

Zoomerang Survey Results

2008 SLB Membership Survey

Response Status: Completes

Filter: No filter applied

Dec 09, 2008 12:38 PM PST

1. Are you a current member of SLB?

Yes	229	93%
No	18	7%
Total	247	100%

2. What is your current job title?

247 Responses

3. Did you attend the 2008 SLB Annual Meeting?

Yes	99	40%
No	149	60%
Total	248	100%

4. If you attended the 2008 Annual Meeting, please rate the following according to this scale: 1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Average, 4=Below Average, 5=Poor

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	1	2	3	4	5
Scientific Content	47 47%	38 38%	9 9%	5 5%	1 1%
Audio-visuals	29 29%	42 42%	21 21%	7 7%	1 1%
Poster Sessions	24 24%	43 44%	22 22%	8 8%	1 1%
Location	50 50%	27 27%	18 18%	4 4%	1 1%
Speakers	48 48%	40 40%	5 5%	6 6%	1 1%
Facilities and accommodations	48 48%	31 31%	12 12%	4 4%	4 4%
Meeting organization (flow of sessions, scheduling)	47 47%	34 34%	13 13%	2 2%	4 4%
Banquet	31 36%	35 41%	11 13%	5 6%	4 5%
Refreshments	48 48%	32 32%	8 8%	7 7%	5 5%

5. Would you favor moving the banquet to the penultimate night of the meeting?

Yes	136	64%
No	76	36%
Total	212	100%

6. Would you favor incorporating the business meeting into another session?

Yes	104	51%
No	98	49%
Total	202	100%

7. If you did NOT attend the 2008 Annual Meeting, why not?

Scheduling conflict	93	62%
Scientific content did not interest me	18	12%
Location was difficult to get to	11	7%
Registration fee was too high	12	8%
Destination was cost-prohibitive	17	11%
Other, please specify	26	17%

Response
attended other meetings same year
no travel funds available
Past unfairness in symposia selection criteria
Too many meetings that I need to attend already
didn't have sufficient data to submit for abstract
too many meetings, too little time
i could not
Company did not sponsor trip
My grants are at \$0
Too busy worrying about grants
budget cuts
Had other travel around same time - too much.
already attended two other meeting in 2008
Junior faculty focused on publishing
Too many meetings to make this a priority, from OS
limited finances to be used for various meetings
No \$\$\$
My position is largely administrative at this time
not enough time, not enough money
travel costs + meeting costs too high
our travel dollars were spent elsewhere
economic concerns
too many other meetings to attend last year
Not working within the field anymore
No active US visa

8. Additional comments on 2008 Annual Meeting

51 Responses

Response

Most of it was quite good. The price for a guest ticket to the banquet, \$125, was exorbitant considering it purchased a \$25 meal and you had to pay extra for wine. Quite a ridiculous sum.

The days are very long and it is difficult to stay alert, especially by Sunday afternoon. It might be good to have less talks and more posters. Or put the poster session in the middle of the day to allow people to get up and move around.

A good opportunity to learn something new about leukocyte biology and a good place to confront each other.

So, thanks for the opportunity! I hope I can attend the SLB meeting next year...

Please try not to schedule meetings during lunch

the mistakes in the program and scheduling made the society look sloppy. The communications from the central office were also pub-par. While in the end all info eventually was disseminated the inconsistencies were very unprofessional.

maybe forgo the banquet and lower the registration fee. Even though you get a "meal" inclusive, many people like to make their own eating arrangements.

N/A. Did not attend

The 8am to 8pm scheduling was a little intense
Excellent organization; excellent speakers; terrific venue

Overall the meeting in Denver was great, I was delighted to be part of it. Congratulations, and Thank you.

