

Gordon Research Conferences - Evaluation Data
Calcium Signalling

Tilton School
 Jul 8-13, 2007

DEMOGRAPHICS										
1. Previous GRC'S	None:	25%	1 to 5:	42%	6 to 10:	24%	Over 10:	9%		
2. Typical Annual Conf's	1 to 2:	55%	3 to 5:	37%	6 to 8:	6%	Over 9:	3%		
3. Gender	Male:	75%	Female:	25%						
4. Role in Conference	Chair / V. Chair:	2%	Speaker:	27%	Disc. Leader:	4%	Poster Pres.:	55%	Conferee:	13%
5. Affiliation	Academic:	91%	Industry:	3%	Gvmnt:	4%	Research:	2%		
6. Age Group	20's:	9%	30's:	26%	40's:	34%	50's:	22%	60+:	9%
7. Num. of People Was	Too Small:	1%	Just Right:	98%	Too Large:	1%				
8. Region of Residence	N. America:	66%	S. America:	1%	Europe:	23%	Africa:	0%		
	Asia:	10%	Australia/Oceania:	1%						
9. Position	Grad Student:	12%	Post Doc:	15%	Professor:	52%	Rsrch Sci:	17%	Rsrch Dir:	3%
	Program Mgr:	1%	Other:	1%						

TOTAL ATTENDED: 140 NUMBER OF RESPONSES: 120 PERCENT OF RESPONSES: 86%

SCIENCE / IDEAS	Score	A%	B%	C%	D%	E%
1. Presentations defined and analyzed the most important ideas & opportunities.	1.4	65%	30%	3%	1%	1%
2. Presentations included a substantial amount of unpublished work.	2.0	38%	38%	14%	6%	4%
3. Presentations were at the frontier of the field.	1.4	70%	26%	3%	1%	0%
4. The Conference was thought provoking, stimulating, exciting.	1.4	68%	26%	3%	3%	0%
5. Poster sessions contributed unpublished research at the frontier of the field.	1.4	70%	22%	9%	0%	0%
ALL:	1.5					

DISCUSSION AT SESSIONS & POSTERS	Score	A%	B%	C%	D%	E%
1. Adequate time for discussion was allowed.	1.2	81%	16%	2%	1%	0%
2. One person or group did not overly dominate discussion.	1.3	77%	18%	4%	1%	0%
3. Discussion Leaders managed their session well and stimulated discussion.	1.4	68%	26%	4%	2%	0%
4. Discussions evoked and explored new directions.	1.6	51%	38%	7%	4%	0%
5. Excellent quality of interaction between students and established investigators.	1.5	58%	32%	9%	1%	0%
ALL:	1.4					

MANAGEMENT / ORGANIZATION	Score	A%	B%	C%	D%	E%
1. Good selection of topics.	1.4	67%	24%	8%	1%	0%
2. Good selection of speakers.	1.4	67%	25%	9%	0%	0%
3. Speakers were present and available for discussion after their presentation.	1.2	78%	21%	1%	0%	0%
4. Attendees were diverse and reflected the composition of this field.	1.4	70%	24%	5%	0%	1%
5. Pool of speakers was diverse and reflected the composition of this field.	1.6	63%	24%	10%	2%	2%
ALL:	1.4					

ATMOSPHERE	Score	A%	B%	C%	D%	E%
1. The Conference was more than just a meeting, workshop, or collection of papers.	1.3	74%	22%	3%	1%	0%
2. Opportunities were available for networking with colleagues.	1.2	83%	15%	2%	0%	0%
3. The overall Conference atmosphere was friendly, not cliquish.	1.2	85%	10%	3%	1%	1%
4. Informal interactions contributed strongly to the quality of the meeting.	1.2	79%	19%	2%	0%	0%
5. Conference business was conducted in an open and democratic fashion.	1.2	82%	13%	5%	0%	0%
ALL:	1.2					

