more ancient and medieval political thought. This conference seemed distinctly modern and postmodern.
8. Nothing specific come to mind, except to keep doing the things that are already done and make this an unusually successful conference: include graduate students in panels, allot considerable time for each paper/discussion, get papers online early, and -- last but not least -- a lot of socializing time with food and drinks. This really is a good combination of attributes that make this my favorite conference.
9. This is my first APT, so my only suggestion is what I said earlier (having the housing and the conference be either very close by or in the same hotel).
10. Yes, be sure to strategically locate the exhibit area relative to meeting rooms. The arrangement at Indiana, where coffee hours were held in the exhibit area, worked well, for example.

² The Program Committee does not determine panel topics beforehand, but rather tries to fashion coherent panels from a diverse set of proposals submitted months before the conference. Sometimes, this effort is not as successful as we hope, especially when completed papers end up exploring different areas than the original proposal—an authorial prerogative we are not sure we would or be able want to police.

11. I like events like the political theory run/walk and the duck pin bowling. Hope for more stuff like that in the future. (How about a theory poker tournament?)
12. Enhanced, or more convenient, book exhibit room.
13. [comment deleted]
14. slightly longer presentation times?
15. Keep it up! It was an excellent conference with some of the most serious discussion I have ever heard at an academic conference.
16. Keep the long blocks of time for meals and panels. It's crucial for the quality of the discussions at/about panels. Don't make the conference larger. Please. It's special, in part, because people can talk to one another, there's no (or little) star-worship, and everyone behaves like human beings. The larger it gets, the less this will be true.
17. More plenaries like Levy and Dean. They are youngish, very interesting, worth bringing the whole group together for. More panels like the Mills/Gomberg panel. Keep up the non-poli-sci recruitment aspect.
18. Dennis M. mentioned to me that there is some discussion of pre-publication manuscript workshops for first-time authors on the Thursday program. This is definitely an idea I'd like to see incorporated in future programs.
19. I would like to see a little more sensitivity to the overrepresentation of "political advocacy" talks. If advocacy is a significant part of Political Theory (as opposed to political philosophy), then I'd like to see much, much more diversity of opinion. If everyone doing advocacy in Political Theory agrees about for what to advocate (as seemed to me to be the case), then that seems a good reason to significantly reduce such advocacy.
20. [comment deleted]
21. think not just about topical cohesion in a panel, but also in broad approach: so, e.g., don't put a historian of political thought on the same panel as someone trying to develop a theory of contemporary phenomena
22. The conference still skews heavily to po-mo interpretive political theory. If it is really supposed to serve the whole community it would be good to invite some heavy hitting analytic types who continue to be underrepresented at the conference.
23. Just those mentioned.
24. If it ain't broke...
25. I understand why some would want to expand the size of the conference, but I think that it's relatively small size makes it easier for people to get to know each other (which is especially valuable for younger scholars like me). APSA and other large conferences just don't afford the same opportunities for dialogue, challenge, and growth.

26. Panels of 3 are much preferable. With 4 on the panel, it often happens that the discussant raises excellent questions for each presenter but there is no time for presenters to respond. (In general, I thought the quality of the discussants was extremely high.)
27. Start on Thursday afternoon so that there can be a few more panels.
28. In the two previous meetings, I repeatedly saw commentators punt on part or all of their responsibilities. But this time, panel after panel, the commentators were highly successful in helping to stimulate discussion of all the essays offered. From my standpoint, this is a return to the high standard achieved in the initial APT gatherings.
29. I thought Dennis's suggestion before the conference to limit time of presentations was excellent and it was generally followed. The result was the best conference yet (I have attended all six).
30. See above re. Registration.
31. more mixed panels--continental and normative philosophy together
32. Not really.
33. A planned party back at the hotel would be good, so people there on their own could socialize easily.
34. I would make fewer presentations and make them longer, still leaving at least an hour for discussion. I also thought the collaborative research session was not that helpful. The sessions on publishing were good in the past, and possibly some sessions tailored to graduate students--interviewing, job search, finishing the dissertation, etc.
35. Individuals thinking about attending a conference look at how stressful a conference weekend will be. Sending out innumerable e-mails about plans that constantly change is stressful for potential participants (and a disincentive to attend). Coordinating with people to get a ride from the airport was stressful (and a disincentive to attend).
36. The ride-share blog was an excellent idea. If possible, an arrangement like last year's (with hotel & conference facilities in the same place) is preferable.
37. I got the impression that most didn't read the papers ahead of time. Perhaps you could limit the # of words for papers -- some were 40+ pages.
38. Nope
39. Keep it reasonably selective!
40. Eating together is a good idea. Keep it.
41. One thing I noticed was that APT is very different from APSA. The differences in how people approach and conduct political theory research is apparent, where at APSA, the panels are more segregated. Also, one of the most interesting people I met was a historian of the French Revolution, Tip Ragan, so the conference was interdisciplinary as well and I would like to see more of that.

