

Zoomerang Survey Results

2011 SLB

Annual Survey

Response Status: Completes

Filter: No filter applied

Oct 19, 2011 10:50 AM PST

1. Are you a current member of the society?

Yes

No

SLB Membership Survey

2. When in your career did you originally join SLB?

Student

Post-Doc

Professional

Total

3. What is your current job title?

114 Responses

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

Less than 1

5-Feb

10-May

More than 10

Total

5. What was your PRIMARY reason for joining SLB?

Interest in Leukocyte Biology

Networking

Career Advancement

Less Expensive Registration Fees at Annual Meeting

Education

Other, please specify

Total

6. How well has your membership met your expectations?

Very well

Well

Somewhat

Very little

Not at all

Total

7. How important are these benefits to you?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

Very important

Journal of Leukocyte Biology	71%
Annual Meeting	64 55%
Networking	59 52%
Newsletter/iSLB	22 19%
Scientific Content of Society Meetings	86 75%
Opportunities for Student Presentations	51 45%
Web Site	21 19%

8. How well is SLB meeting your expectations for these same benefits?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option. **Very well**

Journal of Leukocyte Biology	85 73%
Annual Meeting	70 61%
Networking	55 49%
Newsletter/iSLB	44 39%
Scientific Content of Society Meetings	66 57%
Opportunities for Student Presentations	62 57%
Web Site	46 42%

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

Newsletter/iSLB
Quarterly electronic newsletter
Weekly Emails
Monthly Emails
Other, please specify

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

Yes

No

Total

iSLB - SLB's quarterly electronic newsletter

11. When you receive the iSLB newsletter, do you read it?

Yes

No

Total

12. Is the quarterly frequency of iSLB sufficient?

Yes

Too much

Too little

Total

13. Do you find the content provided in the iSLB newsletter informative and useful?

Yes

No

Total

14. What additional information would you like to see in the iSLB newsletter? Please provide at least one.

25 Responses

JLB/e-JLB

15. Do you like the editorials associated with highlighted articles in JLB?

always survey these

read on occasion

do not look at these

do not think JLB should have these

Total

16. Are you interested in the new feature JLB has added of publishing Technical Advance articles?

Yes

No

Total

17. What suggestions do you have for the Editorial Team to improve JLB?

26 Responses

18. Would you like to see added features to the e-JLB format such as more hotlinks to supplemental data, re

Yes

No

Total

19. Does receiving the emailed Table of Contents (eTOC alert) increase or decrease your interest to interact

Increase

Decrease

Total

SLB Meetings and Future Events

20. Did you attend the 2011 SLB Meeting in Kansas City, MO?

Yes

No

Total

21. If you did NOT attend the 2011 SLB Meeting, what was the main reason?

Scheduling conflict

Scientific content did not interest me

Location was difficult to get to

Registration fee was too high

Destination was cost-prohibitive

Other, please specify

Total

22. Would you attend a future SLB conference event?

Yes

No

Total

23. For SLB Awards, in your opinion, is it more important the society provides more awards of a lesser dollar amount?

More awards, smaller dollar amount

Larger dollar amount, fewer awards

Total

24. Would you be interested in participating in webinars offered throughout the year on various topics such as issues etc.?

Yes

No

Total

25. The Theme for the 2013 meeting is Regulators of Innate Cell Plasticity. Do you have session topics or speakers? Please provide your input below.

31 Responses

2011 SLB Annual Meeting

26. What category below best describes you and your participation at the conference?

Student/Post-Doc
Academia
Industry
Government
Exhibitor/Sponsor
Other, please specify
Total

27. Please rate the following:

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Excellent
Scientific Content	51 50%
Poster Sessions	21 20%
Location	15 14%
Speakers	46 45%
Meeting Facilities	53 51%
Meeting Organization	55 53%
Opening Reception	43 44%
Social Mixer	49 53%

2011 Special Sessions

28. If you attended the Grant Writing Workshop, please rate this session on the following.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Excellent
---	-----------

Organization	17
	49%
Value	19
	54%
Informative	19
	54%

29. What feedback do you have for the Professional Development Committee and do you have any suggestions for improvement?

