

# Zoomerang Survey Results

2007 Meeting Survey AND 2008 SLB Membership Survey

| 1. Are you a current member of SLB? |            |             |
|-------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Yes                                 | 244        | 93%         |
| No                                  | 18         | 7%          |
| <b>Total</b>                        | <b>262</b> | <b>100%</b> |

| 2. What is your current job title? |  |  |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 261 Responses                      |  |  |

| 3. Did you attend the 2007 SLB Annual Meeting? |            |             |
|------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Yes                                            | 63         | 24%         |
| No                                             | 199        | 76%         |
| <b>Total</b>                                   | <b>262</b> | <b>100%</b> |

**4. If you attended the 2007 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                                                                                                              | 20<br>32% | 31<br>49% | 5<br>8%   | 4<br>6%  | 3<br>5% |
| Audio-visuals                                                                                                                   | 10<br>16% | 29<br>46% | 17<br>27% | 5<br>8%  | 2<br>3% |
| Poster Sessions                                                                                                                 | 5<br>8%   | 31<br>50% | 18<br>29% | 8<br>13% | 0<br>0% |
| Location                                                                                                                        | 16<br>25% | 23<br>37% | 16<br>25% | 7<br>11% | 1<br>2% |
| Speakers                                                                                                                        | 26<br>41% | 27<br>43% | 3<br>5%   | 5<br>8%  | 2<br>3% |
| Facilities and accommodations                                                                                                   | 20<br>32% | 19<br>30% | 16<br>25% | 8<br>13% | 0<br>0% |
| Meeting organization (flow of sessions, scheduling)                                                                             | 20<br>32% | 19<br>31% | 15<br>24% | 8<br>13% | 0<br>0% |
| Banquet                                                                                                                         | 11<br>20% | 14<br>26% | 20<br>37% | 7<br>13% | 2<br>4% |
| Refreshments                                                                                                                    | 14<br>23% | 21<br>34% | 19<br>31% | 4<br>6%  | 4<br>6% |

**5. If you did NOT attend the 2007 Annual Meeting, why not?**

|                                        |     |     |
|----------------------------------------|-----|-----|
| Scheduling conflict                    | 103 | 52% |
| Scientific content did not interest me | 26  | 13% |
| Location was difficult to get to       | 23  | 12% |
| Registration fee was too high          | 16  | 8%  |
| Destination was cost-prohibitive       | 31  | 16% |
| Other, please specify                  | 42  | 21% |

**Response**

travel is difficult for me at this time

Location

insufficient funding for travel

Already attended EB2007 and International congress

Cost constraint for budget

didn't have travel funds available

combination of funding issues and research success

Do not have my own grant money

retired member

Teaching/research load conflict

|                                                    |
|----------------------------------------------------|
| didn't get the visa in time for the meeting        |
| constantly need to write grants                    |
| Too many meetings                                  |
| Do not find attendance at large meetings to be a v |
| Unavailability of new FYf unding in Oct./Nov       |
| lack of funding at the time                        |
| boss limits us to one meeting a year               |
| no data ready for submission by the deadline       |
| switched lab and new PI not a member of SLB        |
| retired                                            |
| Do not recall                                      |
| lack of travel funds                               |
| did not have material to show                      |
| Budgetary and time constraints                     |
| physical disability pending surgery                |
| SOMe family issues                                 |
| competitive exams were announced                   |
| budget restriction, independent of location        |
| Retired                                            |
| Retired, no longer active in research              |
| Organization of meeting leaves alot to be desired  |
| too many meetings not enough hours. priority       |
| Too many meetings                                  |
| retired                                            |
| I don't attend these types of meetings anymore.    |
| We needed to attend another meeting                |
| Competing priorities                               |
| Medical difficulty to traveling                    |
| Received grants to attend other meeting            |
| tend to limit travel due to work and teaching load |
| Too many other meetings to attend during the year  |
| N/A                                                |

**6. Additional comments on 2007 Annual Meeting**

34 Responses

**Response**  
 I am a veterinary immunologist. The SLB meeting often conflicts with the AABP or the AAVI meetings.

It did not seem as well organized as previous year.

