

**Membership – Michael Barrett**

**WSSA Annual Meeting Survey 2008**

(Data is presented as Response %, Response count)

**1. How often do you attend the WSSA annual meeting?**

Every year 30.9% 84  
Every other year 18.8% 51  
Less frequently 40.4% 110  
I have never attended a meeting 9.9% 27  
*Answered question = 272*  
*Skipped question = 1*

**2. If you do not attend the WSSA annual meeting every year, please indicate why: (Check all that apply)**

Cost of attendance 47.1% 88  
Location 29.9% 56  
Desire/need to attend other meetings 39.6% 74  
Scheduling conflict 34.8% 65  
The WSSA annual meeting does not fit my professional needs 11.2% 21  
Other (please specify) 27.3% 51  
*Answered question = 187*  
*Skipped question = 86*

Details
I just entered the Weed Science area from Mol. Biology, but my company limits the number of meeting I may attend.
New Member
I have broad responsibilities in pest management and belong to three professional societies. I could and probably should belong to six, but as you see that would be if not impossible, at least crazy.  I also belong to the Southern Weed Science Society where I am a member of technical committees.  Bottom line: The SWSS, WSSA, and my own company's annual meeting fall within a 3-4 week period. You see my problem.
NCWSS meeting has more in my area of interest of corn and soybeans. I usually do not attend both the NCWSS meeting and the WSSA meeting because of the cost and the overlap of presenters.
This meeting is late in the fiscal year and my employer (the Manitoba Government) will always cut out of province travel by the time the WSSA meeting is held.
Meeting is in close proximity to the SWSS; sometimes they are in back to back weeks. WSSA is often the fourth meeting of the year for me, even though it is the first week of February.
I attended every year for about 20 years then costs and bad time to travel reduced my desire to attend. I have missed the last two years. It just seem like weather was not conclusive to travel and the hassle of travel is not worth getting to the meeting. Hope WSSA will consider a web meeting for those who want to attend but not travel.
My research emphasis has changed to other priorities
Abstracts are due in the middle of crop harvest.

I'm from Argentina so the meeting is very expensive for me
Budget or travel restrictions.
I have only a small appointment in weed sciences and I wear many hats. My involvement is subsequently through journal publication and reading the WSSA related journals.
WSSA as well as SWSS have become so academic that we commercialists feel out of place.
Retired
I am limited to the number of meetings that I can attend per year, and being an agronomist, the WSSA annual meeting only partially meets my professional needs.
Difficult to get approval to attend since weed science is no longer a major part of my work life
Conflict with Golf Trade show, GCSAA / GIS
Business priority is lower than other conflicting demands
Travel time and cost of travel to Meeting (given I am in Australia),
Retired
For the past 12 years I have been working for a company that didn't have herbicides as part of the product line, I am now working for FMC who does have herbicides and I can justify attending. I suspect, however that I will only be attending the National WSSA when it is in my territory.
I'm in Europe so cost is very high. Also, I have little time for these activities so I chose to participate to conferences and meetings nearby. I will continue to respond to the questionnaire thinking about what I normally appreciate in conferences
There is also the need to set priorities and therefore the WSSA meeting, based on the attractiveness of the program, my fall behind. In average I am attending every 1.5 years
The timing of the meeting conflicts with so many other meetings that we attend that by being last during the meeting season (usually early Feb) that it follows the Beltwide Cotton (early Jan) and the Southern (late Jan) so being gone to all meetings is difficult to do. Especially when teaching classes, as an instructor you cannot miss that much class and still provide a good educational experience for the students. Maybe move the WSSA to November after the ASA meetings. Very few of our scientist attend weed science and ASA meetings so it would benefit by splitting up the weed meetings. Of course, then you conflict with the other Weed Societies.
My budget is not sufficient to allow yearly attendance even though I would like to be there. I attend meetings that are closer to my home site.
Schedule conflicts with teaching so I usually attend but stay only for a portion of the meeting which makes it an expensive trip.
Can't justify attending two more relevant regional meetings AND WSSA each year.
WSSA is primarily very basic weed science research, not practical research that applies to the producers I consult with.
Often there are funding and time allocation problems for attending both the Regional and National Meetings.
I typically alternate between the regional society meeting and WSSA.
Heavy teaching load in winter term restricts conference participation.

I am back to working more in weed research and the above conflicts and needs to attend other meetings (Soc. for Range Mgt) have ended. I will soon be able to say that I attend every year.
Some years I have to limit the time spent away from the lab because of work commitments.
There are many meetings to attend and although I see value in the WSSA meetings, there are other meetings that fit my needs more closely.
It is scheduled during February, during the cold months, which does not allow for international travel and for extended stays to cover the expenses and efforts.
Have only been a member for a short time.
Limited budget
I find I get more out of the regional meetings - North Central and Western
General time commitment of nearly a week off from work and family. Flying makes me physically ill.
Retired
The regional societies meetings are more focused on the practical issues for that area and the national meeting tends to have more theoretical and basic science topics, or have papers that are repeats of their regional meetings. I have only attended the WSSA meeting when I want an overview of work being done across the US and can't attend at least 2 regional society meetings.
Too many meetings!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
Life events
My children will only be young once. I cannot currently justify the time away from my family.
I usually attend the NCWSS meetings. I have to choose between the NCWSS and the WSSA annual meetings and I choose the NCWSS.
re: question 1, attend most years, but some of the question 2 reasons have caused me to miss some WSSA mtgs.
Few papers in my area of interest.
Hard to get away when teaching full time and cost/distance is often much less favorable than a regional Weed Science meeting.
I do not attend in years when I feel that have no appropriate work to present. I take work in progress to my regional and state meetings and present more complete work at WSSA.
Cost, another important fact is that it is not easy to request funds from employer if one isn't going to present something at the meeting, I only attend when I have something to present

**3. Please indicate the importance of the following factors when making your decision to attend the annual meeting.**

	Unimportant	Of little importance	Moderately important	Very important	Have not attended	Response count
Price of lodging	4.1% (11)	20.6% (55)	43.1% (115)	28.1% (75)	4.1% (11)	267
Avail. of restaurants	25.8% (67)	43.5% (113)	22.7% (59)	4.6% (12)	3.5% (9)	260
Local activities/ attractions	25.7% (67)	38.3% (100)	22.2% (58)	10.0% (26)	3.8% (10)	261
Cost of	2.6% (7)	10.0% (27)	36.8% (99)	46.1% (124)	4.5% (12)	269

travel						
Climate	14.0% (36)	31.0% (80)	35.7% (92)	15.1% (39)	4.3% (11)	258
Answered question						270
Skipped question						3

more details
I LOVED Chicago!
Although my response to Question 1 was "every year," in reality it is "almost every year." In years that I do not attend the annual meeting, the reason almost always is that the venue is a cold and dreary location.
I usually do not attend the meetings during the "cold location" years. If I am going to travel that time of year I want to go some place with good weather, even better if there are attractions/activities that allow me to combine it with a family vacation
With the traditional February dates for WSSA meeting, location and climate weigh more heavily than for other professional meetings. Meetings held in 'favorable weather' locations are preferable to those held in less favorable sites because comfort is not only impacted but travel and preparations are as well. However, favorable weather sites that are congested or poorly designed for 'touring' are not attractive despite location/climate.
Most important - schedule. Late Jan. - early Feb. is a zoo for me. Next: warm climate, cheap flight. If the meeting were in Florida in the winter season, realistically I'd come as often as schedule permitted.
I stopped going when it was in New York.
Easy access and convenience are more important than local attractions. These are business trips not vacations for me. So I would like the structure to be economical and easy to get to Climate is a bit important for getting to. i.e. the NYC event a few years ago was nice to have because but NYC can get huge snows so why take a chance?
meet in nice places, please. Hawaii every 4 years would be good. Puerto Rico would be good.
Since the meeting occurs in February, a warm climate is preferred.
Usually the Society negotiated hotel rates make the room rates reasonable even in locations that would normally be expensive.
It is nice to have things to do outside of the meeting, but for the most part I am interested in the talks and connecting with other researchers over meals. A planned activity (like the IWSS) does not really appeal to me and tends to lengthen the meeting.
Winter meetings in places where we're likely to have difficulty with travel do not make sense.
Modern, up-to-date facility is important. Wireless (prefer free) access desirable in conference center, meeting rooms, and hotel.
I have never attended a WSSA meeting, but the answers above indicate some of the factors that go into my attendance at other annual meetings.
I prefer a downtown area where it is within walking / short cab distance to museums.
Since I make it a point to attend meetings every year, these factors carry less weight for me. Although, there may be a time in the near future where cost of travel and hotel become more important. I do enjoy interesting locations where there is good food and something new to see in addition to the meeting.
I tend to stay within the hotel and don't really take in local activities. If the hotel cost and flights go up too much more, than it won't be possible to attend.

