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Figure 1. Responses for ‘As a result of participating in this working group, I have a better understanding of...’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The types of data needed to better inform existing models</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The research data available on the working group's topic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The modeling techniques available on the working group's topic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New methods and modeling techniques that need to be developed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Satisfaction agreement for working group meeting one

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend participating in NIMBioS working groups to my colleagues.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The group discussions were useful.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The working group met my expectations.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presentations were useful.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the working group was very productive.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presenters were very knowledgeable about their topics.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 participants found the working group had an effective format or achieving its goals.

0 participants found it not effective.
Figure 3. Frequencies of yes/no responses to survey questions with open-ended feedback

- Exchange of ideas during the working group will influence your future research: 6 yes, 0 no
- Working group made adequate progress, for its first meeting, toward finding a common language across disciplines in the research area: 6 yes, 0 no
- Helped to understand the research happening in other disciplines in the group’s topic area: 6 yes, 0 no
- Expectations for the next working group are clear: 5 yes, 1 no
- Developed unanticipated plans for collaborative research with other working group participants: 5 yes, 1 no

Comments: I am a microbiologist but was not very familiar with modeling of biological systems besides my knowledge of risk assessment models in food safety. The meeting gave me much insight into what kind of modeling is being done, at least by the modelers in the group, but also revealed how powerful an approach modeling can be to synthesize available data into a comprehensive form.

Please explain: One participant at Ohio State who models diverse biological systems, and one participant at MIT who model fluids on plant surfaces, which may lead to application of a collaborative proposal to NSF.

Figure 4. Agreement ratings, using a scale of Far short of expectations to Far exceeds expectations, to how the following aspects of your working group compared to your expectations before becoming a member of the group

- The ability of group leaders to move the group forward: 2 far exceeds, 2 exceeds, 2 equals
- The overall cohesiveness of the group: 2 far exceeds, 4 exceeds, 2 equals
- Your integration within the group (i.e. the feeling that you are an important and contributing member of the group): 2 far exceeds, 4 exceeds, 2 equals
Open-ended feedback: “What do you feel was the most useful aspect of the working group?”

I really like the different background of this workgroup. Different person has different knowledge scope. First, it is challenge to find a common language to communicate, but after we understand each other, it will be very productive to go.

It very effectively brought together a very diverse group of people.

The realization that we can do much more by pooling our individual expertise and data than the sum of them.

Diversity of experience. Theoretical, practical

Each participant share their experience and target research questions for modelling were identified learning from different members of the group about the main ideas that may move the field forward.

Open-ended feedback: “Additional comments:”

I was saddened to learn that NIMBioS is coming to a close of its funding by NSF. I see the working groups as a very effective way of bringing together mathematicians and biologists. I would never have had the opportunity to meet or collaborate with modelers had it not be of my participation in this working group. Nor would they have worked closely with me to make good use of data. I really felt at the meeting that the NIMBioS working group was a unique opportunity to bring us all together, and not just to exchange ideas but to produce a tool from it.

There is so much potential for creative application of theory to solving practical problems.

Thanks to the staff for helping make the meeting a success.