21 Responses

30. If you attended the Women and Diversity Townhall Session, please rate this session on the following.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option. **Excellent**

Organization	21
	75%
Value	20
	71%
Informative	19
	70%

31. What feedback do you have for the Women and Diversity Committee and do you have any suggestions for improvement?

12 Responses

Abstracts

32. Did you find the complimentary internet access sufficient to allow you to utilize the online abstract viewi

Yes

No

Total

33. Would you prefer printed abstract books to still be available for purchase at the 2012 meeting?

Yes

No

Total

34. Would you like to see an App available for viewing the meeting schedule and abstracts on portable devi

Yes

No

Total

Accommodations

35. While in Kansas City, where did you stay?

Westin Crown Center (meeting venue)

Local, commute

Other, please specify

36. How would you rate your accommodations?

Excellent

Good

Average

Poor

Total

37. Other comments regarding the 2011 SLB Conference:

30 Responses

3. What is your current job title?

Respondent #

Response

- 1 Professor
- 2 professor
- 3 Graduate Student
- 4 Postdoctoral Fellow
- 5 instructor
- 6 Post-Doc
- 7 Assistant Professor
- 8 Research Assistant II
- 9 professor
- 10 Senior Director
- 11 Professor
- 12 Assistant Professor
- 13 Associate Professor
- 14 Postdoctoral research associate
- 15 Postdoctoral Research Scholar
- 16 Graduate Student
- 17 Professor
- 18 Post doctoral Fellow
- 19 Student
- 20 Principal Scientist
- 21 PhD student
- 22 Professor of Biology
- 23 Graduate Student

24 graduate assistant
25 Professor
26 Professor
27 Graduate Student
28 Postdoctoral Fellow
29 Associate Professor
30 student
31 Professor
32 Professor
33 Associate Professor
34 Professor
35 Professor
36 RTS III
37 senior scientist
38 Graduate research assistant
39 Associate Professor
40 Research Fellow (post-doc)
41 PhD Graduate Student
42 Assistant Professor
43 Professor and Vice Chair
44 assistant professor
45 Research associate professor
46 PhD candidate
47 Professor
48 Associate Professor
49 Graduate Student
50 PhD student researcher
51 senior investigator and research coordinator

52 Research Microbiologist
53 Group leader
54 Research Scientist
55 Professor
56 Senior Research Scientist
57 Graduate student
58 Associate research scientist
59 Clinical Research Fellow
60 Professor
61 Principal research scientist
62 Graduate Research Fellow
63 Post doctoral Research associate
64 Chair and Professor
65 post-doc
66 research assistant professor

67 Research Fellow
68 Group Leader
69 Head Preclinical Research
70 Assistant Professor
71 PostDoct
72 Assistant Professor
73 Professor, Division Director
74 student
75 Graduate Research Associate
76 Associate Dean for Research and Professor
77 Professor
78 Investigator
79 Professor
80 Professor
81 Assistant professor
82 Professor of Immunology
83 Professor
84 group leader
85 Associate Professor
86 post doc
87 Prof
88 Visiting Fellow / Post-Doc
89 Associate Professor
90 PhD candidate
91 professor
92 Assistant Professor
93 Professor
94 Graduate Fellow
95 Assistant Professor
96 Professor
97 Professor
98 Senior Professor
99 Group leader
100 professor
101 Professor and Chief of Infectious Diseases
102 Master of Teaching and Research (team leader)

103 Professor
104 Assoc. Prof.
105 Professor and Chairman of Pathology
106 Professor
107 Professor
108 PI
109 Associate Professor

- 110 Senior Lecturer
- 111 Professor Head of research
- 112 Senior vice president for drug development (retired)
- 113 Professor of microbiology
- 114 Laboratory Head