I would rather attend the national meeting but with the cost of travel, time to get to a distant meeting, combined with location often in a cold city (e.g. Chicago) in the winter, it does not make it very attractive.
Considering timing of national meeting, warm locations are potentially better if air travel is required.
Should be held in warmer weather cities with major airports.
Hawaii was great!
Program contents are what determine whether I attend or not.
Climate is mainly important in relation to travel. Winter locations are more likely to have storms that interfere with travel.
One major issue is the convenience of flights (availability of direct flights). Also, while climate per se doesn't influence my attendance, a location less affected by flight weather delays could influence some.
If possible, avoiding major cities where hotel prices are exorbitant and/or choosing venues near but not in major cities if local activities/attractions are important.
More important than the cost of lodging, registration, or travel, is a week's worth of time to attend the meeting in addition to the regional weed science meeting.
In general I prefer meeting which have lodging, meals and scientific activities very close together.
nice to go to areas where there can be tours to see weed problems-- more difficult to do this when the meeting is in a cold location in February
It is not the climate, but the distance to travel that is important since adding a day or more on each end is too difficult.
I would prefer we go to locations that are of interest to everyone. I enjoyed New York City and HI, and would like to maybe see the meeting go International once every 10 years or so, say Australia or Europe. Are there any rules saying we have to stay in North America?
As a Canadian, I do not appreciate the harassment of the US Federal authority at crossing the border since Sept 11. and I do not trust American airline company for service and reliability
I attend the regional meeting and usually cannot justify the costs of doing both.
I loved Hawaii, and prefer warm locations. I know that you cannot be 100% and things can happen anywhere, but the safety and security of the location is very important to me!
As a working professional, annual attendance is very helpful to keep current with the profession. Thus I attend regardless, which means I placed a lower rank on other local attractions and cost of travel
I live in Canada. Warm in February is a real treat.
It would be great to have the meeting in Alaska where I live.
My rating of the importance of local activities or attractions is based on making the meeting an attractive event to attend for my spouse.
Mountains would be nice.
I like to see meetings in larger cities with other attractions. NYC, Boston, San Francisco, Seattle, Philly, Chicago, etc. It's a chance to see these cities at modest cost, and still have professional meeting benefits. Would also like Quebec City, Montreal, and Toronto. How about Mexico City?
Time to get there is more important
Although I attended, I was surprised that the 2008 WSSA meeting was in such an EXPENSIVE hotel and located in Chicago in February. Although I work for industry, I still felt bad about the cost and really

wondered how students and university members could afford it. Frankly, I'd be happy with a University location, if an adequate conference facility could be found. Local accommodations near campus would be fine. Otherwise, more moderate venues would be appreciated.
The availability of extracurricular activities at the meeting location weighs heavily into the decision as to whether I and/or my family attend.
While I am likely to attend either way, having the meeting in an interesting location that offers something beyond the meeting itself is an attraction
When combined with a regional meeting is optimal.
Travel to the frozen north in the middle of winter is potentially disruptive to travel schedules and meeting attendance. Both New York and Chicago had significant snowfalls that disrupted travel.
Most important factor is the content and layout of the program.
Price is very important for deciding the number of students and other personnel to take.
Since I consider the WSSA annual meeting to be nice but not necessary, cost is a big issue. If I can drive and get a reasonable room price or find someone to share a room, I would likely attend.
I maintain my membership because of my continued interest in weed science. However, due to schedule issues, when required to make a choice I will usually attend the regional NCWSS meeting vs. the National meeting.
Availability of affordable restaurants ensures that the per diem I am provided covers my meal costs. However, I usually do not have that information available when I am deciding whether to attend the meeting.
I attend regardless of location. I suppose if you met in Fargo in February I might skip it, but location is not the reason I attend.
Going to Chicago in 2008 wasn't a good idea, we all know how weather affect air travelers and how busy Chicago airport is, once there is snow, then it is a big problem, weather is important when it affect travelers. I like warm or cold weather as long as I can travel easily, no snow please!

**4. In what type of climate would you prefer the meeting to be held?**

Cold 1.8% 5

Warm 55.7% 151

Does Not Matter to Me 42.4% 115

*Answered question 271*

*Skipped question 2*

**5. Please indicate your response to the following questions:**

	Yes	No	Response count
Are tours highlighting agricultural, invasive, or horticultural weeds pertinent to the region valuable?	69.2% (184)	30.8% (82)	266
Are 15 minute breaks during the sessions adequate to allow interaction with other members?	60.9% (162)	39.1% (104)	266
Are receptions and other social activities offered at the meeting valuable?	89.0% (234)	11.0% (29)	263
Answered question			268
Skipped question			5

**6. What additional activities would you participate in if offered at the annual meeting?**

	Yes	No	Response count
Spouse programs	19.8% (46)	80.2% (186)	232
Local tours	56.0% (139)	44.0% (109)	248

Member receptions	79.7% (196)	20.3% (50)	246
List other suggestions			40
Answered question			259
Skipped question			14

and more details.
Perhaps scheduling a mid-meeting break (i.e., an open afternoon on Weds) to allow members to relax and venture about the local environs on their own, if they wish.
I generally attend the meetings unaccompanied and do a lot of side business.  Pest Peeve: Poster Sessions should mean something. They should not be scheduled in conflict with paper sessions. The best format is a 4-8 PM cocktail party format. People come and socialize and they really see and discuss the posters.
central location of moderate price that is easy to get to.
Although tours can be nice the reason to have the WSSA are to present technical papers and interact. If we worry about the tours then doesn't that take away from the original purpose? I am not saying we shouldn't have tours. Just that if we have a chance to go to a great venue with easy access and economical but no tour potential then that is ok with me. If we have great tours but have to deal with a number of other problems I would say no...
more interaction in the sessions. More symposia on teaching or on "methods" or "professional development ideas", such as ARM, etc...
Please note: on tours there is consistency between my responses to question 5 and 6. I would be interested in tours related to the content of the meeting. I would probably not participate in tourist-type sight-seeing tours, as I would normally rather do that on my own.
I really appreciate the receptions that have been carried on during past meetings. They really provide an opportunity to network with others and a very nice addition to the meeting. I belong to other societies that don't do this and usually skip their meeting and this is one reason why.
Should consider how to shorten meetings to reduce costs or group subjects to reduce days at the meeting location. Should look at other times of the year instead of February - is a holdover from the field crop days.
Hospitality or gathering place
provide opportunities for interaction that aren't available in other meetings. industry/gov't/university workshops etc.
I would prefer the meeting start at 9:00 am and go to 4:30/5:00 pm.
High quality symposia and workshops would be of value to me.
Anything you can do to hold more joint meetings with other relevant scientific societies would be quite valuable.
workshops for professional development (2 hours or less) would be great, rather than jam packed with structured 15 minute presentations. Teaching activities workshop, grant writing workshop, manuscript writing...
Agriculturally-oriented tours would be a draw for me. Examples: touring a food processing or packing plant, an agri-chemical research facility, weed science facilities at a nearby university, etc.
I come for the opportunity to stay up-to-date on weed science. I am not looking for the weed science meeting to provide me with other activities. However, I think it is great to have a reception/dinner in an interesting place like a museum or other local cultural center to enhance interaction and fellowship.

