1. Please check the appropriate box to indicate your level of agreement with the following statements. As a result of participating in this working group, I have a better understanding of:

![Chart showing the results of respondents' agreement levels](chart1.png)

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree

2. Please check the appropriate box to indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about this working group:

![Chart showing the results of respondents' agreement levels](chart2.png)

- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Strongly Agree

- I feel the working group was very productive.
- The working group met my expectations.
- The presenters were very knowledgeable about their topics.
- The presentations were useful.
- The group discussions were useful.
- I would recommend participating in BATS working groups to my colleagues.

3. How do you feel about the format of the working group?
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- [ ] This was a very effective format for achieving our goals
- [ ] This was not a very effective format for achieving our goals
4. Do you feel the working group made adequate progress, for its first meeting, toward finding a common language across disciplines in the research area?

5. Do you feel the participating in the working group helped you understand the research happening in other disciplines in the group's topic area?

6. Comments:

Text Response

We didn't divert from the topic...
7. Did you develop unanticipated plans for collaborative research with other working group participants?

8. Please explain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possibly, not certain at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I made arrangements to collaborate on sampling and testing protocols with participants I did not know previously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over dinner and other venues, it seems there are a few projects (including one with a post-doc at NIMBioS) that are possible. These were unrelated to the topic of the working group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Do you feel that the exchange of ideas that took place during the working group will influence your future research?
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10. Please explain:

Not to a major extent but I do have a better idea of what needs to be done and what could be the issues that I have to think about in order to address the critiques.

I am currently working on a problem that arose in discussions.

I will likely try to pursue the gaps in research that will not be filled by the national plan to obtain a more complete picture of bat populations.

11. Do you feel the expectations for the next working group are clear (in the sense that you are leaving this meeting with a good idea of what your contribution will be at the next meeting)?
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12. Comments:

There is still work to be done to prepare for the next meeting. I do understand what needs to be done between now and then.

I may not be part of the next working group but will be participating in the activity anyway.

We had a one-off meeting; there is no next meeting.

The topics and goals of the next mtg were discussed, but I don't think they were finalized, and I am not sure if I am invited.
13. What do you feel was the most useful aspect of the working group?

Text Response

Modest size of group, yet diverse views and expertise.
Facilitation was good
The collection of participants with varying expertise was incredibly useful.
I liked the free exchange of ideas and thoughts and learned a lot about how large national level surveys are done, both the design aspects and the administrative aspects. It is important for a statistician to know the administrative aspects as well as the scientific aspects.
Agreed on a sampling design
Strong objectives, good expertise in the room, definitive goals
I don't have much previous experience with that type of working group so it was educational. Also, I got to meet scientists with somewhat overlapping interests, and that might prove useful in the future.

14. What, if anything, would you change about the working group?

Text Response

I wish we had more time. 2.5 days is insufficient time to really dig in, especially if you have to break away and do something. Thus, tasks are tabled until you get back to your own office, and then are subsequently delayed because of the myriad of competing interests for our time.
Maybe some smaller (5-6) would have tightened up the discussions. The facilitator was very proficient and gave excellent summaries. At this preliminary stage, I question the need although this usage is common in many governmental meetings.
Make it a bit smaller. When we broke into two smaller groups I felt we made better progress.
We lingered a little too long on some topics.
The research questions were too broad and too ambitious for a short meeting. As a result, we had trouble agreeing on what the actual question was that we were trying to solve, which meant that we did not get very far.

15. Please provide any additional comments about your overall experience with the working group:

Text Response

I got the impression that the group was treated almost royally on the first day, but much less so on successive days. I do not know who might be responsible for meals, snacks, etc.
The facilities provided to us for this workshop were stellar. The food was excellent, too!
It exceeded my expectations.
I very much enjoyed my time at NIMBioS and the University of Tennessee. I hope I have the fortune to return.
I was impressed with the collegiality and closeness that was formed during the workshop. A good bunch of folks!
NIMBioS facilities enhanced the interactions. Working group was interesting group of scientists with very diverse areas of expertise. Interactions were very pleasant, honest, and useful.
I found this working group to be highly effective compared to other groups I have worked with.
It was educational for me, but it would have been more productive if the questions had been more narrow and clearly defined. And more tractable.