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

Respondent #	Response
	1 email every other month
	2 website

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

Respondent #	Response
	1 Nemani V. Prasadarao
	2 Liwu Li
	3 Manuel Galvan, Ph.D. galvanm@iupui.edu
	4 shashi bala, Ph.D department of medicine, UMass Medical School, worcester, ma-01605
	5 Mark L. Hanke Post Doctoral Research Associate University of Nebraska Medical Center Department of Pathology and Microbiology 985900 Nebraska Medical Center Durham Research Center II, Rm 7066 Omaha, NE 68198-5900 (402) 559-7623 mark.hanke@unmc.edu
	6 Joshua Obar joshua.obar@montana.edu 406-994-5667
	7 Mark Quinn, mquinn@montana.edu
	8 Mallary Greenlee-Wacker (mallary-greenlee@uiowa.edu)
	9 Douglas B. Kuhns dkuhns@mail.nih.gov
	10 Ulrike Lambertz lambertz@interchange.ubc.ca phone: +16048754348
	11 M. R. Richardson mrrichardson@nccu.edu
	12 Rahul Mittal ramittal@chla.usc.edu
	13 I am serving as a committee member
	14 chunmei long longx316@umn.edu
	15 Richard Tapping, Ph.D. Associate Professor Dept. of Microbiology, University of Illinois B103 CLSL, MC110 601 S. Goodwin Ave. Urbana, IL 61801 email: tapping@illinois.edu Ph 217 244-7940 Fx 217 244-6697
	16 Charlotte VInes
	17 I am already serving.

- 18 Graduate student development
- 19 Miki Rahat, already serving in the website committee
- 20 Michael H. Kogut, Ph.D. Research Microbiologist
Southern Plains Agricultural Research Center
2881 F&B Road College Station, TX 77845 979-260-3772 (office) 979-260-9332 (fax) 979-452-2031 (Blackberry) mike.kogut@ars.usda.gov
- 21 David Fast david.fast@accessbusinessgroup.com
- 22 Catherine Ong (c.ong09@imperial.ac.uk) Clinical Research Fellow Imperial College London
- 23 Thomas J. Rogers, Ph.D. Temple University
rogerst@temple.edu
- 24 Shalaka Metkar shalakametkar@yahoo.com
- 25 Already on council, Dan Remick
- 26 Marie Benoit, Ph.D. Dept. Molecular Biology & Biochemistry 2419 McGaugh Hall University of California, Irvine, CA 92697 Tel: (949) 824-3266 Fax: (949) 824-8551 Email: mbenoit@uci.edu
- 27 Melanie Scott scottm@upmc.edu
- 28 Oscar M. Pello oscarpello@cnic.es
- 29 Anne Pereira Email: anne-pereira@ouhsc.edu
- 30 carol Miller-graziano carol_miller-graziano@urmc.rochester.edu 585-275-4611
- 31 Guoshun Wang, DVM, PhD Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center Department of Microbiology and Immunology CSRB 642, 533 Bolivar Street New Orleans, LA 70112, USA
- 32 Tonya Webb twebb@som.umaryland.edu
- 33 Andrew Taylor, PhD Boston University School of Medicine Department of Ophthalmology 72 E Concord St Boston, MA 02116 617-638-4525 awtaylor@bu.edu
- 34 David M. Mosser
- 35 domenico mavilio
- 36 Laurie Kilpatrick, PhD
laurie.kilpatrick@temple.edu
- 37 Gernot Zissel, PhD Associate Professor University Medical Centre Freiburg Div. of Pneumology Hugstetter. Str. 55 79106 Freiburg Germany +49-761-270 74360 +49-177-2773098 +49-761-270 37120 gernot.zissel@uniklinik-freiburg.de