Only hold 1 reception. Time is very limited at the meetings.
COST COST COST. Not everyone is working for a mega corporation or some branch of the government. Those of us in the private sector have no travel/meeting budget; it comes right out of our check.
It all depends on available time. These extras are very nice, but increase the duration of the conference.
Local tours as long as they are related to weeds/agriculture/botany
Research topic discussion sessions that are not too structured, i.e. no long talks, just a 5 min factual introduction at the start to get things rolling.
Try to participate in local tours (at any of my meetings).
Cold weather meetings are a problem for travel, not a problem once you are at the meeting.
I enjoy the agricultural and horticultural tours. Of course, it requires meeting at locations where these are in progress.
Wife has enjoyed some, and others have fizzled. May not be pertinent for all locations.
Roundtable discussions of pertinent issues in our industries now.
I would like to have a choice of whether to attend a banquet/member reception or not. My guess is that this option will reduce the registration cost to attend a meeting. Give me a choice.
Schedule poster sessions over lunch and offer sandwiches.
Do the WSSA executives need to be wined and dined? This has to be expensive.
My spouse attends if the location is attractive to her (ex - Hawaii) but not every year. She does participate in the spouse activities.
Don't allow papers/posters that are presented in regional meetings also.
Put tours before or after the main meeting not in the middle.
anything that keeps the members together (meal, social activity, etc) is good. This increases interaction.
Having the meeting in a location where travel into the city is not hampered by winter storms would be a plus. I enjoy the member receptions, but sometimes it seems there are so many that it is difficult to go and enjoy the cultural offerings of the host city.
Discussion sessions, in-depth workshops.
I imagine that there is a very good reason for meeting in warm climates. I think this works for the world of academia. However, I think that there are a lot of younger weed science graduates employed in industry such as me that must answer to a travel budget.
If tours are offered they should cover the agriculture of the region not the weeds of the region. Tours should be pre or post conference and not included in the price of the registration. Therefore those on limited budgets would not lost time or incur unwanted costs. Spouse programs are usually targeted to women and my spouse is male. Programs should be of interest to both sexes if offered.
The current format with receptions is excellent. I did enjoy the 30 minute "energy breaks" at the IWSC and think that perhaps 30 minute breaks could be tried. Many people also noted how helpful it was to have lunch provided, which meant we didn't have to leave at lunch time (and possibly not make it back).

Arranged local tours at a "blocked" time would be great. We use to sneak out when sessions are underway to have a "view" of the area and we miss certain presentation, and why should I go to a place and get back without even walk in the city, it will be like why did I go there, so local tours, great idea, thumbs up, go for it!

**7. Would there be value in scheduling the WSSA annual meeting in conjunction with other societies' annual meetings?**

Yes 82.0% 219

No 18.0% 48

If you answered no, please provide additional comments here: 51

Answered question 267

Skipped question 6

more and more details
It depends. It is important if it strengthen the program.
I suggest that the WSSA schedule jointly with somebody in alternate years. One option would be joint scheduling with the regionals, as is being done with the SWSS in Orland, which I hope to attend. (I have already petitioned to be exempted from my company annual meeting!)
There are so many other meetings that it is hard to coordinate these days. consolidation would be good
I am not in favor of WSSA meeting with non-weed science groups (regionals are good to meet with ). I plan on not attending in 2010, since I predict that meeting with the large cowboy group will be a "disaster".
I marked yes, the reason being that often the WSSA meeting and SRASHS are right on top of each other. I missed WSSA this year because of this.
I don't quite understand how this would work. For example if SWSS and WSSA meetings were together, people from all over the country would come, and it seems like that would de-emphasize the SWSS meeting. Might be possible to have a huge, all-society meeting, much like the Cotton Beltwide meetings -- but wouldn't that lengthen the time-frame of attendance for most people, also like the Beltwide?
I think there may be some value to combining meetings. I guess we will have to see how the trial meeting happens this year.
May be value, will vary by individual's interest in the other society
As long as it did not interfere with the primary function and flow of the WSSA program.
The WSSA annual meeting has an a broad scope and it ´s very useful for those about weed science
I have answered no because I am not sure what other societies you are referring to. If something like ASA the meeting would be so be we would lose our identity. A smaller/or regional society would be possible.
This would help broaden the offerings at the meeting; however, I think it would be very important to make sure that WSSA doesn't lose its identity (nor the other society) by entering into these partnerships.
However, really only valuable when it is a completely different group of individuals and when it would be an opportunity to participate with a society that one might not get a chance to attend.
This would depend... While interactions could be valuable, conflicts in two agendas in terms of events schedules (e.g. timing of similar events of interest such as poster sessions and presentations) might cause too much interference to actively participate in both societies' meetings.
To me the biggest issue is the time of year and location.

The regional societies I attend are more focused on my specific areas of interest - geographically and agronomically. WSSA meetings in conjunction with a regional society would water-down the regional meeting too much, and the regional meetings are of the right size and program length now.
As a retiree it is mostly a social occasion
With Tri-Societies annual meeting.
I think the identity and participation and membership of the regional weed science societies' will decline significantly if joint meetings are done on a regular basis. If you mean joint with an entirely unrelated society in order to have greater bargaining power I think that would be fine.
Put it in conjunction with the ASA meetings. The ASA is restructuring itself to allow more societies to join its meeting. For us who are general agronomist but weed scientist by training, this would be great for the societies to hold a joint meeting.
CPDA or ESA national meetings
Not sure what societies you are referring to. Regional weed societies or other societies such as Range Management? If other societies other than regional weed societies, would depend on which society.
I have attended other joint meetings. It is usually okay when information is shared, but the logistics is too much for most organization. It can allow a small group to use a larger facility than they would otherwise be able to rent.
It reduces interaction between WSSA members. At worst it is like having the meeting in a casino.
More should be done and pursued like the SRM and SWSS
It makes for better economics to consolidate conferences and get the same business done
Combine with other societies or perish
Instead of the costs and time commitments associated with attending two meeting, you could consolidate them into one meeting.
Not routinely, but on occasion it would be a nice addition.
Of course, it depends on the other society. If there is potential to reduce duplication of meetings, I'm all for it.
I am not sure of this value, that's why I wrote NO.
It all depends on the duration of the meeting. If the meeting is only 1 day, it is useful to attach it to other meetings. If it takes more than 2 or 3 days, the total stay would be too long. Normally people cannot be away from the office more than 1 week (this also depends on the season. If it is in winter, maybe it is possible, if it is the field work season it is more difficult.
I find that there is plenty for me at the WSSA meeting and I don't want to split my time any further. I miss too many interesting sessions now due to scheduling conflict.
Worth trying.
The coordination with SWSS will allow me to attend SWSS for the first time.
Brazil Society at Manaus
Saves on travel and hotel costs for those that would attend both. have in conjunction with regional Weed Sci meetings