OVERALL CONFERENCE SUITABILITY	Score	A%	B%	C%	D%	E%
1. The Conference met my expectations.	1.4	71%	23%	5%	1%	0%
2. I expect to attend this Conference again.	1.4	75%	15%	7%	2%	1%
3. This was the best Conference in the field I attended this year.	1.7	57%	26%	13%	4%	1%
ALL:	1.5					

TOTAL SCORE: 1.4

A: Agree Completely B: Mild Agreement C: Neutral D: Mild Disagreement E: Disagree Completely

Calcium Signalling

Jul 8-13, 2007
Tilton School

Conference Comments

The Best Aspects Of The Meeting

1. High quality of speakers and high quality of science.
2. Informal personal discussions.
3. Presentations and the frontier of the field.
4. Informality, chance to discuss work and ideas with leaders in the field. Plenty of opportunity for interaction.
5. All topics covered on the field.
6. Informality and free time.
7. The subject matter.
8. Good variety of speakers.
9. A good variety of speakers covering a good range of topics.
10. The casual nature, easy to meet and interact with other attendees.
11. Very good.
12. Wolfgang Liedtke (wolfgang@neuro.duke.edu) Stimulating; different areas all returning to the theme of calcium regulation and signaling. Ability to meet the people in person who otherwise were known to me from the papers only, great!
13. great program with excellent leading scientist and young scientists: a perfect mixture. very interactive that was stimulated by the environment.
14. The meeting is a gold mine of information of cutting edge development in the field, particularly the biology of ca channels
15. Very good speakers friendly interactions
16. Really well balanced topic selection.
17. The chair, the quality of speakers and the interactions of the participants.
18. Open discussion with the colleagues, top experts, post docs and students.
19. Some strong presentations by top quality people.
20. Presentations, atmosphere and discussions from the sessions.
21. Cutting edge and excellent presentations and representation of the field. The best conference I have attended to make friends in the field. A superb atmosphere.
22. I got a lot of good suggestions regarding my own work.
23. Calcium sensors with Dr. Miyawaka. Excellent discussions of cell biology and physiology.
24. Best was the quality and diversity of the speakers. Overall the meeting was better than others.
25. Speakers used most updated technology in their research.
26. Excellent people interactions. Good sharing of ideas and prospects of collaborations. Excellent conference chair.
27. By far the presentations relating molecular biology and physiology combined strategies for evidence.
28. Organization by heads.
29. Indu was an excellent chair.
30. Cutting edge and broad scope.
31. Very good coverage of the field.

The Poorest Aspects Of The Meeting

1. Participants and speakers with partial attendance. Facilities and technical support weak.
2. Some experts in the field were not invited.
3. Organizers need to pick oral poster presentations far in advance and not at the site at the meeting.
4. No problems.
5. So much published data. Many speakers too many styles. More speakers discussion. Please remind speakers in the future that's what GRC is about.
6. Number of speakers gave unintelligible lectures. Why were they invited?
7. Session questioners were not asked to identify themselves and stand when addressing the speaker. This prevents those not so familiar with the participants from learning names or

continuing discussions stimulated by the questions.

8. Some major players were absent (Rich Lewis, Mike Calderdan, JP Kinet, etc.)
9. One of two of the talks had little or nothing to do with calcium signaling.
10. A little too fast paced due to ambitions/ agenda. Need more frequent breaks.
11. Hard to say.
12. Disagree sometimes with the selection posb. for preservation
13. Representation from the industrial organizations can be improved. There are only attendees of the 136 that are from industry
14. Could improve poster boards and poster space.
15. Topics can be more diverse. Selection of the poster presentations could be more diverse.
16. Overly long poster presentations/ They should be brief advertisements.
17. Room for posters is too small and crowded.
18. It seemed that if you were not doing work in the new invogue field many people were not even interested in your work.
19. Lack of discussion on calcium mediate signal. Lack of discussion on the regulation of the channel, receptors or templates at the level of the gene. Very little or no biochemistry and molecular biology.
20. Breaks between sessions and poster room was crowded.