38 Vito Pistoia, already member of the Editorial Board of the JLB

13. Do you find the content provided in the iSLB newsletter informative and useful?

Respondent #

Response

- 1 When I do read it.
- 2 I am not sure that I'm on the mailing list. I just checked my mailbox and do not see any copies.
- 3 somewhat
- 4 Very useful when I take the time to read it!
- 5 but I don't actually remember what was in the last one!
- 6 Really can't answer, since I never read it.
- 7 Most of my research program is focused on topics other than leukocyte biology.
- 8 I try to find some insights into the society as I am not regularly attend the meetings

14. What additional information would you like to see in the iSLB newsletter? Please provide at least one.

Respondent #

Response

- 1 Information about upcoming meetings in related fields
- 2 Perhaps a hot-topics section with suggestions for one or two "must reads" recently published - may be in JLB or possibly other journals. People may be able to vote from the website.
- 3 It is fine.
- 4 results of the annual meeting
- 5 More oppurtunities for jobs
- 6 Highligh breakthrough journal articles
- 7 Unsure
- 8 see #13.
- 9 It is ok, just too long
- 10 n/a
- 11 information on other meetings, especially those supported by SLB.
- 12 n/a
- 13 Usually don't read it as I ahve to take time to go and open the file - would be easier if important info was in the email with links to the stories if i want to read them.

- 14 There was some nice historical perspective features in the last JLB. What about some sort of regular historical feature in every iSLB edition - I think this would be really interesting to many readers, and history teaches us a lot!!
- 15 technical note
- 16 n/a - I don't read the newsletter.
- 17 other society up coming meetings
- 18 it is fine for me
- 19 Position announcements
- 20 could have a classified section for PIs to list open positions for post-docs
- 21 High impact papers, most cited or most frequently downloaded
- 22 Job opportunities Methods
- 23 no idea
- 24 Update on the availability of grant support for laboratory research.
- 25 none

17. What suggestions do you have for the Editorial Team to improve JLB?

Respondent #

Response

- 1 I think JLB has made some nice improvements in the last few years - I really enjoy the big reviews. Perhaps a special issue dedicated to the inflammasome would spark some interest.
- 2 stringency
- 3 already great
- 4 More articles on bacterial pathogenesis
- 5 Can't think of any
- 6 I enjoy reading the JLB.
- 7 More reviews and science, less editorials.
- 8 n/a
- 9 I still need the hard copy to be reminded to read it!
- 10 None at this time.
- 11 e-JLB s not so necessary, but the eTOC is crucial!

- 12 The editorials are a great new feature. It would be great to have the choice to download the main pdf of the article and supplementary text/figure files in a single pdf. I understand this is not possible for videos or arrays but a single pdf file allows to have all the readable info in a single place. This can then be stored easily in softwares like EndNote or Papers. How about an iPad App for eJLB?
- 13 Nothing particular
- 14 I'd like to see some papers regarding effects of natural compounds on inflammation
- 15 n/a
- 16 I use the e-JLB and dont like the zoom feature- does not allow you to choose the different levels of zoom
- 17 Like the summary of the paper that is now included with the title.
- 18 It's going very well I think. Targeting reviews in hot areas of leukocyte biology is always a good option.
- 19 Editing is very good. I have no idea how to improve it.
- 20 none
- 21 Include more clinically oriented papers
- 22 short reports as BLOOD
- 23 consider quicker open access publishing
- 24 We must continue to attract the top scientists in this field.
- 25 none
- 26 none

18. Would you like to see added features to the e-JLB format such as more hotlinks to supplemental data, references?

Respondent #

Response

- 1 Supplemental data
- 2 Supplemental Data & References, also supplemental methods when necessary
- 3 Links to supplemental data; links to vendors of particular reagents used in studies
- 4 hotlinks to references would be really nice! Also, I would love to get an SLB subscription for my kindle!!!
- 5 supplemental data
- 6 hotlinks to supplemental data
- 7 I never look at eJLB
- 8 hotlinks to supplemental data
- 9 hotlinks to references/supplemental data

