

The 2016 SICB Member Survey was developed over the course of one year with broad input from SICB Committees, the SICB Executive Committee, BAI Management Staff and other SICB officers. Information gathered from the survey is used by the leadership of the SICB to better plan for the future of the Society. The survey was made available online to SICB members in March 2016 for over one month with several reminders to members to complete the survey.

The survey was similar in design to the 2009 SICB Member Survey and consisted of 48 questions over 12 pages. The survey was designed to track answers to questions using the different categories of membership (e.g., Full Members, Postdoctoral Members, Graduate Student Members, and Student-in-Training Members). The questions were divided into different categories as outlined below. There were 614 responses.

### **Some demographics of the respondents**

**Summary.** These data are similar to those provided by the 2009 SICB Member Survey. There was a robust response from the Full Members of the Society and significant responses from the other member categories. More than two-thirds (68.1%) of the Full Members who responded have belonged to the Society for more than 10 years; this is an increase from 33.9% in the 2009 survey. Academic institutions are overwhelmingly on the semester system and this was true of the membership in 2009. Slightly less than half of the Full Member respondents come from large academic institutions with greater than 20,000 students. The degree programs (undergraduate and graduate) of respondents reflect degree offerings for undergraduates, masters, and doctoral students. But there are significant numbers from purely undergraduate institutions (20.9%) and institutions offering undergraduate and masters degrees (17.6%). Full Member respondents indicated a significant balance in expectations between teaching and research (52.1%). While 20.4% have expectations primarily in research, only 16.4% have primary expectations in teaching.

Responses from the different member categories are as follows.

- Full Members (includes full members, life members, emeritus members) = 370 (60.3%)
- Postdoctoral Members = 59 (9.6%)
- Graduate Student Members = 147 (23.9%)
- Student-in-Training Members = 38 (6.2%)

#### Gender of respondents

- Female – 45.6%
- Male – 53.9%
- Other – 0.5%

#### Membership longevity of Full Members

- >30 years – 20.3%
- 21-30 years – 16.2%
- 11-20 years – 31.6%
- 6-10 years – 18.1%
- 4-5 years – 5.1%
- 1-3 years – 5.4%

- <1 year – 3.2%

### Institutional Profiles

The data shown below reflect responses from all members (Full, Postdoctoral, Graduate Student, Student-in-Training) and Full Members.

### Academic institution calendars

- Semester system – 84.3% all members; 85.7% Full Members
- Quarter system – 11.7% all members; 9.6% Full Members

### Size of academic institutions

- <2,500 – 9.3% all members; 12.6% Full Members
- 2,501-5,000 – 8.3% all members; 10.5% Full Members
- 5,001-10,000 – 12.6% all members; 12.6% Full Members
- 10,001-20,000 – 23.2% all members; 22.2% Full Members
- >20,000 – 46.5% all members; 42.0% Full Members

### Academic institution description with respect to biology programs

- Only undergraduate programs – 15.3% all members; 20.9% Full Members
- Undergraduate and masters programs, but no doctoral programs – 12.5% all members; 17.6% Full Members
- Undergraduate, masters, and doctoral programs – 70.1% all members; 59.5% Full Members

### Description of academic institution

- primary expectations in research productivity – 38.2% all members; postdocs 68.5%, grad students 54.1%; 20.4% Full Members
- balance research and teaching expectations – 47.3% all members; postdocs 24.1%, grad students 41.0%; 52.1% Full Members
- primary expectations in teaching – 16.4% (12.3% all members; postdocs 1.9%, grad students 3.5%; 16.4% Full Members
- other – 2.2% all members; postdocs 5.6%, grad students 1.4%; 2.1% Full Members

## **Annual Meetings**

**Summary.** Most members of the Society attend the annual meeting regularly (41.2% of all members attend every year and 21.7% of all members attend every other year). First-time attendees were 12.3% of the respondents. The timing of the annual meeting meets a number of strategic needs of the Society, including, but not limited to the timing of the various academic calendars, affordable venues, and venues convenient to get to. The affordability is a significant factor since the SICB Annual Meeting attracts many students and postdocs; more than 50% of the attendees are students and postdocs (58.1% at the 2016 Portland meeting). The data shown below reflect responses from all members (Full, Postdoctoral, Graduate Student, Student-in-Training) and Full Members. Overwhelmingly, SICB members are satisfied with the current timing of the annual meeting (82.6% in the current survey and 76.0% in the 2009 survey). The

monthly breakdown of preferences for the timing of the meeting is consistent with the overall desirability of the currently established meeting time in early January. Meeting location was somewhat to very important to more than three quarters of all members.