42. I thought that this meeting went very well. No complaints.
43. Overall, the conference was fabulous, so I hesitate to suggest any real improvements. Certainly everything around the panels and attendees was, from my point of view, flawless. The only things I can even think of would be logistical, and there, reasonable scholars can differ -- there's a tradeoff between charm and accessibility, for example. But the producers did a good job of mediating the logistical challenges, I thought.
44. Better logistics for travel and keeping panels in a central location so people do not have to trek all over.
45. No. I think it was overall a very effective and stimulating conference, with a good proportion of senior faculty and graduate students and a very good design (not too many panels, enough discussion etc.)
46. I think it is great to have a mixed level of papers, but I think there are too many graduate students who are not even at the dissertation stage - it is a bit frustrating to sit through so many of those types of papers. I think having graduate students is great - but perhaps there is a way to screen some papers a bit more or ask for more from your abstracts?³
47. With my teaching schedule and living on the West Coast, I have a hard time flying in for a Thursday conference (which means: Wed as a travel day, thus knocking out three weekdays). Perhaps scheduling most everything on a Friday and Saturday would help, especially for those who live three time zone away.

³ This year graduate students were asked about their status and expected date to completion in an effort to address this issue. We will continue this effort, while ensuring the diversity of rank and openness to graduate students that participants also appreciate.

Would you be interested in participating in future conferences? (Note: the positive answers come in two forms because this year we had several people who registered simply to attend the conference. We would like to gauge how much interest there is in attending the conference even when one is not on the program.)

Yes - but only if I were presenting a paper.	12.7%	10
Yes- if I were on the program in some capacity.	58.2%	46
Yes- even if I were not on the program.	21.5%	17
Probably- if I were on the program in some capacity.	3.8%	3
Probably- even if I were not on the program.	1.3%	1
Probably not.	0.0%	0
Definitely not.	0.0%	0
No opinion.	1.3%	1

Have you made use of the conference paper archive, or did you try to access it? If so, when did you first access or attempt to access the archive?

Yes - I used or attempted to use the archive before or during the conference. 50	64.1%
Yes - I used or attempted to use the archive after the conference. 8	10.3%
No - I haven't used the archive, but I intend to use it. 15	19.2%
No - I haven't used the archive, and I don't intend to. 5	6.4%

What do you think of the pre-circulation and archiving requirement? Should future conferences require pre-circulation and/or archiving?

1. It was adequate, yes future conferences I think should require pre-circulation, at least between the presenting members of a panel
2. I don't think that either is necessary. These are mostly works in progress and the value of the conference, for me, is in the conversations.
3. I think it's a good idea
4. excellent and necessary in order to generate highlevel of discussion, which is, after all, the point of a conference
5. It's good; keep it.
6. Keep it and strictly enforce it.
7. It's important to have given the duration of the talks. I think the program should continue to require pre-circulation. Additionally, I believe it adds to the quality of the papers.
8. [comment deleted]
9. They absolutely should! It was so convenient, especially with the wi-fi access that Wesleyan provided, to be able to go to a paper at any time and reference it. It is also great later to be able to go back and still access those papers.
10. It's important. It helps foster relationships begun at the conference and adds to the quality of discussion in the panel sessions.
11. Good stuff. Keep it.
12. I like this requirement.
13. good. Pre-conference deadline is good, although I noticed many still did not comply. yes to pre-circulation and archiving. Very good.
14. I like the requirement. It provides discussants enough time to review the works thoroughly (and tie them to the panel theme). Archiving is great for looking up papers after the conference (when one's interest is peaked by an author's presentation).
15. I was a bit slow in posting the paper, but I think it is a wonderful requirement. This compels people to write better papers, it also allows them to speak more casually when presenting, and it makes it easier for everyone else to know which papers they really want to hear, to have conversations with people whose papers they didn't hear, and can make for better conversations during the panels.
16. I like it a lot. It's a great way to share work in progress.
17. Pre-circulation is a good idea, but with so many papers very few people will read the papers in advance.

18. Both are useful for my purposes, as an acquiring editor for a publisher.
19. I'm fine with it.
20. Good idea, though hard to say how much difference it makes.
21. It's crucial for a good conference in my view.
22. [comment deleted]
23. yes!
24. Yes to both.
25. archiving, yes, but it seems unrealistic to expect folks to read many papers (if any) in advanceexcept for those form their on panels
26. I approve. Didn't manage to use the archive ahead of time at this conference, but I usually do.
27. Very good idea.
28. Absolutely. It's part of why the papers at APT are (often) of higher quality than at some other conferences we all attend. It also improves the discussions at the panels.
29. Yes, I think this is a good idea. Obviously it's tough to meet an even earlier deadline, but having papers available early facilitates conversation.
30. The pre-circ requirement is very important, and should be publicized even more. People should be encouraged to read the program in advance and download papers they want to discuss. Maybe we could add a comments function to the paper archive so that there would be an easy way after the conference to communicate with authors.
31. Yes to both, and we should continue to enforce the requirements strictly.
32. Yes, this seems like a very effective way of stimulating good conversation, without the time of reading full papers aloud.
33. I like the idea of pre-circulating. It gives us a chance to read the other papers and have more of a discussion. I wish that there would be a way of truly enforcing it, as some who did not bother with submitting their paper early tended to dominate the discussion.
34. Crucial requirement. Yes to both. I used the archive both before and after the conference. Seems to me that it is important for different reasons. Before: to ensure that papers are submitted in advance; AFTer: to enable people to read in full the papers of presentations they found interesting.
35. YES!
36. It's fine but I had problems accessing it after I uploaded my paper initially. I wanted to change my paper but couldn't figure out how to do it.