- 10 Anything that makes reading faster/easier.
- 11 Supplemental data, references hotlinks
- 12 supplementary material references (full text when possible)
- 13 Hot links for supp figures/videos would be great.
- 14 easy access to supplemental data and links to references
- 15 hotlinks to supplemental material would be great for all journals
- 16 links to supplemental data
- 17 Both of supplemental data and references.
- 18 links to supplements and references would be helpful
- 19 supplemental data
- 20 Hot links to supplemental data
- 21 Don't know
- 22 Reference links in the discussion to the reference page of the manuscript, or links to Pubmed from the references.
- 23 supplemental data and more detailed methods

21. If you did NOT attend the 2011 SLB Meeting, what was the main reason?

Respondent #	Response
	1 overall, I cannot afford to go every year
	2 had already attended two other mtgs in 2011
	3 family needs
	4 Same stuff, over and over. Same speakers, too few speakers. Meeting is a closed society of the same folks.
	5 Already invited to plenty of conferences; most of my research program focuses on topics other than leukocytes
	6 personal matters needed attention
	7 Grant expiration

24. Would you be interested in participating in webinars offered throughout the year on various topics such as time management, gender and diversity issues etc.?

Respondent #	Response
	1 Also, general management skills might be interesting.
	2 How to find a post-doc Networking Time management
	3 More professional development topics like grant writing, improving CV, Job opportunities

- 4 career advice, particularly for "post-postdoc" scientists
- 5 how to negotiate, grantsmanship
- 6 Working with T cells in animal models.
- 7 Gender and diversity issues, how to write grants, how to prepare a good manuscript, etc.
- 8 great idea!
- 9 Technical advances Translational research-new findings Overview of new developments
- 10 Grant writing
- 11 Great idea. My home institution fills this need, but SLB would be generous to distribute critical professional development advice via the web.
- 12 how to read your NIH pink sheet
- 13 Maybe

25. The Theme for the 2013 meeting is Regulators of Innate Cell Plasticity. Do you have session topics or speakers you feel would enhance this meeting? Please provide your input below.

Respondent #	Response
	1 systems regulation of macrophage differentiation and skewing
	2 Stephen Galli
	3 Mast cells and their regulation
	4 Ralph Snyderman
	5 cell signaling
	6 Mina Bissel as one of the speakers
	7 I focus more on adaptive immunity.
	8 I think the theme is too specific.
	9 n/a
	10 Rebecca O'brien? M. Bonneville?
	11 Peter J. Murray, St. Jude Research Hospital, Memphis
	12 how the microenvironment shape macrophage plasticity/polarity (including hypoxia and interactions with other cell types).
	13 Dr. Iketa, Kobe University, Japan
	14 n/a
	15 Try inviting different speakers for a change.
	16 Probably can answer this later

17 A session on autophagy would be particularly timely I think. There are a number of impressive researchers in the innate immunity/autophagy field. I have heard Vojo Deretic speak a few times, and he is very good. Beth Levine is another option - I have not heard her speak, but I'm sure she would be good. One other point - at the Kansas city meeting, all of the award winners spoke twice. I'm not sure that this is a particularly sensible idea for the winners of the junior awards, as they often have only one strong story to present. So they ended up giving two very similar talks. I don't think this does anyone any favours - the speakers or the audience. It also reduces the opportunity for others who have put in abstracts for talks. My suggestion would be to give 2 talks to only the winners of the senior awards.

18 Oliver Soehnlein from Germany Marco Cassatella from Italy. It will be nice to give these speakers the chance for a 30 min talk.

19 no idea

20 no

21 I am the organizer

22 How pathogens can negatively influence Innate immune response...

23 no

24 canada, QC

25 Steven M. Albelda at U Penn on PMN phenotype would be interesting

26 IL-13's role in promoting an anti-inflammatory environment.

27 Epigenetic in innate immune cells

28 1. tissue cell interactions in regulating innate cell differentiation. e.g. retinal pigment epithelial cell induction and maintenance of myeloid suppressor cell-like functionality in retinal microglial cells.