#### Annual meeting attendance

- Last meeting was the first – 12.3% all members; 1.9% Full Members
- Every year – 41.2% all members; 43.0% Full Members
- Every other year – 21.7% all members; 23.1% Full Members
- Every 3 to 5 years – 12.3% all members; 18.2% Full Members
- Rarely – 7.0% all members; 10.2% Full Members
- Never – 5.5% all members; 3.6% Full Members

#### Present timing of the annual meeting

- While not always at a perfect time, I am satisfied with the present timing of the annual meeting. – 82.7% all members; 82.6% Full Members; 2009 survey response to this question was 77.3% all members; 76.0% Full Members.
- I am not satisfied with the timing of the annual meeting. – 17.3% all members; 17.4% Full Members; 2009 survey response to this question was 22.7% all members; 24.0% Full Members.

Preferences for meeting times on a monthly basis. Numbers are % all members; % Full Members responses.

	Highly desirable	Desirable	Undesirable	Highly undesirable	No opinion
January	42.1; 43.7	26.2; 38.0	9.1; 8.0	4.5; 5.4	8.1; 4.8
February	4.4; 4.5	19.5; 17.8	32.4; 29.8	31.0; 38.6	12.7; 9.6
March	4.1; 3.7	20.5; 15.5	32.1; 32.4	29.9; 38.1	13.4; 9.8
April	4.0; 3.8	16.7; 16.7	32.7; 29.3	34.7; 41.5	11.9; 8.7
May	10.6; 12.5	25.2; 25.7	27.0; 25.3	26.8; 29.4	10.4; 7.1
June	20.0; 21.6	30.5; 26.6	19.0; 21.6	20.0; 22.3	10.6; 7.9
July	18.9; 18.0	29.3; 25.3	20.8; 24.6	19.9; 23.6	11.2; 8.5
August	18.0; 17.7	32.2; 29.5	19.2; 21.3	20.9; 23.9	9.6; 7.5
September	5.2; 4.5	19.8; 15.9	30.9; 30.7	34.1; 42.8	10.1; 6.2
October	3.8; 3.1	18.2; 16.8	33.4; 31.6	32.4; 39.2	12.3; 9.3
November	3.2; 2.4	14.5; 13.2	34.8; 32.4	36.0; 43.2	11.5; 8.7
December	7.1; 5.1	18.5; 17.8	26.2; 26.7	38.9; 44.2	9.3; 6.2

#### Meeting location

How important is the meeting location in your decision whether or not to attend the annual meeting?

- Very important – 23.0% all members; 24.0% Full Members
- Somewhat important – 60.9% all members; 58.8% Full Members
- Not important – 16.0% all members; 17.1% Full Members

## SICB Development Activities

The leadership of SICB has been very active in recent years in making sure that the various funds of the Society are well-managed and that the funds are appropriately serving their stated goals. The SICB Development Committee has been particularly helpful in thinking strategically about ways to enhance the Society's endowment to insure the financial stability of the organization. These funds help to keep the cost of the annual meetings and the cost of membership low. The funds also provide important funding sources to support symposia and student research. A number of questions on the member survey were included to gather information on the opinions and the giving activities of the membership. The data shown below reflect responses from all members (Full, Postdoctoral, Graduate Student, Student-in-Training) and Full Members.

In the past, I have contributed to one or more of the various SICB funds.

- Never – 68.1% all members; 50.8% Full Members
- Once in the past – 13.2% all members; 19.1% Full Members
- Occasionally (and more than once) – 14.0% all members; 22.7% Full Members
- More-or-less annually – 4.7% all members; 7.5% Full Members

I intend to make a financial contribution to one or more of the SICB funds to support its programs.

- within the next year – 10.7% all members; 16.8% Full Members
- within the next three years – 19.4% all members; 24.0% Full Members
- within the next five years – 36.1% all members; 27.9% Full Members
- I do NOT intend to contribute to any of the SICB funds. – 33.9% all members; 31.2% Full Members

I am considering SICB in my estate planning.

- Yes – 2.2% all members; 2.7% Full Members
- No – 66.4% all members; 71.3% Full Members
- Don't know – 31.4% all members; 26.0% Full Members

Please indicate why you have not contributed to a SICB fund or why you are not considering a contribution in some form (check all that apply).

- I cannot afford to make a donation of any size. – 57% all members; 32.7% Full Members
- No one asked me to donate. – 10.3% (13.0% all members; 10.3% Full Members)
- I'm not aware of the need for contributed funds to support Society activities. – 11.6% all members; 11.4% Full Members
- The Society has not made a good case for member contributions. – 8.4% all members; 14.7% Full Members
- I believe my dues should be sufficient to support all SICB activities. – 16.2% all members; 21.7% Full Members
- I don't know what "planned giving" is or how to go about it. – 4.6% all members; 2.9% Full Members

- I have other philanthropic priorities. – 40.6% all members; 55.9% Full Members
- Other (please specify) or comment. – 12.2% all members; 13.2% Full Members

NB Many of the comments were from students who indicated that they would give in the future. Some questioned the need for giving at all.

