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1. Please check the appropriate box to indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about this workshop:

![Bar chart showing level of agreement for various statements related to the workshop.]

2. As a result of participating in this workshop, I have a better understanding of:

![Bar chart showing levels of understanding for various topics related to the workshop.]
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### 3. What do you feel was the most useful aspect of the workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breakout sessions with discussions oriented toward concrete problem-solving goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting with people who have expertise in different areas. I'm a statistical modeler so learning about the disease ecology was useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presentations allowed the participants to focus on topics of concern. The breakout sessions allowed for a more in-depth discussion of these issues. I think they both led to a successful workshop from my perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interaction with colleagues and know new lines of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The unexpected focus on pig control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborations and bringing together a diverse group of researchers to address the workshop topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The discussions and time for subgroups to discuss how to take certain research questions forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The exchange of ideas from different disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really liked the break-out groups, and mevin and murali's discussion of abc and statistical emulators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting researchers in other fields; gaining perspectives outside of my own institutional collaborators on future research projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The focus on discussions instead of presentations made for a much more engaging workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting our diverse disciplines into the same room and the time allowed to be able to chat amongst ourselves and in small group discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction and inputs into group discussions of people from different backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The opportunity to make new collaborative contacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions across disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presentations and in depth discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing what everyone is doing in the field of wildlife disease. Know who to contact if i need advice in different areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent organizers. They did a great job of maintaining the flow for the large group by breaking things into talks vs. Group discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to meet with new colleagues working in a variety of disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction and brainstorming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short presentation followed by long discussions. Breaking up into smaller groups helped to increase contact time between researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting the chance to talk with others from different agencies and countries working on similar topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching a problem from different perspectives coming from people from different disciplines. Brainstorming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborations, personal connections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. What would you change about the workshop?

Some of the initial presentations were a bit too broad - probably adding little to participants with expertise in the given area, and also too broad to really bring others up to speed if not already knowledgeable.

I’d like to have seen three or four specific papers assigned reading before the workshop, one for each discipline that the organizers thought would best demonstrate that discipline to those from the other disciplines.

More modeling discussion to learn about techniques for modeling uncertainty or missing data.

A clearer link between the suggested readings posted prior to the workshop and the workshop itself. Although one could argue that a clearer link may have stifled discussion.

Share with the participants (before the workshop) about the interests / objectives of the exhibitors.

More clarity regarding modeling for those without previous modeling expertise.

Have the presentations provided to participants during the workshop to follow along with the speaker.

It would have been great to have a bit more time to focus on methods for tackling the questions raised.

I think an early talk on how to do cross-disciplinary modeling might have been helpful. A diagram of the various inputs, assumptions, and outputs of a disease model (e.g., spatial aspects, within-host process, transmission modes, prevalence, management impacts, etc.) Might have been useful in guiding group modeling efforts. My group spent a fair amount of time waffling over exactly how we wanted to tackle the question at hand (and what that question even was). Maybe there’s a way to streamline that piece.

Provide an outline of the agenda/activities ahead of time; provide background information to get everyone on the same page (e.g. Fact sheets about diseases to be used as case studies; mathematical modeling techniques), rather than using presentations during the workshop (use presentations only as a brief review on first day); more clearly outline the focus/goals of the workshop; would be helpful if NIMBioS would provide some summary of what workshops can accomplish and how they result in tangible products.

Live streaming of the workshop required passing a microphone around for questions. This seemed to hinder open discussions as we had to wait for the microphone. Discussions were much more open when the live stream was not active.

It would be very helpful to know ahead of time what types of distribution of presentations/media etc. Would be used.

Clearer statement of the scope. While the workshop title indicated the focus was on 'modeling'. In fact most of the contributions and discussion was on issues about collecting data on wild animal populations.

There was a lot of discussion of current barriers to collaboration on modelling, but not that much on how we overcome those types of barriers. In other words, long on describing the problems, but short on proposing concrete ways forward.

More structured timekeeping in places would be helpful, however i also appreciate the need to maintain the flow rather than cutting things off. Give 10-15 break between each talk. Invite a smaller group overall.

I never get much out of the group activities. Too many people who have never worked together to be effective at coming up with anything more than the usual. But, i think the group activities help identify people who i might want to work with later. The group activity one is always tough, and i’ve thought about how to make them more useful, but have never come up with a good idea. For me, i have to understand the people i work with and who i am compatible working with before embarking on a group project. And, i thing large (say >5 people) groups are generally less productive.

A bit more time talking about different modelling techniques (presentation comparing different modelling techniques/tools for example)

I would like to see sessions where techniques are presented rather than results. Data fitting to models would be very useful.

I think i would have had it be 2 full days rather than 3.
5. How do you feel about the format of the workshop?

6. The workshop format would have been more effective if:

Maybe smaller groups and smaller goals.

There were defined objectives and goals at the beginning of the workshop.
7. Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the workshop accommodations:

8. Comments about accommodations:

Comfort level of meeting/presentation spaces was excellent - lunch room was probably less than ideal "comfort" atmosphere for dining and mixing

Not NIMBioS' fault, but I was confused by the application process.

