

## Survey Results 2009 ASM Survey

Below you will find the results of the 2009 ASM Survey. The purpose of this survey was to find out what the overall experience was for those attending.

**Rating Key: Overall, this meeting was:**

- 1- **Strongly disagree**
- 2- **Disagree**
- 3- **Neutral**
- 4- **Agree**
- 5- **Strongly agree**

### Question 1

Well organized;

1	4.3%
2	0.7%
3	3.6%
4	42.0%
5	<b>49.3%</b>

### Question 2

Relevant to my clinical practice;

1	3.6%
2	2.9%
3	8.0%
4	<b>48.6%</b>
5	37.0%

### Question 3

Relevant to my other professional activities

1	4.3%
2	1.4%
3	16.7%
4	52.9%
5	24.6%

### Question 4

Provided good social opportunities

1	4.3%
2	1.4%
3	10.9%
4	34.8%
5	48.6%

### Question 5

Provided good professional interaction

1	4.3%
2	0.7%
3	9.4%
4	35.5%
5	50.0%

**Question 6**

Provided good professional interaction

yes/oui	68.1%
no/non	31.9%

**Question 7**

I learned something in this meeting that has reinforced what I do in practice

yes/oui	92.0%
no/non	8.0%

**Question 8**

This scientific session was free from commercial bias

yes/oui	94.9%
no/non	5.1%

**Question 9**

The objectives of the meeting were clear

1	12.3%
2	4.3%
3	8.7%
4	44.9%
5	29.7%

### Question 10

The objectives of the meeting were met

1	12.3%
2	2.9%
3	15.9%
<b>4</b>	<b>45.7%</b>
5	23.2%

### Question 11

The organizers would like to contact some of the attendees a few months after the meeting to ask some followup questions. Would you be agreeable to be contacted?

yes/oui	35.8%
<b>no/non</b>	<b>64.2%</b>

### Question 12

If yes, please provide your name and email address

\*Responses omitted to maintain privacy

### Question 13

What would you change for next year's meeting

1. C'était un tres bon meeting. Mais il aurait fallu peut-etre un peu plus d'annonces... Du genre, ou aller pour le souper au parlement pour ne pas chercher a la pluie!
2. Make it shorter or if the same length, leave one or two afternoons that are shorter.
3. Print Daily events at a glance, large print on board  
Post Map of meeting rooms  
CROF Donation Table set up  
Go green, use USB's for program and adverts, more recycling bins.
4. The papers selected for oral presentation should be diversified from different centres and should not be dominated by PMH every time. Some of the talks were very poor and valueless.
5. Develop a way to obtain formal feedback from workshop as well. Promote the use of clickers for more interactivity throughout the meeting
6. The oral presentations represent innovative work by Canadian researchers. Time given for each paper should be longer, so attendees can understand the study better. Usually it is a big rush and no time to digest the material or understand the project.
7. More presentations of original reserach.  
Poster discussion session during the middle of the day with food provided, instead of food with the exhibits

8. nil
9. More interdisciplinary interaction
10. More keynote addresses, special lectures, symposia
11. Can we have a patient speak about their experience in one of our plenaries?
12. Nothing, great meeting
13. Must have a Breast Cancer Session. No excuse for omitting it this time.
14. i really appreciated this year's pre conference, so I hope that there is going to be another good idea for next year
15. integrate more brachytherapy papers into main meeting, especially ones with mature results
16. some things I believe will be changed for Vancouver. We need to be more environmental. People need to reuse bags and nametags and less paper should be given out. Also box lunches hopefully much less plastic and garbage.  
The dinner should be moved to friday.  
thanks.
17. How posters are organized. Add Resident Book Prize in honor of Dr. Barry Sheehan. Peer review process for abstracts.
18. The weather
19. ADD3 concurrent sessions as site specificwith incorporation advances in technology and molecular biology pertaining to the site group agenda.
20. poster review session - too short.
21. have the dinner on fri night not sat night - as many people leave
22. Have the display board numbers match the listed abstract numbers from the program.
23. Perhaps there could be a bit more attention to peer review of scientific submissions. There were a few oral presentations that I thought barely merited a poster, and several posters that would have more than qualified for an oral presentation.
24. Have better interaction between the Exhibits and attendies
25. No Saturday workshops as they are very poorly attended.
26. More time for discussion during workshops.
27. The timing of the poster session was not conducive to high attendance. It would be more appropriate as an afternoon wine and cheese, in between other meetings perhaps.
28. Please don't leave the workshops until the last day. Attendance was poor. Would like more participants if running a workshop.
29. I would like to see more of the posters up by the end of the first day. Would allow for more browsing of posters at the breaks.
30. Handouts for the workshops. Will all the oral presentations be posted on the CARO website?
31. Dinner on the Friday night.
32. Poster session NOT in the AM. Best done as in previous years in late afternoon with wine and cheese. Awards dinner not on the very last night to improve attendance.

