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1. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

As a result of participating in this working group, I have a better understanding of:

- the research data available on the working group’s topic
- the modeling techniques available on the working group’s topic
- the types of data needed to better inform existing models
- new methods and modeling techniques that need to be developed

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

- 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 NIMBioS working groups to my colleagues.
3. How do you feel about the format of the working group?

![Bar Chart]

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?

![Bar Chart]

Comments:

There is still room for growth in this area but the initial steps taken and the planned work will assist the group in continuing to find a common language.
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?

![Bar chart showing the percentage of participants who felt the working group helped them understand research in other disciplines. The majority felt it helped.]

6. Did you develop unanticipated plans for collaborative research with other working group participants?

![Pie chart showing the percentage of participants who developed collaborative plans. Most did so.]

Please explain:

Several participants in the group work on pollinators and wish to develop future collaboration in this area, including possibly conducting modeling exercises.

Two areas of collaboration arose out of this; one to look at pollinators as vectors of plant disease and the second to model pollen flow through a landscape as a function of individual pollinator movement and plant biology.
7. Do you feel that the exchange of ideas that took place during the working group will influence your future research?

Comments:

My future research will be influenced in a very positive way as a result of the working group.

Very much so. I think it really helped me to see the potential for applying mathematical models to longstanding problems in my field.

8. 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)?

9. What do you feel was the most useful aspect of the working group?

The desire to collaborate and share.

Time spent in smaller groups then reconvening as a large group to discuss what progress had been made and to exchange ideas.

There was a good mix of working within small groups, but then bringing the work back to the big group for comment.
This was one of the most stimulating and productive workings group I have ever interacted with in my 30-year career. The combination of young dynamic participants with more mature researchers with ample experience in the field was ideal.

Meeting in person always works better for making concrete progress than meeting via phone or Skype. I think the opportunity this NIMBioS workshop has provided us is phenomenal and will lead to some significant scientific advances. It makes me wonder what we in NZ can do to foster similar collaborative meetings. I’m certainly looking into funding for hosting some of my new colleagues back in NZ.

Learning about the data and understand the situation in Africa for our project.

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

Allow 1-2 well trained graduate students (not easy as many lack skills) when appropriate and available. It may significantly increase productivity of such meetings as graduate students tend to be more focused and hence can be more competent than postdoc or faculty members.

It was hard to participate in more than 1 group, if I felt like I wanted to contribute fully to one paper I felt like I could not switch groups or else I’d fall behind.

I wasn’t added to Basecamp before the meeting, so hadn’t seen any of the preparatory information. This was a real hindrance as everyone else was already primed with discussion topics and had brought along datasets to share. The problem was that my international email address with suffix .co.nz had been entered incorrectly by someone only used to US addresses (.com or .edu). This is the only thing that comes to mind when thinking about what could have been done better this time around.

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

Vegetarian meal options needed!

Thanks for the opportunity to participate. I came out of the meeting feeling very enthusiastic about future collaboration and the products from the group.