

Gordon Research Conferences - Evaluation Data
INTERMEDIATE FILAMENTS

Salve Regina University
Jul 30-Aug 4, 2006

DEMOGRAPHICS										
1. Previous GRC'S	None:	37%	1 to 5:	37%	6 to 10:	15%	Over 10:	11%		
2. Typical Annual Conf's	1 to 2:	63%	3 to 5:	32%	6 to 8:	4%	Over 9:	0%		
3. Gender	Male:	66%	Female:	34%						
4. Role in Conference	Chair / V. Chair:	7%	Speaker:	32%	Disc. Leader:	4%	Poster Pres.:	44%	Conferee:	13%
5. Affiliation	Academic:	86%	Industry:	2%	Gvmnt:	4%	Research:	9%		
6. Age Group	20's:	25%	30's:	24%	40's:	21%	50's:	23%	60+:	7%
7. Num. of People Was	Too Small:	1%	Just Right:	98%	Too Large:	1%				
8. Region of Residence	N. America:	64%	S. America:	0%	Europe:	29%	Africa:	0%		
	Asia:	6%	Australia/Oceania:	1%						
9. Position	Grad Student:	26%	Post Doc:	15%	Professor:	38%	Rsrch Sci:	14%	Rsrch Dir:	4%
	Program Mgr:	0%	Other:	2%						

TOTAL ATTENDED: 134

NUMBER OF RESPONSES: 122

PERCENT OF RESPONSES: 91%

SCIENCE / IDEAS	Score	A%	B%	C%	D%	E%
1. Presentations defined and analyzed the most important ideas & opportunities.	1.4	69%	24%	7%	0%	0%
2. Presentations included a substantial amount of unpublished work.	1.7	47%	42%	9%	2%	0%
3. Presentations were at the frontier of the field.	1.4	69%	28%	3%	1%	0%
4. The Conference was thought provoking, stimulating, exciting.	1.3	75%	20%	3%	2%	0%
5. Poster sessions contributed unpublished research at the frontier of the field.	1.3	77%	16%	7%	0%	0%
ALL:	1.4					

DISCUSSION AT SESSIONS & POSTERS	Score	A%	B%	C%	D%	E%
1. Adequate time for discussion was allowed.	1.4	76%	15%	3%	5%	1%
2. One person or group did not overly dominate discussion.	1.7	58%	29%	7%	4%	3%
3. Discussion Leaders managed their session well and stimulated discussion.	1.5	61%	30%	4%	3%	2%
4. Discussions evoked and explored new directions.	1.6	55%	32%	8%	4%	1%
5. Excellent quality of interaction between students and established investigators.	1.7	55%	26%	13%	5%	1%
ALL:	1.6					

MANAGEMENT / ORGANIZATION	Score	A%	B%	C%	D%	E%
1. Good selection of topics.	1.3	77%	19%	1%	1%	2%
2. Good selection of speakers.	1.3	76%	19%	4%	1%	0%
3. Speakers were present and available for discussion after their presentation.	1.2	83%	12%	4%	0%	1%
4. Attendees were diverse and reflected the composition of this field.	1.3	78%	19%	3%	0%	0%
5. Pool of speakers was diverse and reflected the composition of this field.	1.4	72%	22%	4%	2%	0%
ALL:	1.3					

ATMOSPHERE	Score	A%	B%	C%	D%	E%
1. The Conference was more than just a meeting, workshop, or collection of papers.	1.3	79%	17%	4%	0%	0%
2. Opportunities were available for networking with colleagues.	1.2	86%	10%	4%	0%	0%
3. The overall Conference atmosphere was friendly, not cliquish.	1.3	83%	11%	3%	3%	0%
4. Informal interactions contributed strongly to the quality of the meeting.	1.3	76%	21%	3%	0%	0%
5. Conference business was conducted in an open and democratic fashion.	1.2	87%	11%	3%	0%	0%
ALL:	1.2					