33. More social opportunities. Better evidence-based selection of talks
34. The workshops leaders should be known experts in the subject of the workshop. Moderators must keep speakers on time, a few didn't.
35. Posters need to be set up earlier.
36. Consider ALL Residents oral presentations for recognition
37. The evaluation of the poster session is difficult since there is many presenters and only 1 hour to evaluate. However, One of the 2 winner was not present at her poster at all raising question about seriousness of the process
38. I think it would be good to change the moment of the Resident oral session for the first day of the meeting.
39. Social or scientific or mixed interactions based on practice groups. For example prostate brachytherapy group, breast brachytherapy group, gynecological brachytherapy group or prostate hypofractionation etc
40. Invite an international speaker
41. Have more specific and a more complete roster of site-based preferred paper sessions.  
There was too MUCH emphasis on the theme of palliation
42. Provide interview opportunities for the residents and program directors for Fellowships.
43. CARO dinner after business meeting
44. If possible, more workshops and dinners with the sponsors
45. I found the audio was too quiet - I strained to hear most of the speakers, even after asking the AV tech to increase volume ( it was not Randy)
46. Maybe the dinner should be held on Friday night.  
It is difficult for me to read the posters - is it possible to have all the posters placed onto a CD or flash drive? This has been done at ESTRO meetings and I really liked it. Maybe a sponsor could provide this service?
47. Canadian Brachytherapy Society meeting to include non prostate, non gynec papers and presentations
48. increase the basic research content
49. Poster session at the end of the day instead of early in the morning
50. More time for questions after the talks
51. Have the dinner on Friday night (I.e. not the last night)
52. there were 2 GU sessions at the same time which was not optimal
53. Have it earlier than Oct
54. better food at reception.
55. Consider holding dinner/award event on Friday evening instead of Saturday to increase # of attendees.

#### Question 14

Please comment on exhibits

- . Bon... mais peu d'interaction pour la plupart cette année.
2. I don't like there attitude sometimes! :) Most are nice, but they are very precious.
3. Impeded the flow into the main conference room too much!
4. excellent
5. good - broad and comprehensive
6. Broad range
7. Good!
8. Reasonable - I think they could have been located better
9. I never quite feel that some exhibits are relevant to me, as I'm not in a position to be choosing vendors etc - only making the best use of those that are chosen within my dept.
10. Great, although did not have much time to view them as was so busy with presentations
11. Exhibit displays were crowded, sloppily organized, and uninviting. I felt pretty sorry for the exhibitors that they had such a poor space for their displays.
12. je crois que le jeux des étampes étaient intéressants afin de nous donner une petite motivation pour faire le tour des exhibits...  
je dois avouer que je ne suis pas allée les voir cette année...
13. It is important that the poster stall numbers be the same as the abstract number, otherwise it's impossible to find a poster quickly
14. Well done - close to the main traffic for attendees.
15. Well done
16. Not much time to check them out for me.
17. Good. Well placed for maximum exposure to attendees
18. pretty good.
19. ok
20. N/A
21. Need to be able to spend more time with the exhibitors.
22. poor setting for exhibits. There was not a lot of interaction between the attendees and exhibit. Must find a way to increase visits to the kiosks, otherwise will loose sponsorship
23. Very interesting. Good variety.
24. I'm coming from an exhibiting company so most of the survey is not applicable. From my perspective, as a Canadian company, CARO is a very important meeting to attend and is a good chance to interact with our CDN prospects and customers. However, it is often disappointing how little traffic is generated by the booth. I understand there are very strict regulations, but is there perhaps a way to set aside time specifically for exhibits? Perhaps it is a matter of semantics, simply changing the name to "Exhibitor presentations" and encouraging attendees to visit the booths. Would it be in regulation to allow each exhibitor 1 or 2 10 minute sessions dedicated to them? For example, "Resonant Medical demo at booth at 11:40am, Company X at 11:50am" While I understand that CARO has strict regulations regarding vendor endorsement, it would be great if the exhibiting companies and CARO could brainstorm throughout the course of the year to come up with a solution for 2010 that would bring more traffic to the booths and