Not on a regular basis but from time to time it may be useful to meet jointly with other societies such as Agronomy, Entomology, Phytopathology where there are themes or issues of common interest.
This isn't of importance to me. However, I would not oppose doing so.
I go to the meeting to keep up with weed science, and to meet other weed scientists. There is no reason to meet with other societies.
This could go either way. Depends on what other society.
I seldom view attending a meeting as a vacation. It is just work, it is also a distraction from my other duties and thus it is easier for me to be gone two or three days than a whole week, which is often the result of combining society meetings. The larger the meeting, the bigger the hotel, and bigger the city. All of that means more cost to attend.
Depends - what societies are being considered? My primary professional society is the Crop Science Society of America. This CSSA annual meeting is already too large.
I have no problem with joint meeting with SWSS, but I have no reason to attend other regional meetings.
We will know better after the 2009 meeting. But, the regional societies have applied focus. WSSA has a broader focus. There is little to be gained by combining them other than a weeklong conference that is over-filled with presentations when we really need to be limiting the number of presentations and facilitating more discussion in the sessions.
Together with regional weed science meetings or ecological society
That's the only way I will attend.
I think meeting with regional chapters or with societies with which we overlap would be both interesting and beneficial. I look forward to the next two meetings.
Professional networking is a key element of meeting attendance, and a combined meeting would not enhance this aspect of the meeting. Perhaps some suggested possibilities of other Societies would help me to see the value of such a combined meeting, e.g. ESA? ASHS?
This would only work for me if it were a society related to my work such as a horticultural society. I would not be interested attending agronomy or soil science meetings for example.
People can't attend all the meeting, having it together with other meetings would help those who attend other meetings like NCWSS

**8. Please indicate your satisfaction with the Poster Sessions:**

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Response Count
Quality of session	2.0% (5)	2.8% (7)	27.2% (67)	58.1% (143)	9.8% (24)	246
Viewing time	2.0% (5)	9.4% (23)	26.1% (64)	55.9% (137)	6.5% (16)	245
Interaction with authors	2.5% (6)	10.3% (25)	28.0% (68)	55.1% (134)	4.1% (10)	243
Additional comments						38
Answered question						246
Skipped question						27

Possibly connect specific topic areas of posters with appropriate oral session where poster author has opportunity to present a brief summary of the poster.
Because typically there are as many (maybe more) posters than oral presentations, more time must be devoted to poster sessions with authors present.

See previous comments. Have a mini-reception at the venue of the posters from 4PM - 8PM.
Please look at the American Phytopathological Society "Flash and Dash" format. It is a huge success.
It would be helpful is there were some way to have discussions of the posters in a larger group than one on one with the authors.
I can't make comments... I am simply not a poster kind of guy.
The sessions are too long
always will be a struggle, since some folks have boring posters. The idea of having a set discussion time within a poster section is a logistical challenge that is hard to overcome.
It is often hard to find the authors even though the schedule says they should be there, or they are there but engaged in an extremely long conversation. This is mostly a problem with senior folks. Grad student authors are almost always there and ready to get into a discussion
SWSS changed their poster session format to include a reception with drinks and snacks in the late afternoon/early evening. They only tried it once, but it was a huge success. The interaction around the posters was far greater than anything that I have seen at any other meeting.
group posters by general topic. have 'mini-presentations' of posters.
I have not yet attended WSSA meetings, but I certainly like poster sessions at other meetings. Numerous concurrent sessions in multiple hotels (prior to the poster era) never worked well.
poster sizes are ASA are larger; viewing times are shorter. The space for the poster session really sets the tone for the meeting. Too small a space inhibits viewers and visits among people.
I like the move to group the sessions by subject matter this year. I think that this offers members with similar interests more opportunity to interact. I would like to see this practice continue -- to find out if it increases member satisfaction with the meetings.
Haven't been in about 3 or 4 years so I can't comment.
there should be more time for posters. Half the time I must stand by my own poster, so cannot view other posters. Then I've missed half the authors.
Would be nice to have shorter, but more sessions with authors by posters to reduces some congestion
Posters are not up long enough.
Posters need to use print that can be read from 6 ft. Too many posters recently are using journal page print that is unreadable from even 3 ft and then posters get crowded so I do not read those. Poster committee should grade comment sheet about poster to all authors. Another concern is that the visual aspects of "professionally produced posters" are those winning many awards and science is of lower concern.
I have not been for a couple of years so I have to vote neutral at this point.
N/A, haven't attended
Think everything is good with this session.
Walking space between posters often is a problem
Encouraging authors to bring a sufficient number of 8 1/2 X 11 or 8 1/2 X 14 copies of their posters would be very helpful.

I have attended WSSS for many years and always enjoy the posters. I am sure WSSA would be the same, but as I have never attended, I can't comment.
I have not attended a meeting since 1995 so I am not familiar with the Poster session format used at the WSSA meetings.
I appreciated having complementary coffee available in the poster venue. Please urge poster presenters to use larger font and have hand outs available.
Not a big fan of poster sessions but they are necessary to accommodate the large numbers of presentations and attendees.
I would like to have a later submission date for posters. I can submit abstracts for the CWSS later than I can for the WSSA and CWSS is held earlier!
Have more posters and less oral presentations. This way the oral talks will get more time, say 20 minutes, instead of 15
The poster sessions are the premier event for interaction with colleagues. I think they need to be longer. Perhaps 4 2-hr sessions at which authors are present at one of these. Author presence needs to be encouraged! 95% of posters contain too much unnecessary information. Limitation of poster verbiage needs to be encouraged. Figures need to be large enough to read from 3-4 ft, which they rarely are.
The poster viewing times are very inconvenient and difficult to get to while authors are there. Few members visited posters last year. My students presenting posters were disappointed.
I suggest that the poster display should be more concise.
Just don't switch to SWSS format.
Posters are second class presentations at weed science meetings. In Chicago, it seemed that many poster authors did not even bother attending for the entire sessions.
Use a room that is big enough so it is not too crowded when viewing posters
Unfortunately I always get involved in discussions that have little to do with posters during the official poster sessions and then have to visit the posters during "off" times so that I can actually read them. Similarly, my own poster last year was not visited much while I stood by it, and the discussions I had were on other subjects, so I didn't think that making it was a good use of my time (and UPS wrecked it when I sent it home). I really like it when the authors put printed copies with the posters for reading later; perhaps we could suggest that to authors.
I think the poster session is Ok, the problem is when u find a poster and the author is nowhere to be found.

**9. Please indicate your satisfaction with the Oral Paper Sessions:**

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Response Count
15 minute presentation format	2.0% (5)	5.2% (13)	14.1% (35)	63.3% (157)	15.3% (38)	248
Discussion during session	4.4% (11)	19.0% (47)	31.5% (78)	39.5% (98)	5.6% (14)	248
Open discussion to compliment session	3.7% (9)	20.8% (51)	33.1% (81)	38.8% (95)	3.7% (9)	245
Additional comments						40
Answered question						248
Skipped question						25

Personally, I would prefer few sessions with fewer oral papers with more time per presentation to provide more background, context and implications.