OVERALL CONFERENCE SUITABILITY	Score	A%	B%	C%	D%	E%
1. The Conference met my expectations.	1.2	81%	17%	2%	1%	0%
2. I expect to attend this Conference again.	1.3	80%	12%	5%	2%	1%
3. This was the best Conference in the field I attended this year.	1.4	72%	14%	13%	1%	0%
ALL:	1.3					

TOTAL SCORE: 1.4

A: Agree Completely

B: Mild Agreement

C: Neutral

D: Mild Disagreement

E: Disagree Completely

INTERMEDIATE FILAMENTS

Jul 30-Aug 4, 2006
Salve Regina University
Conference Comments

The Best Aspects Of The Meeting

1. Expertise of participants.
2. Diversity of topics and balance organization.
2. Availability of senior investigators for interactions.
3. Lots of new young people. Disease mechanisms discussed usefully.
5. Stimulating discussions after each talk. Time to talk informally with colleagues.
6. Diversity in the area of intermediate filaments. The meeting discussed many different aspects.
7. Heard of the latest scientific "gossip."
8. Congratulations for an excellent meeting.
9. Many chances to meet the "vaders" in the field in an informal setting.
10. Most frontiers met together to discussion current researches.
11. Very friendly atmosphere, all researches were very nice and available for discussions.
12. Excellent selection of topics and speakers.
4. Inclusive of nearly all topics related to all aspects of IF science.
14. High quality of talks, very large range of subjects.
15. Good talks, excellent technological equipment. Investing new insights in the field.
16. Great selection of speakers and topics.
17. The science in the field has become much more interesting in the past 5 years.
18. diverse topics
19. availability of scientists
20. very interactive
21. overall good talks and interactions
22. good discussions
23. new ideas, feedback on own project
24. good selection of speakers and topics
25. good speakers, good interactions
26. poster session, informal interactions
27. field is moving in novel directions
28. great meeting, dedicated chair, very positive working atmosphere
5. dynamic, accessible chair, good selection of topics and speakers
30. very active crowd
31. very open and friendly, has helped advance field
6. abundant discussion from wide variety of people, chair did a great job of bringing new people from "outside" the field, hard working chair and good job at fundraising
33. meeting people in the field
34. new ideas
35. good overview and interactions for new students and people from different areas
36. open interactions
37. interactions
38. congrats to the organizers
39. interactions and feedback
40. subject matter was well represented
41. there is a lot of interaction between scientists
7. variety of topics
43. very collegial, excellent discussions, very interactive
44. As a grad student, I found the best part to be the session for survival skills for ongoing researchers, it should be included every year

The Poorest Aspects Of The Meeting

1. Some speakers should either be told to focus (long before they present) or not be invited to speak in the future.

2. Too many talks ran over. We prefer not cutting short discussion, then sessions too long.
1. Microphones should be turned off when speakers go over the time allotted.
4. Sessions too long, people gone over-time.
5. Keratin people, Lamin people and neurofilament people still have minimal overlapping.
6. Limited time to discuss results.
7. Not enough time to discuss.
8. Most speakers went over time; perhaps time allotments should be pre-evaluated and then adhered to.
9. Difficult to keep speakers (or to limit speakers) to 15 minute talks.
10. not much quantification of results
11. Please give more opportunities to young researchers, for example, you can shorten presentations and add to the number of speakers
12. a few discussions dominated by arguments between two people
13. would be nice to have a collection of abstracts for the speakers and posters beforehand for some background knowledge of the presentation
14. too many talks
15. many speakers cancelled at the last minute, nothing the chairs could do
16. the speakers spoke too fast and they have to think that there are people from different parts of the world that do not speak English very well
17. lack of primary data in some talks and not everyone wanted to present data in fear of it getting scooped up, people must keep to time
18. too many slides in some presentations
19. dominance of certain groups in some presentations
20. too little structural biology
21. many speakers over-run their time
22. the selection of poster presenters
23. no abstracts
24. some leaders in the field not present