### SICB Research and Educational Resources (RER)

This section of the member survey contained questions generated by the SICB Educational Council and refers to issues surrounding teaching and providing research resources. The data shown below reflect responses from all members (Full, Postdoctoral, Graduate Student, Student-in-Training).

Have you ever viewed the teaching resources available on the RER or the old Digital Library?

- Yes – 25.0%
- No, never – 58.7%
- My first time visiting the RER page was made recently as a result of this survey. – 19.3%

The Educational Council is working to enrich the RER in different disciplinary areas. If the content of your research or teaching area were increased, how likely would you be to consult and use material from the RER? Scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = very likely and 5 = very unlikely.

- 1 – very likely 21.9%
- 2 26.8%
- 3 31.7%
- 4 10.1%
- 5 – very unlikely 9.5%

What teaching areas of the SICB RER would you most like to see developed?

This table includes the teaching areas from the survey where more than one response was reported. They are ranked by the most popular response.

<b>Disciplinary Area</b>	<b># of Responses</b>
Physiology	83
Biomechanics	47
Evolution	47
Ecology (includes ecological physiology)	38
Invertebrate Zoology	32
Animal Behavior (includes behavioral ecology)	25
Anatomy (includes comparative anatomy)	20
Phylogenetics	19
Morphology	17
Endocrinology	16
Neurobiology	15

Evolutionary Developmental Biology	13
SAAWOK (Science as a Way of Knowing)	9
Developmental Biology	8
Quantitative Biology (includes statistics)	8
Bioinformatics	4
Great Scientists	4
Marine Biology	4
Climate Change	3
Disease Ecology	3
Ecoimmunology	3
Biochemistry	2
Computational Biology	2
Conservation biology	2
Embryology	2
Genetics	2
Neuroethology	2
Robotics	2
Taxonomy	2
Toxicology	2
Zoology	2

## SICB Journal – Integrative and Comparative Biology

The data shown below reflect responses from all members (Full, Postdoctoral, Graduate Student, Student-in-Training) and Full Members.

What new things would you like to see in Integrative and Comparative Biology? Check all that apply.

- invited reviews – 65.1% all members; 65.6% Full Members
- perspectives articles – 58.3% all members; 62.7% Full Members
- editorials – 22.2% all members; 26.1% Full Members
- STEM education-based articles – 45.0% all members; 46.2% Full Members
- Other – 6.9% all members; 8.3% Full Members

What is the greatest **strength** of *Integrative and Comparative Biology*?

Many respondents indicated in various forms that the content of the journal with the publication of papers directly related to the symposia at the annual meetings is a real strength. The table below provides a summary of the responses in general categories with the frequency of the responses in the second column.

Attribute	# of Responses
Breadth	38
Diversity of Topics	36
Reviews	28
Organismal and Integrative Biology	11
Integration	10
Quality of Articles	10
Interdisciplinary	9
High quality of articles	8
Good Reputation	4
Syntheses	4
Comprehensive Coverage	3
Grand Challenges papers	2
Peer Reviewed	2
Quick Time to Publication	2

What is the greatest **weakness** of *Integrative and Comparative Biology*?

Many respondents indicated that publishing only symposium papers was a weakness; some felt that other kinds of articles should be included. Many respondents indicated that most of the issues were not of interest because the issue focused on a specific topic or topics not of interest to them.

Attribute	# of Responses
Articles are limited to SICB meeting symposium, rather than open to all researchers	52
Many issues are of no interest to me.	21
Lacks visibility	12
Limited number of volumes.	8
Uneven quality	8
Low impact factor	5
Weak peer-review	5
Less useful for teaching, especially compared to previous decades	4
Lack of diversity	3
Lack of breadth	2
Not always cutting-edge research	2
Not open access	2

If you actively conduct research and/or publish scholarly papers, how important is *ICB* to your work?

- Very important – 9.3% all members; 6.1% Full Members
- Somewhat important – 61.9% all members; 66.4% Full Members
- Not important – 21.0% all members; 22.9% Full Members
- Not applicable – 7.8% all members; 4.6% Full Members

If you teach or assist in **undergraduate** courses, how important is *ICB* to your teaching?

- Very important – 4.1% all members; 3.3% Full Members
- Somewhat important – 27.4% all members; 32.0% Full Members
- Not important – 43.2% all members; 48.5% Full Members
- Not applicable – 25.3% all members; 16.3% Full Members

If you teach or assist in **graduate** courses, how important is *ICB* to your teaching?