- make the cost more justifiable for the companies.
25. Non-obtrusive and the exhibitors were very pleasant.
  26. I didn't visit them
  27. Much less than usual?
  28. location of exhibits was good.
  29. not a very enthusiastic display by the exhibitors
  30. Good
  31. diversified
  32. Good
  33. Poor choice of time
  34. Good variety
  35. good
  36. They were pretty good!
  37. excellent well placed
  38. Reasonable number of exhibits, good opportunity to meet /discuss their products
  39. OK
  40. Fair
  41. I never visit them - don't find them useful.
  42. Well set up. Smaller exhibits could be kept close to the traffic
  43. exhibits were relevant to clinical practice and had innovative products/ideas
  44. Good.

### Question 15

Please comment on meeting facilities, meals, room set-up, city, other.

1. pas de probleme. La ville de Quebec etait un bon choix
2. Facilities, meals were fine. Quebec City was lovely.
3. Good location. A bit pricey.
4. Loved Quebec city. Would recommend a return.
5. Everything was perfect, outstanding choice for CARO dinner.
6. need a green meeting
7. Generally good.  
Better to have meeting rooms on the same floor to allow moving between rooms to catch different talks.  
The lobby room was awkward.
8. Quebec City is a lovely location.

Many of the break-out (seminar) rooms were too small and could not accommodate the attendees.

9. excellent
10. fine
11. Very nice city, expensive
12. Quebec city was great. The hotel OK. The meeting facilities so-so (the 2nd mtg room was the wrong shape, less than perfect for AV...)
13. Great
14. nice hotel set up. Good choice
15. Great! Big difference between the two rooms for oral presentations though...
16. Location was great
17. The first floor meeting room was a problem
18. good meals, good choice of city!  
not a lot of food on thursday night event, unfortunately
19. thursday night was a bit disappointing.
20. I did not think the touchpad evaluation worked well at all.
21. Quebec City is always a fantastic site for CARO!
22. Nice set-up
23. Avoid wide and shallow meeting rooms if possible.  
  
We came down to collect our posters straight after the last workshop on Saturday. Two of my posters were destroyed totally. ripped in two and crushed up completely and put in a skip. I was so upset, I realized I should have removed them earlier however the custom is normally to take the posters down and leave them in a corner somewhere or rolled up behind a desk or in the lost and found. These posters cost my hospital \$260 each and were supposed to be displayed again in November. I contacted the hotel and complained bitterly, there were at least 10 posters destroyed. I was told that they were sorry but CARO employed their own set up and take down company. This was my private property and should not have been destroyed, if it had been a jacket costing \$260 it would not have been torn up and put in a skip. I suggest we never use this company again, or at least give them decent instruction....
24. my hospital \$260 each and were supposed to be displayed again in November. I contacted the hotel and complained bitterly, there were at least 10 posters destroyed. I was told that they were sorry but CARO employed their own set up and take down company. This was my private property and should not have been destroyed, if it had been a jacket costing \$260 it would not have been torn up and put in a skip. I suggest we never use this company again, or at least give them decent instruction....
25. Great food. Good hotel meeting room air flow and ambient temperatures. Great hotel location. Hotel conference staff most attentive and helpful. Great A-V. Host City was great.  
  