I would like to participate but usually do not get around to set aside the time for a transatlantic trip.

The meeting is too small to maintain a energetic society. I think the society must do a better job to recruit members, find more outstanding speakers, and organize a better meeting for attracting more people to the meeting.

N/A

Boston is a very costly place to find accommodation. Please select smaller cities/ cheaper places so that more people can join.

It was excellent, as always

Attendance was very low compared to previous ~5 meetings. Organization suffered from the absence of Debbie. Very few posters and many people that submitted abstracts did not attend. Consequently, the value of hte meeting was low compared to previous years. Some changes in refreshments were unexpected (eg., cash bar without two drink tickets) but these changes are not significant.

I felt that the meeting only provided the very bare minimum to the attendees. The facilities seemed sparse, the refreshments were a bit strange (one session all bagels, the next all ballpark junk food) and the banquet was really stark. I was stunned that we had to purchase tickets for drinks, which consisted of cheap wine served in plastic cups! The ambience was cold and barren. The food was "OK", again served on plasticware, which I considered very tacky. This is hardly what I would expect for the \$500-plus registration fee. Guest tickets to the banquet cost \$125. I feel very sorry for anyone who paid that price for what seemed like a \$10 value. The audiovisuals were problematic. Each meeting room should have had someone available to monitor the situation. This was not the case and in some sessions there were lighting problems or speakers that could not be heard. No one was available to fix these problems.

Overall the meeting seemed "thrown together" and I was left the feeling that I had grossly overpaid for the experience. The scientific content was fairly good, but there did not seem to be the opportunities for interaction that I've experienced in previous meetings and there was no sense that any effort was made generate any enthusiasm. If this was the only SLB meeting I had attended, I wouldn't consider attending SLB meetings in the future.

thought the topic was an interesting choice

Usually JLB meeting conflicts with other meeting I attend and has for several years.

It was very frustrating (and financially draining) that of 3 of my trainees who submitted abstracts for travel awards NONE of them got one. While I allowed them all to come to the meeting (and I came as well) I think it is unlikely that I will be able to do that in the future.

I have made this point many times in the past, October is a very difficult month for new FY funding for travel/meetings.

audiovisuals in the afternoon sessions were unacceptable - a portable screen with 30 rows of chairs - no one could see the data being presented.

morning coffee at the 8:00 session is necessary. ideally, there would be breakfast/snack at the 8 am session.

I just felt you had a lot of the big wig speakers at the 2006 meeting and not too many at the 2007 meeting.

The poster sessions were poorly attended, partly I think because there was no subsidised bar. People therefore took some food quickly then left after a long day of scientific sessions.

The meeting needs to be a class act. The banquet, especially, was outrageously poor..and yet guests/spouses were charged \$125!!! Someone has absolutely no respect for SLB. The refreshments should be mixed to accommodate vegetarians, people who don't eat high fat, or high sugar snacks. If this trend toward low class ambiance continues, meeting attendance will drop to double digits.

Good meeting.

I look forward to future joint meetings with the endotoxin society (as in 2006). The 2006 SLB was one of the best meetings I have ever attended.

Two students from my lab went to the 2007 Annual Meeting

none

I did not attend the banquet because it is on the last evening and conflicted with my schedule. I suggest having the banquet on the evening of the second day, so more people can attend (having paid for it), or charge it separately.

I read the abstracts ..Excellent science

No

None

If you have poster sessions, do more to encourage attendance. Otherwise, the poster presenters are wasting their time.

I would like to attend more of meetings containing infection and immunity

The facilities were terrible, and the staff very non-responsive to requests. We asked to have a room set up and were told not to worry, it would be done just in time. Of course it was not and the session was done without audiovisuals for the first speaker, while the support staff ran around. It was very annoying that they did not do this when asked, but merely sat behind the desk with a smug look that things were under control.

much-much improved

I am mainly interested in leukocyte biology and the focus of the meeting was diluted by a lot of cancer talks. Though it was interesting to hear about research in this field, it left much less time for topics of interest to me like inflammation in sepsis/ microbial infections. But the organization/ food/stay was excellent. Thank you.