My only complaint would be the traffic noise at the holiday inn.

Travel arrangement could have been more interactive to allow better timing

The holiday inn was comfortable but noisy. The new NIMBioS facilities were great.

All good

Excellent job by the director and various assistants.

Satisfied

A couple of suggestions - a sink in the 'break room' would be great; offer advice to participants to bring along a water bottle; have at least one wired desk available for organizers to follow the Livestream

I had arranged my own accommodation with my daughter who lives in Knoxville. Accommodation with the other participants was arranged for me but I preferred to stay with my daughter

Hotel staff was generally not helpful.
9. How satisfied were you with the opportunities provided during workshop presentations and discussions to ask questions and/or make comments?

10. Please indicate any suggestions you have for facilitating communication among participants during the workshop:

The group was large so the break out groups were helpful, but I still felt like there were too many people.

Perhaps the use of microphone and being broadcasted was a bit intimidating.

I wonder about using clickers, especially to survey groups/get people on the same page rapidly. That might also help keep a few voices from dominating. I was struck that even though the gender balance of this workshop was pretty even, the preponderance of the discussion was still carried out by men. More passive communication forms might alleviate that.

As indicated before, having to pass a microphone around for discussion during presentations really hindered flowing discussions.

It would be better to avoid passing around the microphone for comments from the audience. Everyone played along, but it wasn't very good for fluid discussion.
11. Do you feel participating in the workshop helped you better understand the research going on in disciplines other than your own on the workshop’s topic?

No (0%)

Yes (100%)

12. Comments:

Would have liked more content on actual modeling methodologies.

The organizers brought together a diverse group of individuals who were able to address topics concerning the biology and ecology of disease and the mathematical modeling associated with understanding disease dynamics. The interdisciplinary nature of the group allowed me to understand not only the research being conducted but the concerns of the individuals working in particular disciplines.

Though some results/evolution of the workshop were unexpected, it was highly beneficial.

I thought this workshop did a great job of pulling together people from different backgrounds. As a consequence of that diversity of expertise, we had to commit a fair amount of time to developing a common working vocabulary. That time commitment meant that we didn't get into the nitty gritty modeling details to the same extent that other workshops might; instead, the emphasis was on overall process. I thought that was totally appropriate, especially since the constituencies involved really need to practice talking to each other. A follow-up workshop in a year, comprised of largely the same attendants, might be positioned to go into much more explicit modeling depth.

Gained a better perspective on issues of concern in the USA and elsewhere.

Satisfied.
13. **Do you feel the workshop made adequate progress toward finding a common language across disciplines for research on the workshop’s topic?**

![Pie chart showing 97% Yes and 3% No]

14. **Comments:**

- Very good discussions between the groups.
- Could have used more discussion on modeling...
- There were a number of opportunities during the workshop for individuals to interact across disciplines and find a common language.
- Although I think we put more emphasis on explaining disease issues to modelers than modeling issues to disease researchers.
- It was very informative to bring different disciplines together in this format.
- Nil
- Various problems in different geographic regions presented helped me realize where I can get help or useful comments.
15. Do you feel that the exchange of ideas that took place during the workshop will influence your future research?

- Yes (65%)
- Maybe (35%)
- No (0%)

16. Comments:

I hope it will. I’m in a support role so if no one asks ...

I walked away with a better understanding of the field and will use the information gained from the workshop to pose new questions in the field.

I made some excellent collaborative contacts that I think are likely to take our research in valuable new directions.

Satisfied

I was made to realize the importance of consulting non-mathematicians in the relevant areas such as ecology, biology etc. to gain deep understanding of the processes involved.
17. Did you develop plans for collaborative research with other workshop participants with whom you had not previously collaborated?

18. Comments:

- Some ideas identified, not formalized at this time
- satisfied
- Very useful contacts with experts in veterinary sciences
19. Please use this space for any additional comments:

Really pleased with how easy NIMBioS made the workshop. If anything could be improved, and this is minor, it would be in the pre-game set up. We had some minor issues with emails going to spam folders and the participant being unaware of the invites. I also felt like people could receive the invite a little earlier. That said, I will highly recommend NIMBioS to my colleagues.

Great workshop

Very nice job by both the organizers and NIMBioS staff. Thank you.

Great workshop. I want to thank the organizers and the NIMBioS staff.

I found it very interesting and enriching way of working.

An amazing and most useful format. Thank you all for this great opportunity.

This workshop was a very enjoyable and informative experience! Thank you!

I am impressed by the NIMBioS approach of encouraging research collaboration by actively supporting and hosting meetings of this type. It is a great forum for promoting multi-disciplinary interactions

Thanks so much for funding our workshop and for doing such a fantastic job to help us have a successful event!

The staff at NIMBioS was excellent--friendly and very accommodating.

Really thought the workshop went well, so well done to all.

NIMBioS is a great facility for this type of workshop. All my issues about group work are common to these types of activities and not particular to the NIMBioS workshop. Maybe group discussion work better for others - I like things to be ultra-efficient and am pretty linear so these issues are probably more specific to my type of working style.

It was a pleasure to be part of the workshop. I was in the company of competent and friendly people. The staff at NIMBioS was excellent.

Thank you!