

Report on the Survey Results from
AIChE's Annual Meeting - 2003 San Francisco
(Compared with Los Angeles 2000, Reno 2001, Indianapolis 2002)

Finally we have completed a summary of the San Francisco conference web survey and a comparison with onsite touchscreen surveys at recent annual meetings.

The most obvious observation is how happy attendees were with the San Francisco locale. The geographic location metric shot off our chart (See Point 5) and may have been responsible for a 'big boost' in the value-to-cost number as well. The only significant decline seen in these results was in the attendee reaction to the Exhibits (See Point 6). Despite the high costs associated with the city and the very real sleeping room attrition problems, annual meeting attendees clearly find San Francisco very attractive and we should try hard to return there on a regular periodicity.

From a programming perspective there was no significant change in the rating of program topics or content. Theme wise the four bio topicals collectively commanded the most attention followed closely by nano and fuel cells/sustainability. This tracks well with our Genesis Strategic Plan. It's also worth noting that the 3 sessions per day format appears to be reasonably well accepted (Point 6).

Enclosed is a more specific summary of the **post conference** electronic survey results at AIChE's 2003 Annual Meeting in San Francisco with a comparison to previous onsite electronic surveys performed at Los Angeles 2000, Reno 2001, and Indianapolis 2002. A total of 1143 attendees responded to the San Francisco survey, this represents (25%) of total attendees compared with approximately 349 who completed the touchscreen survey in Indianapolis (10%), 681 surveyed in Los Angeles (21%) and 501 in Reno (17%).

(NOTE: On multiple-response screens, total cases percent and raw percent may exceed 100%.)

1. Use Web as a Presenter, Chair or Coordinator?

LA (2000)	Reno (2001)	Indy (2002)	SF (2003)
Yes: 59%	Yes: 63.9%	Yes: 58.5%	Yes: 69.7%
No: 40.5%	No: 36.1%	No: 41.5%	No: 30.3

2. Which of the following topical conferences did you attend?

**San Francisco (2003)
Topical Conferences**

Nanotechnology	29% (1)
Biochemical Engineering: Fundamentals, Innovations, and Technology	21% (2)
Fuel Cell Technology	18% (3)
"Don't Know"	17% (4)
Computing and Simulation at Work	13% (5)
Engineered Particle Systems: Synthesis, Process and Applications	12% (6)
Advanced Membrane-Based Separations	12% (6)
Polymerization and Polymer Processing	12% (6)
Discovery, Development and Delivery of Medicines	12% (6)
Bioinformatics and Functional Genomics	12% (6)
Process Research and Innovation	12% (6)
Pilot Plants in Process Development	11% (7)
Sustainability and Life Cycle	9%
Envisioning Biorefineries: Chemicals and Materials from Renewable Feedstocks	8%
Sensors	6%
COFE 2003 – Eight Topical Conference on Food Engineering	5%
Advanced Microelectronic Processing	4%
Annual Meeting of the Electrophoresis Society	3%
Electrodeposition Processes in Semiconductor Device Fabrication	2%

**Indianapolis (2002)
Topical Conferences**

Nanoscale	53.3% (1)
Sustainable Engineering	33.2% (2)
Envisioning Biorefineries	24.4% (3)
AES/Bioinformatics & Functional Genomics	19.7% (4)
Sensors	18.4% (5)
Critical Issues	12.3% (6)
Protomics & High Throughput Technology	11.1% (7)

**RENO (2001)
Topical Conferences**

Nanoscale Science and Engineering	35.5% (1)
Separations	29.0% (2)
Apply Molecular Simul Computat Chemistry	26.0% (3)
Pharmaceutical Biotechnology – Discovery Development	24.8% (4)
Bioinformatics and Genomics	14.1% (5)
Batch Processing Topical Conference	12.3% (6)
Conference on Food Engineering	8.1% (7)
Annual Meeting of the American Electrophoresis Society	7.3% (8)

3. Aware of the Special Saturday Sunday Short Course(s) and Tutorials?

LA	Reno	Indianapolis	San Francisco
Yes: 69.7%	Yes: 69.1%	Yes: 75.1%	Yes: 68.2%
No: 30.3%	No: 30.9%	No: 24.9%	No: 31.8%

4. Did you visit the Showcase Exhibition? (San Francisco Question Only)

Yes: 68%

No: 32%

5. How would you rate the following aspects of the 2003 Spring National Meeting?

(Excellent = 5 Very Good = 4 Good = 3 Fair = 2 Poor = 1) NA = Not Asked

Aspect	LA (2000)	Reno (2001)	Indy (2002)	SF (2003)
Technical Topic	3.83	3.84	3.83	3.75
Content	3.60	3.62	3.62	3.64
Geographic Location	3.49	2.82	3.14	4.18
Amenities	3.24	2.87	3.57	3.49
Networking Opportunities	3.57	3.48	3.47	3.52
Exhibits	3.31	3.25	3.06	3.18
Meeting Staff	3.62	3.50	3.58	3.38
Value to Cost Ratio	2.72	2.74	2.79	3.51
Institute Lecturer	NA	NA	NA	3.52
Special Events	NA	NA	NA	3.51
CD Proceedings	NA	NA	NA	3.17