29 Role of macrophage plasticity in infectious diseases

30 Dynamics of biofilms in host defenses.

31 no

26. What category below best describes you and your participation at the conference?

Respondent #

Response

1 Government contract

2 Program Chair

3 non-profit research - medical center

29. What feedback do you have for the Professional Development Committee and do you have any suggestions for future programming?

Respondent #

Response

- 1 I strongly feel that the SLB should invite more speakers from diverse fields and divide the sessions into three or four groups. Several of the talk in SLB 2011 are repetitive. Moreover, the number of members attended the meeting is very low, so it is better to additional areas to increase sessions.
- 2 Too much time spent on introduction to Grants/Different Funding Mechanisms. Officer from NIH was given no time to talk but managed to give a few words of wisdom and insights to the NIH, more time for her would have been helpful.
- 3 It seemed to be more geared to someone that new nothing about the NIH as a funding agency and less on how to write a grant. More generality about how to write Specific Aims, etc would be helpful.
- 4 Mentoring
- 5 Grants available from non-government institutions
- 6 Bring back the meet the speaker event for graduate students/post docs or related opportunity.
- 7 It was a pity the grant writing workshop was exclusively on NIH grants. So very little value for non-US scientists. Maybe this could be made more general or at least announced in advance.
- 8 I really enjoyed the one-on-one interaction at the grant writing workshop, mentorship workshop, and the social. The talks seemed to drag on during the last day in the final session.
- 9 Please increase the duration and include more people from NIH who reviews the grants.
- 10 Excellent keynote speaker. Good format. Need more time for questions
- 11 I enjoyed the grant writing workshop. We might try to have oppo
- 12 Presentation time was too long and slides were too wordy. Table discussion was terrific.

- 13 I didn't attend, but a grant writing workshop is very worthwhile. Repeat it with updates?
- 14 Some cultural event or an excursion would better bring the people together. The plenary lecture speakers (some) should avoid abbreviations and take into account that not all in the auditorium are experts in this particular field.
- 15 maybe have 2 separate sections, one for students, etc. that know very little about the process and one for experienced students/post docs, etc. that know the basics already
- 16 Keep up the good work.
- 17 the presentation was too long and so time for discussion was too short
- 18 I like what they are doing and it is good to have continuing educational content from the society
- 19 Please see previous comment about double up of talks for junior award winners. My recommendation would be to give only 1 talk to junior award winners.
- 20 Need more NIH program input to ensure most up to date info
- 21 More time.

31. What feedback do you have for the Women and Diversity Committee and do you have any suggestions for future programming?

Respondent #

Response

- 1 It was well-attended and I really enjoyed it.
- 2 Networking sessions
- 3 This is the best session that we had. I met a couple of valuable contacts and expanded my network. I also learned a new philosophy about treating my life like a GPS.
- 4 Speaker was outstanding!!
- 5 Keep up the great work!
- 6 I did not attend this session, but I think it was because I did not understand what it was about. From the title, I assumed it was about minority women groups in science- NOT for women in general. I was only explained that this was the case afterwards, and I was very sorry I missed it. Please make this clearer for next year, because people like me would love to go!
- 7 In addition to Diversity speaker, have breakout sessions at each table with a few senior investigators to have more private discussions and personalized mentorship.

- 8 I really enjoyed Sharon's talk, it hit on many of the major issues and was very pertinent
- 9 I liked the presentation but the scientific data presented at that time were not really necessary for this Women and Diversity Committee especially because they were absolutely not related to the topic (though science was really good)
- 10 Also like these sessions although was unable to attend
- 11 would be greate to have more accent on the women career as the way for the one's selfrealisation
- 12 networking socials

35. While in Kansas City, where did you stay?

Respondent #	Response
	1 Savoy
	2 Hyatt
	3 Hyatt

37. Other comments regarding the 2011 SLB Conference:

Respondent #	Response
	1 I want to see a variety of speakers talking at SLB instead of repetiting the same talks. I also feel that SLB should incorporate infectious diseases and leukocytes in the sessions.
	2 Program was odd. Did not understand why some persons gave their presentation twice. Only presenting once would have opened slots for other persons. Would have prefered a larger conference room with tables and only on center screen for presenting that is elevated so the whole screen can be seen from everywhere in the room, not just the front rows. Coffee breaks were too short and offered no time for real discussion only enough time for bathroom breaks and waiting in the coffee line. Would have liked a afternoon off or some free time to visit the area or meet with other attendees.