After 30 years, the paper sessions seem formulaic. I would like to see less talking at the audience and more talking with the audience. We might try to more sessions with grouped papers (2-3-4) and hold a focused discussion of the topic with the speakers as a panel.
really want more discussion. this may be hard to accomplish, since our society really does not like conflict. People are hesitant to speak freely.
Limit oral papers and expand poster session. Oral papers should be for a completed project of some merit, updates for poster session. Set a budget of time for oral papers and then have section chairs be gate keepers to allow the most important papers be oral. May consider increasing time limit to 20 minutes and/or have minisymposia.
15 minutes is not enough time. Just extending to 20 minutes would improve quality of oral presentations.
I would like to session every person who wants to give an oral presentation given that opportunity, as in the old days. I really hate poster sessions.
Generally ok. Questions are posed. little discussion or debate.
I think we need to have some 15 minute talks; however, I am generally not very interested in attending. It seems like the format leaves less opportunity for the author to explain the topic and the current format offers little opportunity for exchange within the sessions. I would like to see more discussion within the 15 minute format. I would also like to see more discussion within symposia and would like to see WSSA try discussion topics (1 to 2 hr discussions on a current relevant topic with limited presentation). This may necessitate going to more posters and fewer volunteer talks.
There needs to be more time for open discussion at the end of each paper session.
Less papers and more breaks/times for discussion... helps if the section chair can organize papers around themes, with 3-4 common papers and then a 15 minute discussion. It has worked effectively.
Haven't been in about 3 or 4 years so I can't comment.
I have no problem with the way they run now and am not in favor of changing them. SWSS made some changes against its memberships wishes and it has hurt that meeting. If not for graduate students I would not even bother going and don't when other opportunities to speak are available for my students.
Longer, more in-depth presentations/discussions are most helpful.
Open discussion can be an important part of the paper sessions. However, this is partially dependent of the skill of moderator/section chair in leading the discussion.
15 minutes is too short for a good presentation, but I can see how it is needed to enable many authors to speak. I prefer symposia that have 20-30 minute presentations.
more or clustered turf and specialty uses (right of way etc) is invaluable
There is not enough time for discussion.
Longer periods set aside for discussion during session. Fewer papers to allow time for discussion.
Need more time for questions and interactions.
papers are too short and too little time to ask questions. too many concurrent sessions
No time for discussion. Discussion at end of session no good as I may have gone to another talk.
open discussion following papers doesn't work well if authors leave or one author dominates. I would prefer to have questions immediately following each person's presentation and the facilitator then summarize for the section after the last presenter has answered questions.

Same as above.
N/A, haven't attended
I enjoy the discussion sessions although they are not usually that well attended (with the occasional "hot topic" exception).
I am in favor of 20 minute presentations followed by a semi-organized discussion around a common theme.
Need more topic specific discussions - panel discussion with lots of time for group discussion
15 minutes goes by very quickly and usually no time for questions (or one very short one). Often much of the presentation is taken up with M&M and very little time left for results and discussion. I think the M&M portions of many papers could be reduced - allowing more time for R & D and questions at the end.
They are fine the way they are.
I assume that I get most of the papers presented in written form in the journals, which I read.
Need more time for interaction after oral presentations - perhaps stretching to 20 minutes would help.
I liked the open discussion format at the end of some of the sessions.
The majority of presentations at WSSA are basic research, which doesn't fit my needs. I am much more interested in applied research.
We need to find a way to stimulate more discussion in the oral sessions. the current format does not foster these interchanges.
The discussion time has not been very well used.
As members, we don't tend to ask good, tough questions to promote dialogue.
need more time devoted to discussion
The format of the recent IWSC, with selected, invited speakers with a half hour was a nice addition; this could be accompanied by some more frequent time for discussion.
Section chairs should be able to invite 30 minute papers from among the submissions.
Time is so tight that little discussion actually takes place, and most people leave after the session rather than stay and discuss. Perhaps there could be a few talks then an open discussion, repeated, rather than waiting until many talks have gone by to discuss.

**10. Please indicate your satisfaction with the Symposia:**

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Response Count
Topics	2.4% (6)	2.4% (6)	24.9% (61)	62.0% (152)	8.2% (20)	245
Format	2.0% (5)	2.9% (7)	25.8% (63)	61.5% (150)	7.8% (19)	244
Opportunity for discussion	2.5% (6)	7.5% (18)	30.0% (72)	53.3% (128)	6.7% (16)	240
Additional comments						29
Answered question						245
Skipped question						28

Additional discussion time would be valuable, esp. if scheduled when attendees are not rushed to a meal or other activities
Try to oversee symposium organizers to assure speakers represent diversity of programs directed toward the symposium topic to assure that only one view or one project's interpretations are reflected.
There should be a good facilitator with each symposium and adequate time to get discussions going on the topic.
Too many of them. It interferes with normal sessions. For example, I remember genomic type symposium being scheduled at the same time as physiology.
want more diversity in topics. not really interested in any more biotech or biofuel symposia, so please have something different.
I think it is important not to overlap symposia topics with relevant paper sessions.
The Bioenergy symposium at the last meeting was the best I've seen due to some good (some marginal) presenters and great discussion. More time for discussion might be needed for hot topics.
Too many or too specific draws support from tech paper and poster sessions.
My comment above covers my thinking on symposia.
Symposia should be limited to 3 critical topics, which should highlight the overall theme of the meeting.
Haven't been in about 3 or 4 years so I can't comment.
I don't find symposia that interesting.
These have been great.
more or clustered turf and specialty uses (right of way etc) is invaluable
Usually not enough discussion time is built into the program.
More time for discussion of topic and papers. Reduce the number of papers to a few invited.
More on adaptive integrated management
Get rid of the symposia
Topics are too related to lobbying policies of US or are too much related to politics. They are too few symposia related to true scientific challenges or theory
I believe symposia on pertinent topics are a large draw. In the regional meeting I attend, the symposia have attracted individuals and organizations that would not normally attend. Furthermore some of these did not even know that there were Weed Science Societies.
N/A, haven't attended
The symposia have been a great addition to the meeting in the past few years. Some important topics have really increased interest in the meeting from outside our "normal" weed science attendees. I think this should be further encouraged.
The odds of a symposium fitting one's area of interest are low, given the great diversity of potential topics within weed science. The topics that have matched my interests have been excellent very useful.
May be having too many symposia. They aren't a cure all. Some seem a stretch. Seem like a search for brownie points from administrators.

Same as above
I have not attended any symposia.
The danger with symposia is that sometimes they become a forum to promote a company agenda, and when they do become dry.
Selection of symposia topics should have more input from the membership at large. Some societies have working groups that meeting during the conference and suggest topics for symposia and workshops for the following year.
I usually attend these because there is more time for comprehensive coverage and I always learn a lot.

**11. Would you find instructional workshops, held in conjunction with the meeting, beneficial?**

Yes 64.8% 169  
 No 9.6% 25  
 Undecided 25.7% 67  
*Answered question 261*  
*Skipped question 12*

**12. If yes, when would the workshops be best scheduled?**

During the meeting 48.5% 98  
 Before the meeting 39.6% 80  
 After the meeting 11.9% 24  
*Answered question 202*  
*Skipped question 71*

**13. Do the current WSSA publications (*Weed Science, Weed Technology, and Invasive Plant Science and Management*) meet your professional needs?**

Yes 92.8% 244  
 No 7.2% 19  
 Please help us improve the publications by providing additional comments here: 38  
*answered question 263*  
*skipped question 10*

Very difficult for Industry research projects to be published.
Weed science is getting weaker. Too much focus on ecology and biology and Ignore other aspects of weed science. The review process is not efficient and some reviewers lack enough knowledge and experiences. Have two reviewers is not enough and rejecting paper by associate editor base on split decision is wrong. I have stopped sending manuscript to weed science because my disappointment with the review process.
The new journal is a nice addition and the quality is very good.
need more incentives for reviewers. there is very little incentive to be a good reviewer. I suggest you list the number of articles each reviewer saw when you put their name in the back of the journal. This would at least indicate how many articles that person reviewed.
We dilute the impact of our flagship publication, Weed Science, each time we create a new journal. Imagining that we can increase (long-term) membership by starting a new journal is silly. This did not happen with Weed Technology, and it likely will not happen with IPSM. WSSA is a small scientific society, and it needs a single journal only, but one with a very high impact factor.
new journal superfluous