Great meeting, attendance seemed a bit low. Excellent relevant meeting which took advantage of the excellent intellectual resources in the Boston area.

Thank you for very interesting meeting and organising banquet in museum!

Keeping the concurrent sessions on time is crucial to being able to take advantage of all the talks one wants to hear. This was sometimes a problem

The timing of the sessions and poster sessions makes it difficult to have meals with colleagues without missing sessions.

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

102 Responses

**Response**

Smoother organization of sessions & speakers  
Washington DC or Baltimore MD would be easiest for me, but that is personal

Chicago is a good site, plenty of hotel rooms and central

The location was very expensive this year (Boston).

Themes and content: macrophages, phagocytosis, cytokines, inflammation

themes are always very well selected

LA, Seattle, Vancouver, Chicago, San Diego, Miami, San Francisco

more sessions relevant to lymphoid cells would attract me - current meeting is heavily focused on myeloid cells.

Midwestern location

Cardiovascular Immunology, more open access to symposium presentations

a cardiovascular based meeting

Diabetes, Insulin resistance and inflammation; obesity and inflammation

New York City as a location so our junior staff can attend or Atlantic City

Emphasis on Innate immunity

Location suggestion: Seattle, denver

Should not conflict with IEIS meeting (august 2008), Toll meeting (Portugal, sept 2008?)

Location suggestion:

San Antonio, Texas

looking forward to the joint meeting with other societies in Lisbon

host-pathogen

Smaller cities, cheaper places will be more appropriate place. Immune tolerance is my favorite theme with sub-sessions including- Tolerance and transplantation, Tolerance and Infection, Tolerance and tumor growth etc  
Chicago, Minneapolis. Inflammation, apoptosis, metalloproteases

Continued focus on innate/adaptive immune interactions

Phagocytosis, more host pathogen interactions and innate immunity.

innate adaptive immune cross-talk

Choose locations outside USA

must be a Program Committee/ head that helps generate ideas to present to President etc?  
also involvement of a member at local site is good can bring in some local speakers who would otherwise not come.

Hotel cost at some locations can be a factor...  
Generally if I could go I would as all of above are ok with me.

Every SLB meeting I have attended has been well planned and executed and the sites are part of the attraction. Especially: Churchill College, Cambridge, Maui, in 2001 (the latter not well attended but fine meeting)

Locations and content was good in the past...

Tag team event with other meetings/societies, have more satellite meetings to bring in a crowd. Cheaper cities that require only one airplane to get to.

As a long-standing SLB member and attendee of many meetings in the past, may I suggest a more democratic approach in selection of Plenary Session topics? Proposals should be invited from the membership at-large and a Program Committee should select topics/sessions based on overall merit and related subject-specialty areas of proposals submitted within the framework of 'Leukocyte Biology'. The selection of the scientific program for SLB annual meetings should have a more 'inclusive' approach.

The alternation with European locations, which the society seems to have stopped, was a very good idea. The European locations should be started again

sessions on focused, organ-specific issues, e.g. neuroimmunology, lung disease, etc.

In a developing country. It's a shame at the very heart of the XXI century to keep this events at in Europe and USA only having members of other parts of the world. What about Mexico, Brazil, Chile or Argentina (the latest with recognised Nobel Prize winners)? Please, we are scientists and we have the responsibility for the ideological change of mentalities as well. Thanks

Hawaii, las vegas, seatle, san francisco

Central U.S.

Tuscon, AZ

Pittsburgh as a location?

See previous question for content (joint mtg with endotoxin society).

Charleston, SC is a great venue.

Recent content has been appropriate for my interests, innate immunity.

San Diego, CA

Theme: Gender differences in immune responses following injury

I have none to suggest.