I didn't like the split screen format for the plenary sessions and the speakers having to use the computer mouse for their presentation (instead of a laser pointer) and I also found the simultaneous symposia distracting and difficult to get everything in that interests you

I liked the 2 for 1 registration fees

My only major complaint came in the pre meeting organization. Details about when and where talks would be, poster sessions as well as the lateness of notification of acceptance to present posters and talks. I also would have moved the awards banquet to another night earlier in the meeting.

none

No additional comments

It is difficult to travel for a meeting immediately after an NIH grant deadline (November 5). The cost of travel these days is high while research funding has not increased. I'd like to attend the annual meeting otherwise. The program seemed to be great.

The meeting rooms were really awkward with the dual screens and the speaker in between.

nice meeting~~~

Teaching

It was my first SLB conference and I enjoyed the scientific sessions. Organizers have done a good job.

Excellent meeting. Nice selection of scientific subjects, specially T reg and Th17.

Excellent organized, job well done.
The society needs to increase its size to recruit more people.

Great Scientific Session; great opportunity to network with colleagues (not too few, not too many people)

was surprised that extra tickets to the banquet were so expensive and it was still cash bar!!

Terrific!. Great meeting all around. Great talks, plenty of opportunity for interaction. Venue was excellent. Very well-organized.

The only think I thought was problematic was the large auditorium with two screens. I would really favor a room with one screen and the podium to one side. The wide/shallow room we had did not allow the speakers to really interact with the audience as they had to kepp their eyes on the computer screen to operate the mouse pointer.

If the poster workshop sessions were intended to generate extensive discussion it would be great to have slightly more time for presentation/questions/discussion. It is important that the presenter has time to bring everybody "on board" with some background before presenting the data to be able to generate more discussion afterward. The requested 10 minutes for the presentation seemed too short for this.

It was really well organized. However as the poster session was at the end of an already heavily scheduled day not many people were interested in looking at the poster. May be if it is scheduled sometime in the middle of the day there might be a better attendance

Great Meeting. Great food. Nice size for maximum interaction with others.

I would have liked to have the poster session earlier before the banquets. It would have been nice to have more seating. A lot of people including myself had to stand in the back of the room.

Good meeting!

The stage in Conference room A and B was not very conducive to the speaker - too wide. Also, it was very difficult finding vegetarian food in the banquet and receptions - it would help to take into account dietary restrictions of participants ahead of time, perhaps during registration itself. Thanks.

I found it annoying that the speakers in the plenary sessions had to use the mouse instead of a laser pointer.

N/A

The so-called banquet was a buffet. This was rather misleading. Though these are two French words, they are not interchangeable. Food at the buffet was good, but nothing more. Definitely not banquet grade. And no wine? In many meetings, that had to be a first. One or two bottles per table, and then pay as you go, would have been in order. Ah well.

improved scientific content
could use a better attendance

Good flow of meeting. One problem was that there was just not enough water during the breaks.

No

More diverse

Each annual meeting certainly should have its own thematic emphasis. However, key topics and themes should always be included in all meetings

Although the presentations differed in topic, the methods used in the studies were the same. I encourage future planners to consider including different approaches that are used to address both basic and applied leukocyte biology.

Also, for the presentations I attended, I observed that many of the papers cited (if not all) by the speakers were papers in journals other than the Journal of Leukocyte Biology.

Consider providing the poster abstracts prior to attendees before the meeting begins.

I also enjoyed the Alcohol symposium on the tail end of the meeting.

Overall the presentations were broad enough that they were useful to me. I applaud your inclusion of some farm species work in the presentation. There was a lot of good science. I enjoyed the meeting.

Congrats for the awesome organisation

Thanks for the warm and friendly welcoming
The quality and range of the scientific content was excellent.

Large meeting room was bad design. Should be deep not wide. 2 screens with speaker in the middle was annoying.

The meeting was great. Good job! Although the Dolph Adams award winner should give a more prominent talk if they are present. 24 people attended Dr. Bocarsly's talk for SLB this year. I think that that was not good. She did not mind, but I did.

It looked a very good programme but being based in the UK there are only so many I can get over to.