- Very important – 4.8% all members; 6.1% Full Members
- Somewhat important – 23.0% all members; 30.6% Full Members
- Not important – 22.7% all members; 28.2% Full Members
- Not applicable – 49.5% all members; 35.2% Full Members

If you are a **student member**, how important is *ICB* to your coursework?

- Very important – 11.1% student members
- Somewhat important – 45.6% student members
- Not important – 43.3% student members



## A New SICB Open Access Journal

If you publish, in what journals do you publish? Name up to five in no particular order.

About 295 different journals were named by respondents. Journals named 10 or more times are shown in the table below with the number of respondents indicating a publication in that journal.

Journal	# of times named
Journal of Experimental Biology	167
PLOS One	58
Journal of Morphology	55
General and Comparative Endocrinology	49
Functional Ecology	40
Physiological and Biochemical Zoology	37
Evolution	35
Proceedings of the Royal Society London	35
Hormones and Behavior	34
Animal Behavior	29
Journal of Experimental Zoology	29
Biological Bulletin	28
Biology Letters	27
Marine Biology	26
Marine Ecology Progress Series	25
Zoology	25
Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology	24
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences	24
Journal of Comparative Physiology	21
Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology	20
American Naturalist	18
Current Biology	18
Journal of Anatomy	16
Molecular Ecology	16
Anatomical Record	14
Copeia	14
Invertebrate Biology	14
PeerJ	14
Journal of Zoology	13
Evolution & Development	12
Integrative and Comparative Biology	12
Journal of Herpetology	12
Nature	12
Science	12
Behavioral Ecology	11
Journal of Crustacean Biology	11
The Auk	11
Ecology	10
Frontiers	10
Journal of Insect Physiology	10

Do you feel that you currently have appropriate outlets for publishing your work?

- Yes, I have adequate outlets for publishing my work – 56.3% all members; 60.4% Full Members
- Yes, but it could be better – 42.6% all members; 38.7% Full Members
- No – 1.1% all members; 0.9% Full Members

Do you think there is a place for a new journal as described above?

- Yes – 46.6% all members; 43.5% Full Members
- No – 12.3% all members; 15.9% Full Members
- Maybe – 41.1% all members; 40.6% Full Members

Would you publish your work in a new SICB journal as it is described above?

- Yes – 23.0% all members; 22.9% Full Members
- Yes, but it depends on the cost – 63.8% all members; 59.8% Full Members
- No – 13.2% all members; 17.3% Full Members

**SICB Voting and Communications**

Low voting turnout has been a recent concern and that is why these questions were placed on the survey. Interestingly, 59.4% of all members responding to the survey claimed to have voted. Only about 25% of the membership of SICB responded to the survey, so 59.4% of those responding works out to be almost exactly the number voting in 2015.

Indicate your response regarding the SICB elections last spring (2015). (All voting for officers and ballot measures occurs each spring.)

- I was not a member of SICB in the spring of 2015. – 13.7% all members; 4.7% Full Members
- I voted. – 59.4% all members; 74.9% Full Members
- I did NOT vote. – 26.9% all members; 20.5% Full Members

If you answered “I did NOT vote” in the question above, please tell us why you did not vote. Some common answers.

- Forgot
- No means or not involved enough to make informed decision
- Did not know the candidates
- Too busy

SICB Member Update. The member update is emailed to members on a monthly basis.

	Always	Sometimes	Never
I read the member update.	42.6% all members 48.1% Full Members	53.1% all members 49.6% Full Members	4.3% all members 2.4% Full Members
I find the member update useful.	21.1% all members 26.3% Full Members	73.0% all members 70.0% Full Members	5.9% all members 3.8% Full Members

SICB Newsletter. The newsletter is published in the spring and the fall of each year. Please indicate how you read the different parts of the newsletter.

	Always (each newsletter)	Sometimes	Never
Society-wide news	35.6% all members 42.7% Full Members	56.6% all members 52.5% Full Members	7.8% all members 4.8% Full Members
Experiences in Integrative and Comparative Biology & Experiences in Science Education	19.3% all members 21.7% Full Members	65.3% all members 65.4% Full Members	15.4% all members 13.0% Full Members
Divisional news	42.8% all members 49.9% Full Members	48.8% all members 44.5% Full Members	8.4% all members 5.6% Full Members

SICB Newsletter. Your Society-wide and divisional officers work hard to produce a newsletter full of information about the programs of the society. Please comment on how the content of the newsletter can be improved.

Some suggested a web-based (html) format instead of pdf. A few didn't like the articles being broken up. One responded that book reviews should be in the newsletter and not the journal. Many commented that they liked the newsletter.