I am really excited by the latest publication on invasive plants and their management.
Would like to see more practical applications.
The delays in turnaround time of the review process needs to be improved.
Go back to two journals and have the "Invasive species" papers in a separate section of either journal, depending on whether the paper deals with biology (Weed Sci) or technology (Weed Tech). The new journal has completely confused the terminology regarding invasion, and we now see the phrase "invasive weed" sprinkled throughout as though that gives added importance to the study in question.
I also think papers in all journals are too long and verbose. Authors should be encouraged to get right to the point and focus their writing better. The "best" journals, like Science and Nature give writers word limits. More use should be made of "short communications". The summaries in the new journal are OK, but the writing is often sloppy and just repeats the abstract. See JEQ or Science for how to do summaries.
Having said this, the quality of Weed Science, in particular, has improved greatly over the last 10 years and is now a respectable journal.
I am sorry to see the society develop another journal as Invasive Plant Sci and Management; There are too many journals (society and corporate) aiming for the same papers. So far I have not seen anything in "Invasive" that could have been published in WS or WT. Development for further journals could be a financial/professional loss.
Thank you for publishing Invasive Plant Science and Management. There may be a need to combine Weed Science and Weed Technology into one journal once IPSM matures.
Actually, we need a more applied Journal. I thought Weed Technology was supposed to serve that purpose but it's really starting to get to technical. I'd like to see a Journal that accepts papers that target a broader audience, such as consultants, specialist, and county agents. My main problem with Weed Tech is that visual data doesn't seem to stand alone anymore.
Can the dues be reduced by only subscribing to one or two publications?
I do not think the Invasive Weed Science journal is necessary. Weed Science is just a sliver of a journal as it is, and the invasive weeds articles could have been incorporated into it, even if it meant renaming it. I think it was just an expensive 'political correctness' to come out with another journal.
It appears as though if you have a name for yourself, some less than stellar research will be approved for publication. Then, if you do not have a name for yourself, your research can be endlessly picked apart over miniscule details instead of approving the high quality research for publication. Weed Technology should also be for applied field research with a little more latitude given to the research instead of trying to make it a second "Weed Science" journal. To publish in Weed Tech should not take months of endless reviews just to publish simple straight-forward research findings.
cut the size in half and focus on the most important issues
use a "digest" version in front to help the reader get an overview of the contents-refer to "Science" journal format, and "Science News"
make articles available online as pdf's
However, we need to increase their impact numbers.
We need to shorten the length of time that reviewers have to review manuscripts. If someone can't get to it in 4 to 6 weeks, should they really be assigned the paper? Other related journals I publish in (e.g. ASA and ASHS) have a much better turn-around-time than WSSA journals. More timely reviews (therefore publication) aren't simply important to authors, but very important to maintaining relevancy

and impact of the journals. I want to keep supporting the WSSA journals, but these long review periods (>3 months) are disappointing, especially when one or more of the reviews have little substance.

I thought we were to get an annual CD when we signed up for the web delivery option. I have not gotten a CD yet. Storing the paper copies is difficult and expensive.

You did not give space to discuss membership fees and publications. Here is my beef; there is a perception that the BOD is way too willing to spend money with individual membership and regional society dues without impact on members. The dues are getting out of hand due to the easy out of hiring someone to do the job. The BOD willingness to keep hiring people to do the work has killed the culture of stepping up to assist the society for free. The regional societies are fighting this change. The BOD has to stop the free spending of members' dues and get the dues realistic again.

I am interested in more forestry information. These journals do not have forestry papers. I have heard the editors do not recognize the differences in forestry/ag cultures, i.e. replication over years, multiple sites, etc.

More or less but I tend to try publishing in other journals if possible simply because of speed of publication, the ease of web site usage and uploading, and the higher impact factor.

There is a good range of topics covered from basic weed science to more applied

More publications concerning problems confronting row crop agriculture would be most helpful.

Invasive Plant Science should be part of Weed Science - but that is no news to you

I turn to these publications daily. Especially now that the older volumes are available through J-Store.

Are there sufficient submitted articles to justify publishing Weed Technology 6x per year instead of 4x? Perhaps the new "Invasive..." journal will take some of the pressure off Weed Sci and Weed Tech to help speed the time from submission to print...

Yes, these journals cover some of my professional needs, but only the applied aspects. I rely on journals from ESA and Biological Invasions to fill the void.

I think our publications are excellent!

NO is maybe be too hard, but too many publications are too US specific. EWRS publications are more international. However there is often a learning for outside US weed scientists - this is why I still read it.

I prefer electronic versions.

A national online quick turnaround place to publish non-reviewed or minimally reviewed reports of applied research preliminary results would be useful.

Forget metric units for weed technology and make the articles understandable by more readers

The quality of the Associate Editors work is highly variable. Some are conscientious. Others are sloppy and simply repeat the reviewers' comments, without any real editing or considered advice. Editing is often nit picking in the extreme regarding format, but then I find egregious errors in published papers. I am not talking about copy editing here, but rather mistakes in fact, inappropriate citations, uninterruptable figure and table captions, incorrect use of statistical procedures and so forth. I suggest the Society consider holding regular workshops for Associate Editors (perhaps at alternate annual meetings), where experienced editors pass on tips to new or younger editors.

Weed Tech needs to be more available to applied work while Weed Science should focus on more basic research. I'm not sure the new Weed Tech editor understands this.

Online subscriptions should include a yearly CD or DVD of each publication for that year. I want an archival copy of the journals and I would rather have that as a CD than in printed form.

The time from submission to publication is too long. We must seek to improve the impact factor of our journals as that is increasing important for faculty performance evaluations.

**14. We are currently evaluating the membership fees for the WSSA to better serve the members. Given a choice, how would you like to see the membership fees structured?**

Reduced membership fees with publications available by subscription only 14.7% 38

Slightly reduced membership fees with a subscription to *Weed Science* in print and online included and the other publications available at a discounted rate 7.0% 18

Slightly reduced membership fees with your choice of one publication in print and online 10.9% 28

Slightly reduced membership fees with online only subscriptions to all publications and print versions available for an additional fee 47.7% 123

Increased membership fees with all publications in print and online included 19.8% 51

*Answered question 258*

*Skipped question 15*

**15. If you could only select one publication to be included in your membership fee, which would you choose?**

*Weed Science* 39.8% 103

*Weed Technology* 48.3% 125

*Invasive Plant Science and Management* 12.0% 31

*Answered question 259*

*Skipped question 14*

**16. Please provide your thoughts about how to increase WSSA membership:**

Response Count 83

*Answered question 83*

*Skipped question 190*

<p>Include plant ecologists and others interested in invasive weed biology and management. Agrichemical consolidation and academic growth limits will limit the total number of traditional people that could be attracted.</p>
<p>I would do more outreach to ASPB and Biotech. Industry. No society really serves the biotech scientific community well.</p>
<p>A slight increase would be OK to retain availability of all three journals because I pay for dues and publications out of my pocket. I receive each journal and plan to continue until I retire, unless the cost becomes prohibitive. I have submitted to all three journals and thus far published in two.</p>
<p>Reach out to graduate students and young scientists in invasion biology, plant population biology and other disciplines that overlap substantially with weed science. Promote image of weed science as an important area of applied plant biology - not just herbicide science.</p>
<p>You need to target broader audience who are interested in weed management, provide services during the meeting that bring people. Have symposiums with topics that bring wider audience. The symposiums that dealing with biology and ecology are not popular and few people attend these. There are many people today who prefer to go to regional meetings and not to WSSA because regional meeting focus more on topics important to them. Keep the core of the meeting the way it is now but broaden the topics to bring new audience.</p>

Do we need to increase membership? Some professional societies are fully functional and have excellent annual meetings with only about 300 members and 150-200 at attendance, e. g. Society of Nematologists. They do real science and have excellent annual meetings.

I think the best way to increase membership is to offer a membership in which the member is getting a good deal for his investment. As I look at Question 2 above, I see changes coming that will make a WSSA membership less instead of more attractive.