Location : Vancouver; Same format, themes and content

translational medicine

combine with faseb or clinical reasearch societies

Vaccine Adjuvants, immunotherapy

The meeting in Hawaii a few years ago was great!! New Orleans, Las Vegas, Seattle

innate immune cells and inflammation

Yokohama, Japan

cytokine balance in inflammation

Denver, Santa Fe,

More with neutrophils, signaling

therapeutical applications are needed in th future

Italy would be nice

add a Neuroimmunology section

I've been to the same Royal Sonesta hotel just a few years agon for a SLB meeting. A new place will be more interesting. In many ways (scientific program, location, cost, fun activity, etc), the meeting at San Antonio was better organized.

san francisco

I hope joint meeting with IETIS will be held again in the future

1. If the conference was to be held in Europe more often (e.g. every other year), it may be easier on the non-American members, financially and "Jet-Lag" wise.

We should include STEM cell as a special topic

No

European meeting - e.g. Oxford 2005 excellent

It would be nice to have a sections on neutrophils and immunology

Keep a good balance between cellular and humoral elements in the program. In some of the previous meetings, the program was too dominated by the preferences of local organizers.

Program suggestion:

innate - adaptive cross talk

Paris-France

Locations that are cheap-to-get to destinations (ie, major cities, with lots of flights) would be preferred as that would make it easier for me to visit because of limited travel budget.

occasional meetings in europe (like Oxford 2005)

None

UK, Oxford or Edinburgh

More cohesiveness; poster session during the peak times of the day; fewer of the same names giving oral presentations. How many times do we need to hear the same data from a small number of folks from the SLB clique?

Macrophage activation, New T-cell Networks, The forgotten Neutrophil, B-Cells Jack of all Trades. Cleveland, Baltimore, Austin, Charolett

macrophages in tumors

Bacteria and macrophage interactions, evasion of host immune response related topics

No break between sessions and posters.

Student and PostDoc gathering (like in Cambridge, England.)

Have Jeanette Thorbecke winner give a talk at a lunch event?

More diversified content in the field of neutrophils and inflammation.

location not only in US

Topics:

Comparative Immunology and Evolutionary Implications

Neuroendocrineimmunology

Locations:

Portland, OR

Santa Fe, NM

Flagstaff, AZ

W.DC, chicago.

Get support staff who actually respond to reasonable requests (such as setting up the room 15 minutes prior to the start of a session rather than literal 1 minute)

Crete in Greece

Innate immunity

location somewhere in western part of europe.

Subjects: interaction/signaling of TLR's and complement system

Innate immunity; Europe

Cytokine influence on stem cell differentiation

Chronic infection of dendritic cells and macrophages - impact on properties and functions

Boston/suburbs

autoimmunity theme

vaccines theme

one distinguished key note speaker, renowned for the theme

invite speakers that are not always part of the "circuit" so as to stimulate new ideas and discussion at the sessions.

Themes: Role of leukocytes in pain

joint meetings with Cytokine Society and ISCIR, particularly international meetings are of greater interest

Should be held in a place, where the total cost will be less like air fare, hotel accommodation, etc. Something like a small city.

Leukocyte in Cancer development and treatment

Pls. consider California for the next location. Would like to see more cancer and immunology topics

why sepsis remains such a killer even though we have so much basic information...

Hematopoiesis/stem cells

Europe such Paris, Lausanne, Basel

I usually go to the meetings in Europe and that suits me fine. So every third or second year somewhere in Europe is good.

More meetings in Europe, maybe every third meeting or so.

1. Schedule some of the meetings in Europe
2. Place more emphasis on biochemical aspects of leukocyte function

Europe

San Francisco

I think planning more conjoint meetings with other societies can be more stimulating and well attended .

No special suggestions, I feel the programs are appropriate

Denver, CO

Spain !!!

macrophage polarization. myth or reality?

Joint meeting

Europe, Cell adhesion and migration to inflammation sites, Mechanisms and role of membrane receptors shedding in inflammatory responses

Providence RI- themes co-inhibitory receptors  
expression on various leukocytes influence  
inflammatory and immune responses.