6. What did you especially like about the meeting?

Total Respondents for San Francisco: 1143
 Total Respondents for Indianapolis: 323
 Total Respondents for Reno: 515
 Total Respondents for Los Angeles: 649
 NA = Not Asked

	LA (2000)	Reno (2001)	Indy (2002)	SF (2003)
Tech Topics/Information	69.6%	71.9%	73.8%	73.0% *
Quality Presentation	35.1%	35.6%	41.9%	NA
Topical Conference Proceedings	23.7%	20.6%	15.7%	22%
Conferences, Luncheons, Dinners, Receptions	18.3%	20.6%	26.8%	35%
Staff Help	13.9%	11.5%	17.9%	NA
Facility Logistics/ Venue/Facilities	12.2%	8.9%	20.1%	31%
Exhibits/Fall SHOWcase	26.5%	18.6%	17.3%	9%
Welcome Reception	7.6%	17.8%	20.8%	22%%
Other	6%	7.5%	7.7%	4%
Social Programming	5.2%	5.1%	4.5%	NA
Special Events	NA	NA -	NA	22%
Institute Lecturer	NA	NA	NA	16%
Three Session/Day Format	NA	NA	NA	29%

* For 2003 SF / Technical Information/Quality of Presentations were joined.

7. What areas especially need improvement?

Total Responses Los Angeles: 644
 Total Responses Reno: 785
 Total Responses Indy: 792
 Total Responses: 748

Aspect:	LA '00	Reno '01	Indy ' 02	SF '03
Facility Logistics/Venue	26.4% (1)	40.7% (1)	26.5% (2)	19% (2)
Quality Presentation	19.9% (2)	22.1% (2)	27.7 (1)	4% (7)
Conference, Luncheons, Dinners	15.2% (4)	12.1%	19.1% (5)	7% (4)
Exhibits/ Fall SHOWcase	12.7% (5)	8.7%	22.0% (3)	5% (6)
Welcome Reception	19.4% (3)	6.5%	14.1%	10% (3)
Topical Conference Proceedings	11.6% (6)	14.6 (4)	15.2%	7% (4)
Tech Topics	9.6%	12.6% (5)	19.9% (4)	NA
Others	9.9%	16.4% (3)	14.8%	38% (1)
Social Programming	10.7%	12.3 (6)	18% (6)	NA
Staff Help	9.0%	8.7%	8.2%	NA
Special Events	NA	NA	NA	2%
Institute Lecturer	NA	NA	NA	5% (6)

8. How did you hear about this meeting / this year's event?

	LA '00	Reno '01	Indy ' 02	SF '03
Previous Attendance	40.1% (2)	40.3 (1)	NA	NA
Web (AIChE Web Site '03)	45.7% (1)	33.6% (2)	24.6% (2)	24% (2)
Web Banner	NA	NA	3.6%	NA
Word of Mouth/Colleagues	27.1% (3)	26.9% (3)	25.5% (1)	33%(1)
Flyer/Direct Mail/AIChE Brochure	26.8% (4)	19.6% (4)	16.2% (4)	6%
AIChE Newsletter/Extra	10.3%	5.9%	NA	NA
Division or Local Newsletter	6.9%	4.5%	NA	NA
Local Section Meeting	NA	NA	2%	11% (3)
Ad in CEP	10.2%	2.4%	7% (5)	1%
AIChE E-mail	13.3% (5)	11.8% (5)	17.1% (3)	11% (3)
Link/Listing from Other Web Site	4.1%	2.6%	1.4%	1%
AIChE 2001 Brochure in CEP	NA	10.8%	NA	NA
Other Advertising	4.4%	2.9%	2.7%	9% (4)

9. What area best represents your professional sector?

Affiliation:	LA '00	Reno '01	Indy '02	SF '03
Academia	62.6%	70.1%	68.2%	64%
Industry	28.7%	22.4%	23.1%	23%
Other	1.9%	2%	2.2%	6%
Consulting	3.1%	3.9%	2.8%	2%
Government	3.7%	1.6%	3.7%	5%

10. What is the best way to inform you of the conference? (SF '03 ONLY)

Email: 67%
Web Site: 24%
Mail: 7%

Questions on Future Attendance:

SF 2003:

Plan to attend 2004 Annual Meeting in Austin?

Yes: 57%
No: NA

Plan to attend 2005 Annual Meeting in Cincinnati?

Yes: 36%

Indy 2002:

Plan to attend 2003 Annual Meeting in San Francisco?

Yes: 58%
No: 8.8%
Undecided: 33.2%

Reno 2001:

Plan to attend 2002 Annual Meeting in Indianapolis?

Yes: 51%
No: 6.1%
Undecided: 42.8%

Plan to attend 2003 Annual Meeting in San Francisco?

Yes: 46%
No: 3.7%
Undecided: 50.3%

Los Angeles 2000

Plan to attend 2001 Annual Meeting in Reno?

Yes: 49.8%
No: 12.1%
Undecided: 38.2%

Plan to attend 2002 Annual Meeting in Indianapolis?

Yes: 31%
No: 11.7%
Undecided: 57.3%