For the most part very good. It would have been more convenient to have some space in the paper program for notes. The poster set up was counterintuitive. The separation of posters into residents and fellows or staff made it difficult to find a poster if you were unaware of the author's status. The arrangement of posters alphabetically when the program listed them numerically was a challenge to my organizational skills. The city was a good choice, lots of things close by. The facility was average for this type of meeting. The A-V was spot-on! The bacon breakfast and ice-cream bars perked up the final day as well. The one meeting room on the main floor was not conducive to interaction and the chairpersons couldn't see the presentations....it took me several minutes to find it as well....I'm directionally challenged.
26. the arrangement of posters alphabetically when the program listed them numerically was a challenge to my organizational skills. The city was a good choice, lots of things close by. The facility was average for this type of meeting. The A-V was spot-on! The bacon breakfast and ice-cream bars perked up the final day as well. The one meeting room on the main floor was not conducive to interaction and the chairpersons couldn't see the presentations....it took me several minutes to find it as well....I'm directionally challenged.
27. Excellent meeting in every aspect. I regret not attending it in the past.
28. very good
29. food was great - apart from the app's at the thurs night get together.
30. some of the workshop rooms were too small and very uncomfortable. For the cost of the meeting should have better meals and include the dinner for the price we pay

31. Good facilities, better meals than usual, lovely city.
32. Generally fine. Shame about the weather.  
Excellent facilities and venue.
33. The main hall's entrance should have been larger. (and more prominent... some people had difficulty finding it if they came late... it also made for difficult entrances/exits).
34. Poor. Need a better venue.
35. The Villeray room set-up was not ideal. The podium was facing one side of the room, whereas there were a lot more chairs on the other side of the room. The moderators could not see the slides.  
Quebec City was great (can't help the weather). The hotel/conference facilities were ok, nothing special.
36. The welcome social was rather disappointing, the museum was basically locked up, and the food was scarce.
37. The ground/lobby floor meeting room was too wide and screens were not well seen.  
Overall very well done. I liked that there seemed to be an effort to present on items of clinical relevance, and less of a focus on obscure basic science presentations. My impression was that CARO was starting to become a meeting aimed at a small academic subset. This meeting was good and I believe CARO is broadening its appeal again
38. The rooms for the workshops were small and limited attendance.
39. Excellent on all counts. Would like more social interactions but meals, room set up etc was ideal for the type of event. Thank you!
40. Overall, very nice. Excellent location for access to city after meeting activities.
41. Single small door into room for plenary sessions not great. Initially, hard to find room on H level that was used for some of paper sessions - staff at registration desk didn't know where it was.
42. Excellent food and meeting space.  
Villeroy room on main floor was awkward to see/hear presenters
43. All very good
44. Weather was lousy.  
Facilities and AV were good. The dinner venue was excellent and beautiful with good meal. The reception food was not great and I wonder whether we shouldn't change that into a reception right after the first day, right in the hotel with just wine and very light appetizers and allow people to make their own arrangements for dinner. Having the caro dinner at the end means many don't stay although perhaps there is no perfect time for it. Second last night would be better I think??
45. meals good. availability of vegetarian options much appreciated. poster positioning somewhat disjointed. exhibitors squeezed into gaps- i prefer them all in one place. Hotel excellent. city excellent
46. Good
47. Morning poster session was excellent timing.  
Workshop rooms were small. Meals were very good.
48. perfect
49. The breakfast and snack were really appreciated.
50. Fantastic!
51. fine
- 52.
- 53.

54. great to have time to eat before the beginning of pm conferences
55. Very good. Reception at Museum was a good opportunity to make contacts.
56. Excellent location, both the hotel and the city.
57. evrything was good
58. It was perfect! Just the weather could be better...
59. Super
60. Good facilities except poster setup had to be separated into 2 areas
61. The workshop rooms were too small
62. Excellent. A beautiful city. Hotel staff were all great.
63. good
64. Need proper espresso-based caffeine delivery vehicle.
65. good
66. very good
67. bad weather meant good meeting attendance!
68. very good. Needed more coffee available. National Assembly was an outstanding venue for the dinner
69. excellent
70. rooms were good, food and meals were good also
71. lower price for resident accomodation. lunches provided quite poor quality.
72. Very good.
73. better food at the reception.

Total number of respondents was 138.