Ambiance was excellent and friendly; the welcome was warm

To offer more opportunity to introduce participants to each other

9. Suggestions for future Annual Meetings (locations, themes, content, et al)

72 Responses

Response

phagocytosis

have it in a warmer location...

cell adhesion and integrins of all leukocytes (neut, eos, monos); role of these in inflammation, especially allergic airway inflammation and asthma

Endogenous protein activators of leukocytes both positive and negative

Somewhere further south and warmer. Houston, Dallas, Atlanta?

The meeting was excellent. It is so nice to have big enough to see lots of science and small enough to "see" the science. Please include more T cells. As a T cell person, I barely fit in with the mission of the science as it currently occurs. T cells are leukocytes too!

Rio, Brazil.

I hope the organization of the future meeting will shape up even better!

I would favour a longer meeting with no simultaneous symposia and a longer break in the middle to re-charge the brain

New York

themes: innate immunity and cancer

I thought the quality of speakers and the breadth of subject as well as the personality of the meeting was outstanding. It was nice to find a group open and interested in new ideas that are supported by good research.

Ottawa, Canada

no suggestions

Look forward to the joint meeting in Lisbon. It is nice to have an international location once in 3 years. If the annual meeting continues to be in late fall (like this time), then some warm locations will be nice. We may go back to Charleston SC or Tucson AZ as we did many years ago. The contents of recent meetings have been great.

Chicago

For themes and content I would suggest platelets and immune function. This is a new and exciting area.

San Antonio, Trauma

If there is an option, it would be nice to have the translational research session on the 2nd day not on the final day and final session

Canadian cities should be included

Vancouver, more Th-17 and Treg. It would be interesting to add a theme on negative regulation of inflammatory responses

Theme should be on Microbial Pathogenesis

Location should be in Los Angeles, California

East Coast????

We should try Maui again. That was 2001 and there were too few people there.

theme: inflammation

New York City

This year's meeting was great because, in part, there were some new areas represented. We need to keep new content on the agenda, not just the same stuff and same speakers. This year there were new topics and new faces, which was really refreshing. Let's keep up that trend!

It should be somewhere in USA, so that we can attend.

European locations

Themes: Cell adhesion and migration, Neutrophils and diseases

hold more sessions about calcium, ROS signaling in leukocytes

to do joint meetings like next year in Portugal ist a great idea

session on leukocyte cellular immune monitoring of disease status and therapeutic interventions

Tri-State area

Focus the meeting around innate immunity and a disease process e.g. infection, arthritis, autoimmunity, inflammatory bowel disease, etc. Locations could include large cities (San Francisco, Miami, Seattle, Boston, Denver) as well as more small scale locations (NC, SC beach areas, Napa, New England (during leaf season) etc.

Locate centrally as in Chicago

innate immune functions or adaptive immune cells.

Kansas City or the Twin Cities

Orlando, FL

Location was quite a distance from the airport. Perhaps having more focused sessions based on organs may be good - for example, the aging session and the lung session were quite focused.

More content on lymphocytes, interaction between adaptive and innate immunity

I hope to be able to attend!

I think they are OK

I would like to see more on virus infections and maybe vaccines

More European locations. Three times in a row in the US was too much.

Los Angeles

Signaling

Stem cells

Autoimmunity

Northeast (e.g., Phil, NY, Balt, Wash, Boston--convenient for many)

Cell signaling in innate immunity

Immunology of pregnancy/neonatal

Cambridge, again. Great meeting and excellent location.

Canada -- Ottawa or Toronto

Encourage more diverse species models - not just mice and humans.

No

Diseased leukocytes

location: Berlin / Germany

Urban areas that are easily accessible by air

Give consideration to the attractiveness of the meeting site (with limited funding, things to swing people in favor of attending this meeting over the larger meetings is necessary).

Please consider inviting me as a Plenary Speaker or Symposium Chairperson so I may attend.

tissue-innate cell interactions provided a broader perspective to the function of the innate system, more closely approaching physiological conditions of innate immune function. This is in sharp contrast to previous meetings that tended to focus on single receptors on isolated cell types.