37. [comment deleted]
38. yes to both-a key part of the conference structure I think
39. It should ALWAYS be a requirement. Archiving as well, since I appreciate the chance to read papers after the conference when presentations were provocative.
40. It is a vital part of this conference. It is part of what makes the panels so excellent.
41. fine the way it is
42. I like pre-circulation. The conference is much stronger as a result.
43. Very good idea - I found it very helpful in deciding which panels to attend. One can only tell so much (often next to nothing) from a paper's title!
44. Good idea - keep the requirement that people post papers in advance
45. I continue to support this device, and it has made lots of arguments available to me that I would not have been able to experience otherwise. When my own schedule has let me work most in advance with essays, it has helped me seek out individual authors for specific conversations; and that is a highly useful dimension.
46. It's good. Yes.
47. Most people on my panel didn't get the paper in early. Why the rule?
48. GREAT
49. It is good. But it might be good to limit the length of papers to be submitted.
50. Yes, papers should be circulated in advance, but extenuating circumstances should be considered. It IS in the spirit of academia and scholarly work to accept preliminary findings. Sometimes you just cannot get over a certain point in the argument. Conferences should help scholars get over a research hurdle even in the absence of an actual paper.
51. Even though I was a bad citizen, I think it is a great requirement!
52. Yes. It sucks but it's good. Or, Good.
53. This is a very important part of the APT conference and it should definitely be maintained.
54. sure.
55. yes
56. Absolutely: pre-circulation AND archiving
57. Great requirement. I wish the people on the panel I discussed adhered to the deadline.
58. I think it's a great idea.

59. It's a great idea but we need to continue to be tolerant of those of us who can't find the time to read ahead.
60. My 2 cents. Keep the requirement. It is excellent.
61. Since APT started this requirement from its inception, people accept it. I think it works extremely well. It helps insure that papers come in on time, if nothing else.
62. Oh, yeah. I've just been caught up in stuff here, but there are at least four papers I'd like to read, and it seemed, at least to me, that the requirement committed presenters to developing their ideas more fully than at the regionals.
63. I thought pre-circulation is a good goal to strive for, however, sometimes I felt the organizers could be a bit militant about the "rules".
64. pre-circulation is important, archiving comes too close to publishing
65. I do not think this is necessary.
66. [comment deleted]
67. VERY important (my panel circulated papers beforehand via email, but one way or another is huge).

Please feel free to add any additional comments or suggestions that you may have here. Note: -If you would like to volunteer to serve on the Program Committee or the Chairs and Discussants Committee, please indicate your interest here (and add your name). -If you do not want any of your comments to appear in a summary of comments on the conference page website, please indicate here that you wish to restrict circulation of all your comments to Association officers. And thank you for your time!

1. Perhaps if people are going to be encouraged to read the papers prior to the conference their should be a suggested page limit.
2. delete
3. My book comes out at the end of summer 2009. Almost every chapter was vetted at APT. What this organization and conference has meant to my career is immeasurable. I'm deeply grateful to Dennis, Emily, Liz, Andy, and all the organizers over the years.
4. Many thanks for continuing to do this! I fully intend to get more actively involved, though probably not until I have tenure.
5. no restriction
6. Yes, I would like to serve on one of these committees. [name deleted]
7. Great conference!
8. I'd be happy to serve on the program committee or the chairs and discussants committee.
9. I may be interested in serving on the Program Committee; would welcome more info. Overall a very good conference!
10. [comment deleted]
11. I am a big fan of this conference - and a new convert to it. I'd be happy to serve on the Chairs and Discussants committee, should you need the help. [name deleted]
12. Feel free to call on me for committee work as it fits with my knowledge base: [name deleted]
13. The locals (host faculty) were wonderful when they participated here and in Ontario. Let's try to integrate them into the program where possible. Also, I think a hidden key to the success of the conference is the difficulty of escaping it :)
14. I don't mind my comments being posted anonymously.
15. Already volunteered for Program Committee.
16. [comment deleted]
17. I am not able to volunteer this year. feel free to include my comment.

18. I'd be interested in being on the Program Committee. Comments remain anonymous, right? If not, I'd rather they not be posted.
19. I would serve on the program committee-- [name deleted]
20. I'm happy to help on the chair and discussants committee again. Now that I know what the process entails I think I could be more helpful. [name deleted]
21. I would be delighted to serve on any of the committees. Let me know if you need me! [name deleted]
22. Chair or Discussant [name deleted]
23. You could contact [name deleted], who has expressed an interest in hosting a future APT.
24. Thanks!
25. [comment deleted]

Note: This section has been edited to remove the names of those volunteering to serve on one of the Program Committees. Four respondents requested that their comments be restricted to the Association's Officers; their requests have been honored in the above.