Reach out to the growing interest or popularity in sustainable, organic, and horticultural areas. These groups are hungry for not only management but better knowledge of weed biology and ecology. WSSA needs to emphasize its involvement in these areas more, as it has done for the invasive weed area. Conventional agriculture has mostly gone the way of Roundup Ready - WSSA needs to be flexible and broaden its perspectives.

We need to reach more practitioners as well as ecologists, range managers, botanists, who are practicing weed science but don't consider themselves weed scientists. We're too scientific for most practitioners and too applied for many ecologists.

keeping membership fee lower without any restriction for journals. fast downloadable journals (zip file for whole journal) can be another choice to keep fee lower.

I realize you all worry about this all the time, but the ag business as a whole has been contracting for several generations. So WSSA gets smaller, who cares!!! we have a good strong program, we have money in the bank, our journals are going okay....

We need to "tap into" the horticulture industry and public. I am a researcher (100% time), not an extension educator, but I still get calls regularly regarding weed control issues. Most of the questions I receive are not related to farming. Instead, they are related to gardens and lawns. Master Gardener programs exist in each state (and province in Canada, I believe), and these programs represent an untapped resource for WSSA membership.

Bring in outsiders in areas such as invasive species and environmental toxicology for symposia.

Merge the affiliated regional weed science societies and WSSA into one body; maybe include NAWMA. A national association of scientists, state and regional weed managers, and practitioners would make the discipline of weed science stronger and more impactful at all levels. How far must our numbers fall before we merge?

work to be more inclusive and inviting to people in turf, weed control in industrial areas, etc.

Improve the science! This society reports to much 'spray and pray' research. Also, although placing seeds in the soil for weedy species and reporting on the germination characteristics over time has its base line value for agricultural management, why can't the society members start to report on the genetics, biochemistry and physiological responses within the seeds; are we lacking training in these fundamental disciplines? When I want to fall asleep at night, all I have to do is read a Weed Science paper on the germination potential of seed buried at different depths in the soil. In fact, many papers published in Weed Science could just as well be published in Weed Technology. Weed Science indeed should be more about the 'SCIENCE' behind the weedy characteristics.

Appeal to the invasive plant world and less to the crop scientists

We are a shrinking society. We need to find ways to attract some of the basic plant scientists (botany, ecology, invasive plants...) that currently do not attend our meeting. With all of the people that work on weeds, our membership should be much greater than it is.

Recruiting students, both undergraduate and graduate levels, is where it starts. How many PhDs are going to change fields/research direction(s) after 20 years?

Program must be more applied in nature and deal with solutions to issues. A stronger blend of disciplines would be helpful.

Three quick ideas:

1. Attract a larger international audience. Give up the "of America" part of the name, and merge with the International society to produce an international society and international journals. The need for weed science research outside America is great, and many international members would join, perhaps at an initial reduced rate.
2. Attract more ecologists (the ones getting funds from the NRI Weedy and Invasive Plants program) by making Weed Sci look and read more like Ecology, and having strong ecology sessions at the meetings.
3. Attract more practitioners, consultants etc by making writers of Weed Tech articles include a single page "Summary and Recommendation" section that is written in extension-type language, might include a table, and contains the practical, hands-on message of the article. Something consultants will copy and put in their notebook and carry in the truck. The associate editors would have to be trained in how to pull the right kind of information out of authors for this, but it could be an effective way to link the society to a larger audience.

I wish I had a solution but if you come up with one ASA and CSSA would love to hear from you.

I think WSSA needs to concentrate on providing quality subject matter at meetings, quality journals, and developing strategic partnerships with other groups that work on weed science issues. We need to think about how to make the meetings so attractive that people go out of their way to attend. I am also concerned about WSSA's interactions with its current partner societies, the regional societies and CWSS. I see a big disconnect between the groups - we do not interact in a positive manner for the most part. all our organizations are territorial and mistrustful -- I think that we need to work to overcome this barrier.

Ask people to join. Hire or create a membership director position. Create and distribute membership materials to WSSA Board of Directors and ask each of them to "sign up" 5 new members.

Change the public perception of agriculture and activities their associated with.

As mentioned above, we need to appeal to a broader audience. Less science and more information combined with choice locations would be a start. We would need to keep an eye on membership dues and registration fees. One way to do this is maybe we should charge more to publish manuscripts and/or have different membership levels. For those of us whose promotion and tenure depend on publications and professional involvement the cost really doesn't matter, within reason. Others may not have grants to cover these expenses.

Weed Science would be 2nd choice

Go after the companies that are in the ag field

Currently, very few people other than weed scientists attend the meeting because of the subject matter which is scientific, but doesn't reach a wide variety of people. County agents and consultants would probably be more apt to attend if subjects included useful material about farming weed science issues, homeowner weed issues, turf issues, etc. Also, if a course such as the Purdue Mode-of-Action course were offered, I would definitely attend in order to take it while not increasing my travel budget.

Reduce membership fees; align with other professional organizations to increase exposure.

I think the board has come up with some good ideas on how to increase the membership. Work on creating a welcoming atmosphere for those who do not come to the meeting with a traditional weed science background. The meetings are probably intimidating to a non-traditional attendee as everyone knows everyone else and can speak the lingo. Maybe it's worth discussing that weed science is not a growing discipline at this time and concentrate instead on quality publications and meetings, although both may be smaller than in the past.

Membership is driven by funding and jobs in weed science (both in academia and industry). These have been declining and it's hard to envision how to reverse the trend.

Make the science more relevant to the general public. If I am not mistaken, there was a time when county weed directors would at least regularly attend the regional weed science meetings. Now there are many crop consultants and certified applicators who need CEU credits. Therefore, the need for the science is there, but the society is doing a poor job making it relevant to the general public. We are too concerned with whether proc glm or proc mixed was used in analyzing the data instead of making the findings relevant and communicating it to the masses. The "elitist" mentality needs to be dropped by many society members and they need to learn to embrace the knowledge and practical experiences of others in related fields.

Help explain the magnitude of the economic and environmental issues involved to a wider audience, everything is internally focused currently

Diversification into other areas of plant management.

I think WSSA membership trends reflect the consolidation of industry and the loss of Weed Science positions (and graduate students) at Universities/ College. If we focus on these "traditional" audiences our membership will continue to decline. One approach is to adapt to smaller numbers by combining meetings with other societies and focus publishing to online WSSA journals. If we decide the Society needs to increase membership then first the WSSA needs to make sure "traditional" members are well served by the Society and identify new audiences such as folks in IPM, Invasive Weeds, farm suppliers, Extension, community colleges, etc. If WSSA is going to attract new audiences it must be more relevant than current societies attracting these groups. Containing meeting costs (what about a meeting every 2 years?), time of the meeting (are there better times than February?), and workshops on teaching, applied aspects, etc. aimed at new audiences might help.

I believe that our membership is declining along with our numbers in weed science. Nicer locations for the meeting could spur additional interest from individuals who wouldn't otherwise attend.

You will need to increase participation in agricultural sciences. From that base, good paying jobs in weed science would attract sufficient members to maintain the profession.

Decrease industry presence other than through professional paper presentation.

In my opinion, the membership follows potential opportunity from development of new technologies and funding. Perhaps biofuel production and weed science along with some new chemistry will jumpstart the membership. Otherwise, I really don't think that adding bells and whistles is going to help. For me, opportunities derived from industry developments will provide the most significant increase in potential membership.

Make the programs and content more relevant to OTHERS (I mean non academic/mfg) especially people more connected directly to PRODUCTION ag...this is the huge audience you are not coming within a country mile of most of the time...If you had 1/3 of the CCA or CPAg population come to a meeting every third year you would be more than doubling membership...think about it!

Improve the appeal to professionals outside of academia.

I usually chose to go the regional meeting as it is more pertinent to what I do. I would like it if there was just one meeting to combine the WSSA with a day or two to devote to regional organizations like the NCWSS, WSWS, and SWSS. I think we need to roll up the weed science societies to strengthen the discipline.