All the best for even better meetings

As a european member of SLB, I appreciate occasional meetings in Europe

east coast + keep meetings in the continental US

New Orleans, Boston, Chicago

regulation of immune signalling,
osteoimmunology

I have already proposed a session on fungal infection and defense for the Portugal 2009 meeting

Barcelona, Madrid

It is urgent to improve the quality of scientific presentations (either speakers or posters).

Macrophage-center biology, as a traditional theme.

Denver is a fine one

Although historically the Society was strongly oriented to the neutrophil and the macrophage as prototypic innate immune cells, there is already growing attention to other cell types as lymphocytes. I would suggest to dedicate some scientific session to adaptive immunity.

seattle, new york, san Francisco, t cells, stem cells

genetics of inflammation/immunity

Pattern recognition receptors in the host response

Location : Boston

include or allow more time for presenting the review lecture or current understandings

would include more than neutrophils oriented topics, more talks focused on tissue environment and immune cell interactions (ECM and immune cells interaction, endothelium and leukocyte interaction)

10. If you are a CURRENT SLB MEMBER, please reply to the remaining questions. When in your career did you originally join SLB?

Student	39	17%
Post-Doc	56	24%
Professional	137	59%
Total	232	100%

11. How many years have you been a member of SLB?

Less than 1	45	19%
5-Feb	80	34%
10-May	49	21%
More than 10	59	25%
Total	233	100%

12. What was your PRIMARY reason for joining SLB?

Networking	91	38%
Career Advancement	34	14%
Less Expensive Registration Fees at Annual Meeting	23	10%
Education	62	26%
Other, please specify	27	11%
Total	237	100%

13. How well has your membership met your expectations?

Very well	48	21%
Well	118	51%
Somewhat	57	25%
Very little	7	3%
Not at all	2	1%
Total	232	100%

14. How important are these benefits to you? (1=Very Important, 2=Somewhat Important, 3=Not At All Important)

	1	2	3
Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.			
Journal of Leukocyte Biology	170 72%	52 22%	14 6%
Annual Meeting	105 44%	111 47%	20 8%
Networking	122 52%	92 39%	19 8%
Newsletter	33 14%	138 60%	58 25%
Scientific Content of Society Meetings	150 65%	67 29%	13 6%
Opportunities for Student Presentations	106 46%	87 38%	37 16%
Web Site	53 23%	130 57%	47 20%

15. How well is SLB meeting your expectations for these same benefits? (1=Very Well, 2=Somewhat, 3=Poorly)

	1	2	3
Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.			
Journal of Leukocyte Biology	147 70%	55 26%	7 3%
Annual Meeting	100 49%	84 41%	20 10%
Networking	73 36%	109 54%	19 9%
Newsletter	39 20%	121 61%	38 19%
Scientific Content of Society Meetings	89 44%	93 46%	20 10%
Opportunities for Student Presentations	84 43%	95 49%	16 8%
Web Site	45 23%	118 59%	36 18%

16. Is the quarterly frequency of iSLB (electronic newsletter) sufficient?

Yes	205	90%
No, too much	13	6%
No, too little	12	5%

17. Please check those features you'd like included on SLB's Web Site:

List Serves	67	30%
Job Postings	153	70%
News of Other Societies' Meetings	140	64%
Ability to Change Your Own Database Information	101	46%
Electronic Newsletter (versus Printed Newsletter)	134	61%
On-line Journal Club	85	39%
Other, please specify	10	5%

18. What are the most effective ways for SLB to communicate to you? (Check all that apply)

Newsletter	62	26%
Quarterly elcetriconic newsletter	98	42%
Weekly Emails	26	11%
Monthly Emails	132	56%
Other, please specify	4	2%

19. Are you willing to serve on an SLB Committee or Task Force?

Yes	79	39%
No	125	61%
Total	204	100%