- 3 The last day, especially the second half of the day was poorly attended because the majority of people had already left because you couldn't catch a flight out that day and make it to those sections. Food at the Social mixer wasn't very good. More diversity of speakers, seemed a bit heavy on monocyte/macrophage biology.
- 4 I was disappointed in the membership of SLB for not supporting the meeting. As a result the chance for networking was poor. I hope that the society was not hurt financially as a consequence. I am sure that everyone will raise their hand to go to Maui next year. I thought that we went to meetings first for science before considering location. Next year SLB and IRA are at similar but not overlapping times. Other than location, the society should ask how they can compete with IRA for participants. Based on the 2011 meeting, I assume that SLB will win based on location. I am pleased with the outline of topics for the 2012 meeting.
- 5 Would suggest that student/post-doc awardees only present once during the meeting. There were several instances where individuals were giving the same talk twice, which was not time-effective. The breaks should be extended to 30 min. since some sessions ran long and extended into the break. It was difficult to visit/network with such a limited break time.
- 6 I think more effort should be made by some session chairs to remain on schedule - in particular for the concurrent sessions. I also think that at future meetings there should NOT be duplicate selected talks
- 7 Better logistics for travel. The timing of airlines was such that many participants missed the last session because of the restraints of air travel. Is there a way to end the session earlier to accommodate the travelers trying to return the same day?
- 8 The contents did not quite reflect what the title implied. I would have liked to see more talks and presentations on infection and pathogen-host interactions.
- 9 Power needs to be supplied to vendors. Shipment of instruments, etc for vendors from dock to ballroom should be conducted by SLB and not charged for through hotel.

- 10 Please have more sessions on bacterial pathogenesis. Some of the sessions were repetitive. For postdocs there should be more opportunities to interact with other scientists. Regarding food, please have more vegetarian options
- 11 Enjoyed the meeting
- 12 Excellent meeting Only 2 suggestions: dont have award winners talk twice Please more or longer breaks for exchange (also at posters after talks)
- 13 Excellent job with one exception: speakers failed to stay on schedule. Luke O'Neil should never be invited to speak again. He may feel that his work & ideas trump those of others, but he's sorely mistaken. Being smart & entertaining doesn't make rudeness acceptable.
- 14 It was unclear to me why some individuals were asked to speak twice. I would have preferred that other individuals were given the opportunity to speak instead.
- 15 Meeting program was packed much too tightly. Need more breaks (even 10 min bathroom breaks!!). Some chairs did not keep their speakers on time. Meeting organizers at the booth/table were very helpful and friendly. It was great to have food available at posters and receptions.
- 16 Overall great conference, I intend to become a member after attending. Only thing better would be to have a few more speakers.
- 17 The internet server at the hotel was not adequate for the number of guests using the internet, rendering the internet unusable. This is unacceptable, as many of us must work on projects at home while attending these meetings. Duplicating speakers seems unnecessary, especially with students. Allow other students to present, rather than repeat presenters. As painful as they may be, "forced" socializing like the opening reception can help foster collaborations. Having breakfast or group lunch early in the program could help with this, rather than waiting for the opening reception (which could have even been Wed evening, when many are already present at the hotel). If you need to fill time, plan an outing for the conference attendees, rather than duplicating talks.