Make WSSA more inclusive of the entire weed science community. Currently, several (many?) weed scientists may only belong or attend their regional society meetings. Discussions should take place on which regional societies would be interested in merging with WSSA in the long-term. Many benefits would occur to individuals personally and to the society as a whole.

Have more information available for practitioners at annual meetings. This could be done through more symposia, workshops, joint meetings.

I am primarily a EWRS member, where we face the same membership issues. My advice to EWRS is to look more globally and the same may be helpful for WSSA.

I cannot answer this question, all journals provide useful information.

Unite regional WS Societies with WSSA.

Make Weed Science more prominent

This may already be occurring, but perhaps make more contact with state conservation departments, highway people, etc. about benefit society membership can provide in invasive weed management.

Offering workshops and trainings that enhance student participation might bring in more members. Cross-discipline activities also enhance interaction and bring in more people that are not traditional weed scientists.

Implement a method of having Weed Science educators inform their students about WSSA via some type of introduction the first day of their weed science class. Maybe a 20 minute video, something to introduce the society and how national and international we are. Include information about IWSS.

-Unlikely to change much as numbers of professionals in education and government are declining and weed science is fading as a discipline.

-WSSA is noted as the herbicide oriented society and research topics on science of weeds (botany, biology, interaction, etc) is very much less appreciated. We need to get more content to make more welcome the "thinkers of weed aspects" and not just the chemical control aspect.

I won't pick a journal. As a WSSA member I think I should have access to all three of these journals on-line. I should pay 'extra' in my membership dues if I want a printed copy sent to me. With the cost of printing and postage this makes sense. I would not send free printed versions to fellows either (not sure if they do get them) because the cost of printing and postage is so expensive.

This is a tough decision for me. Because I am in the applied side of Weed Science I typically use "Weed Technology," but I find myself turning to the "Invasive Plant Science and Management" journal more and more as new issues are produced. I am dealing more and more in the area of invasive plant management.

Think that you are doing everything that you can. The addition of the new journal, lowering of membership fees, and better (warmer) locations for the meeting are things that come to mind.

I am hesitant to see the WSSA journals move towards online publication only (I know that's not the current plan but it could be a slippery slope). I hope that the new Invasive journal will increase interest in the Society and encourage non-traditional weed scientist to join.

Cater more to the ecology, applied and non-crop interest groups. Configure meetings especially for them rather than their sessions becoming 'step child like'. This will only be able to happen if the Crop folks make a strong tie to non-crop and openly welcome and attend these sessions. This can be accomplished by having at least 2 hour Group Discussion sessions (starting with 30 to 60 min panel discussion) on specific issues weed scientists face that crossover between non-crop and crop. No other sessions should be offered during this time frame. Discussions should be on the second and third day of the meeting. A moderator that is excellent at encouraging group participation is needed. This type of event would help non-crop and crop people become more familiar with each other and find common ground. this format should be done for several years.

Perhaps we could broaden our base by making sure Weed Science is made a degree in universities and a job title in the Agricultural Research Service

I think there is a large pool of crop scout / crop advisor / extension type people who would join if membership fees were decoupled from subscriptions to print versions of the journals. Many of these folks are more likely to be members of a regional society. Perhaps WSSA and its regional members could develop some sort of "bargain" WSSA membership fee for regional society members.

We need to make sure that the EPPC councils in the SE US are aware of WSSA.

Train more weed scientists.

If you go the subscription route, just be certain that online access accompanies the subscription.

What are the provisions for retired academics? Would like to remain active and attend meetings. Not greatly interested in journals any more.

I would not be interested in paying an increased WSSA membership fee.

Federal and state land managers are numerous and providing workshop opportunities for them to obtain continuing education credits or similar might attract them to our society meetings and membership.

WSSA and regionals have, for years, discussed this. Let's face it; there are fewer of us than there once was.

Become more international

Reducing membership fees will increase WSSA member.

Vigorously advertise at Universities and offer very low student memberships.

Conduct joint meetings with other disciplines (pathology, entomology). Encourage more applied research papers. Have the meeting at touristy destinations. You could use the APS format and include company advertisements for a fee in the program in order to bring in additional funding.

increase your audience by making articles more readable

I did not answer # 2 because I want all three printed journals and membership at the old Price. Since I am retired I should get a price break like the American Society of Agronomy gives but I will pay to get all three WSSA journals if reasonable.

Do not have meetings in northern US, including Canada. It's cold and dreary. If you must rotate locations around regions, change meeting dates to a different time of the year. Like the American Chemical Society, stick to larger cities.

Won't happen as the Weed Science community is declining in professionals.

I am optimistic that, given time, folks outside of WSSA who work on invasive plants will begin to join the society if we persevere with this strategy - though some WSSA members will be uncomfortable with this change.

Tailor meeting and programs, etc to appeal to all membership more equally. Sometimes academia seems to get the highest focus.

Joint meetings with regional weed and other societies.

Do a better job recruiting graduate students. I think we need to work hard to reinvent weed science.

Keep expanding invasive plants offerings, esp. management, broaden beyond commodity crops.

Expand the base to include weed and invasive plant information in natural areas, rather than relying so heavily on agriculture.

Endeavor to specifically define "invasive", "competition", "increased biodiversity" in both the political/regulation sense and in the scientific sense.

Our group needs to realize that the good old days are gone. It is not a bad thing that membership may be declining.

The only way I see is to recruit collateral areas that have pertinent interests such as the ecological portions included with Invasive plants, etc.

Figure out how to attract students! Older established professionals aren't going to change affiliations or join new societies very much, but students are looking at developing their careers and contacts and we should be attracting them! In my own area, ecology students who want to work in applied areas such as invasive species are a ready target, but they don't currently come to WSSA meetings because the focus is primarily weed control and herbicides. The WSWS attracts many students (and perhaps other regionals do as well); we should see what they are doing and emulate it.

Difficult one, the only way to increase membership is to increase participation by graduate students. If you increase the number of graduate students then even when they finish graduate school they will still be part or members of WSSA. Have incentives for graduate students like reduced fees. Most people who present at WSSA are professors, ask them where are their graduate students and what should be done to bring them along. Graduate students work their 'butts' off only for advisors or professors been the ones taking the presentation to WSSA. May like if u are a professor, u bring your graduate student, you pay less, u bring 4, one of them doesn't pay etc. Students want to go but funds. Some students feel like going for regional meetings because they are told like WSSA is for big 'guys' and I think it is a wrong perception, I am graduate student and I presented a paper at WSSA 2008, it was fun and I had good comments that made me better.

**17. Please indicate your professional setting/position/title:**

College/university faculty 52.2% 130

Graduate student 4.4% 11

Nonprofit organization 2.8% 7

For-profit company 22.1% 55

Consulting firm 3.2% 8

State agency 3.6% 9

Federal agency 15.7% 39

Other (please specify) 29

*Answered question 249*

*Skipped question 24*

Extension
Cotton Incorporated
Industry
Research Associate / Graduate Student
I really do not like on line surveys....
University Post Doctoral Associate
Soon to be retired
Research staff at a University
Own a chemical company
Retired
Retired from Federal agency
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada
retired
I do R&D and speak at several professional venues. Unfortunately WSSA feels closed and less accessible to me today so I don't think much about working with it vs other groups
WSSA is missing out, needs to broaden its appeal beyond academic/specialist membership
County weed district supervisor.

Extension Service/County Agent
extension
Postdoc
Retired
Retired university faculty weed scientist.
Contract Research
Extension Service
Post-doc
Retired university. Now contract research.
Technician
University Extension Specialist
Retired
Non-US National govt agency
Pesticide Industry, Head of Business Development

End of survey