Canada and Latin America locations

Make SLB Annual Meetings jointly held with other  
major meetings e.g. FASEB or AAI

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

|              |            |             |
|--------------|------------|-------------|
| Student      | 30         | 12%         |
| Post-Doc     | 71         | 29%         |
| Professional | 148        | 59%         |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>249</b> | <b>100%</b> |

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

|              |            |             |     |
|--------------|------------|-------------|-----|
| Less than 1  | 21         | 8%          |     |
|              | 5-Feb      | 107         | 43% |
|              | 10-May     | 35          | 14% |
| More than 10 | 86         | 35%         |     |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>249</b> | <b>100%</b> |     |

**10. What was your PRIMARY reason for joining SLB?**

|                                                    |            |             |
|----------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Networking                                         | 92         | 37%         |
| Career Advancement                                 | 32         | 13%         |
| Less Expensive Registration Fees at Annual Meeting | 33         | 13%         |
| Education                                          | 58         | 23%         |
| Other, please specify                              | 37         | 15%         |
| <b>Total</b>                                       | <b>252</b> | <b>100%</b> |

**11. How well has your membership met your expectations?**

|           |     |     |
|-----------|-----|-----|
| Very well | 57  | 23% |
| Well      | 117 | 46% |
| Somewhat  | 66  | 26% |

|              |            |             |
|--------------|------------|-------------|
| Very little  | 11         | 4%          |
| Not at all   | 1          | 0%          |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>252</b> | <b>100%</b> |

| <b>12. How important are these benefits to you? (1=Very Important, 2=Somewhat Important, 3=Not At All Important)</b>            |            |            |           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|
|                                                                                                                                 | <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b>   | <b>3</b>  |
| Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option. |            |            |           |
| Journal of Leukocyte Biology                                                                                                    | 179<br>72% | 63<br>25%  | 8<br>3%   |
| Annual Meeting                                                                                                                  | 111<br>45% | 110<br>45% | 26<br>11% |
| Networking                                                                                                                      | 121<br>49% | 101<br>41% | 23<br>9%  |
| Newsletter                                                                                                                      | 29<br>12%  | 142<br>59% | 68<br>28% |
| Scientific Content of Society Meetings                                                                                          | 156<br>64% | 68<br>28%  | 19<br>8%  |
| Opportunities for Student Presentations                                                                                         | 89<br>37%  | 92<br>38%  | 59<br>25% |
| Web Site                                                                                                                        | 50<br>21%  | 129<br>54% | 62<br>26% |

| <b>13. How well is SLB meeting your expectations for these same benefits? (1=Very Well, 2=Somewhat, 3=Poorly)</b>               |            |            |           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|
|                                                                                                                                 | <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b>   | <b>3</b>  |
| Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option. |            |            |           |
| Journal of Leukocyte Biology                                                                                                    | 159<br>69% | 63<br>27%  | 8<br>3%   |
| Annual Meeting                                                                                                                  | 92<br>42%  | 112<br>51% | 15<br>7%  |
| Networking                                                                                                                      | 69<br>31%  | 128<br>58% | 24<br>11% |
| Newsletter                                                                                                                      | 40<br>19%  | 143<br>66% | 33<br>15% |
| Scientific Content of Society Meetings                                                                                          | 98<br>45%  | 107<br>49% | 14<br>6%  |
| Opportunities for Student Presentations                                                                                         | 75<br>34%  | 114<br>52% | 29<br>13% |
| Web Site                                                                                                                        | 49<br>23%  | 132<br>62% | 32<br>15% |

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

|                                                   |     |     |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|
| List Serves                                       | 62  | 26% |
| Job Postings                                      | 158 | 66% |
| News of Other Societies' Meetings                 | 150 | 63% |
| Ability to Change Your Own Database Information   | 100 | 42% |
| Electronic Newsletter (versus Printed Newsletter) | 136 | 57% |
| On-line Journal Club                              | 110 | 46% |
| Other, please specify                             | 13  | 5%  |

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

|                       |     |     |
|-----------------------|-----|-----|
| Biennial Newsletter   | 60  | 24% |
| Weekly Emails         | 22  | 9%  |
| Monthly Emails        | 197 | 78% |
| Other, please specify | 12  | 5%  |

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

|              |            |             |
|--------------|------------|-------------|
| Yes          | 150        | 58%         |
| No           | 107        | 42%         |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>257</b> | <b>100%</b> |