- 18 It would have been nice to have more presentations as quite a few were repeated presentations.
- 19 Absolutely did not understand the repetition of talks from plenary/award sessions in the subsequent sessions. Was there a dearth of speakers from other areas of expertise????
- 20 better communication between awards committee and organizers to avoid repetitive similar sessions!
- 21 We plan on exhibiting next year in Hawaii. I was overall very pleased with 2011 SLB.
- 22 There were too many repeated presentations especially the posters.
- 23 I thought the scientific content of the meeting was weaker than other years. Also did not like the repeated content with finalists for awards speaking twice - I think this denied someone else the opportunity to present and this may have improved the overall scientific content. In general I thought the sessions were quite specialized and not of great interest to a broad range of the membership. Also the location was not ideal, although the facilities and standards at the Westin were excellent. I think this meant that a lot of people who would normally attend did not.

- 24 Overall, a success! Good job Faseb
- 25 Was a bit disappointed by low turnout. Maybe Kansas City is partly to blame? Science was excellent though.
- 26 Congratulations to the organizers on a great meeting - well done! I thought the meeting went very smoothly, there were a few talks that were particularly interesting for me, and I learned a lot!

- 27 a little heavy on the brain
- 28 I don't think it was a good idea to have the award talks repeated again throughout the meeting.

- 29 Didn't understand having speakers give the same exact talk on repeated days. This was quite annoying, and would've preferred to see a different speaker rather than, at some points, the same talk nearly verbatim.
- 30 More concurrents. Eliminate repetitive talks. Don't use speakers to also serve as session chairs...spread it around more.

116	82%
25	18%

31	27%
32	28%
53	46%
116	100%

30	26%
34	29%
18	16%
34	29%
116	100%

88	76%
8	7%
6	5%
6	5%
5	4%
3	3%
116	100%

51	44%
54	47%
10	9%
0	0%
0	0%
115	100%

Somewhat important	Not at all important
30	3

26%	3%
48	4
41%	3%
49	6
43%	5%
73	18
65%	16%
24	4
21%	4%
48	15
42%	13%
78	13
70%	12%

Somewhat	Poorly
28	3
24%	3%
40	4
35%	4%
50	7
45%	6%
57	12
50%	11%
44	5
38%	4%
37	9
34%	8%
55	9
50%	8%

49	42%
29	25%
14	12%
64	55%
2	2%

45	42%
61	58%
106	100%

97	84%
19	16%
116	100%

103	90%
5	4%
6	5%
114	100%

104	91%
10	9%
114	100%

41	35%
69	59%
6	5%
0	0%
116	100%

102	89%
13	11%
115	100%

ferences?

62	60%
42	40%
104	100%

with the e-JLB?	
103	93%
8	7%
111	100%

80	69%
36	31%
116	100%

25	69%
3	8%
0	0%
0	0%
1	3%
7	19%
36	100%

111	99%
1	1%
112	100%

or amount or fewer awards of a larger dollar	
77	72%
30	28%
107	100%

as time management, gender and diversity	
53	46%
61	54%
114	100%

akers you feel would enhance this meeting?	

--	--

38	37%
53	51%
4	4%
3	3%
3	3%
3	3%
104	100%

	Good	Average	Poor
	36	15	0
	35%	15%	0%
	65	17	0
	63%	17%	0%
	49	33	7
	47%	32%	7%
	47	9	0
	46%	9%	0%
	41	9	1
	39%	9%	1%
	36	11	2
	35%	11%	2%
	38	16	1
	39%	16%	1%
	30	12	2
	32%	13%	2%

	Good	Fair	Poor

16	2	0
46%	6%	0%
11	5	0
31%	14%	0%
12	4	0
34%	11%	0%

ons for future programming?

	Good	Fair	Poor
	6	1	0
	21%	4%	0%
	7	1	0
	25%	4%	0%
	8	0	0
	30%	0%	0%

or future programming?

ng feature new to this meeting?

74	75%
25	25%
99	100%

56	55%
46	45%
102	100%

ces if it meant a higher registration fee?

29	29%
70	71%
99	100%

98	93%
4	4%
3	3%

65	62%
35	34%
4	4%
0	0%
104	100%
