

2020 BRAIN Initiative Investigators Meeting

OMB# 0925-0648 Exp. Date: 05/2021

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. **An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.** Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to: NIH, Project Clearance Branch, 6705 Rockledge Drive, MSC 7974, Bethesda, MD 20892-7974, ATTN: PRA (0925-0648). Do not return the completed form to this address.

On behalf of the Program Committee, we would like to thank you for your participation and contributions to the 2020 virtual BRAIN Initiative Investigators Meeting. We would like you to take a brief moment to answer a few questions and provide comments (optional) regarding your meeting experience. Questions will automatically display for each session that you attend, in addition to the overall questions here. This feedback will help us in the planning and improvement of future meetings so we can better meet your needs. We hope you share our excitement about the progress the BRAIN Initiative has already shown, and we appreciate your efforts towards its success.

Thank you for your time,

1. Please indicate your overall satisfaction with the 2020 virtual BRAIN PI Meeting:

- Very Satisfied
- Somewhat Satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied

2. Having participated in this virtual meeting, please provide your thoughts on the following question:
In what scientific area(s) is there a need for the BRAIN Initiative to support (additional) research training/education in order to accelerate research in the high-priority areas identified by participating federal agencies?

3. Having participated in this virtual meeting, please provide your thoughts on the following question:
What tools, technologies, or methods that have been created/enhanced under the auspices of this Initiative would you like to see highlighted at a future meeting?

4. Please provide feedback as to aspects of the agenda that you found useful/informative, topic areas you found less helpful or missing, suggestions for future session themes, and/or other suggestions for the improvement of future meeting programming.

5. Please indicate your overall satisfaction with the 2020 virtual BRAIN PI Meeting Plenary Address originally broadcast from 10:30am-11:30am EDT on Monday, June 1st:

- Very Satisfied Somewhat Dissatisfied
- Somewhat Satisfied Very Dissatisfied
- Neither Satisfied nor dissatisfied

6. Please indicate which Symposia Session(s) you viewed, originally broadcast on Day 1 (June 1st) from (11:30am-1:00pm EDT):

- How Can Dynamical Systems Neuroscience Reciprocally Advance Machine Learning?
- Developing and Distributing Novel Electrode Technologies
- Did not attend any of these



7. Regarding the Symposia Session(s) you viewed from the Day 1 (June 1st) 11:30am-1:00pm EDT time slot, how would you rate the quality of the session panel/presentations?

- Excellent Fair
- Very Good Poor
- Good

8. Regarding the Symposia Session(s) you viewed from the Day 1 (June 1st) 11:30am-1:00pm EDT time slot, how would you rate the relevance/usefulness of the session topic, information and discussion to your research?

- Excellent Fair
- Very Good Poor
- Good

9. Please indicate which Symposia Session(s) you viewed, originally broadcast on Day 1 (June 1st) from (1:30pm-3:00pm EDT):

- Advances in Neurotechnologies in Human Research
- Expanding Species Diversity in Neuroscience Research
- Did not attend any of these

10. Regarding the Symposia Session(s) you viewed from the Day 1 (June 1st) 1:30pm-3:00pm EDT time slot, how would you rate the quality of the session panel/presentations?

- Excellent Fair
- Very Good Poor
- Good

11. Regarding the Symposia Session(s) you viewed from the Day 1 (June 1st) 1:30pm-3:00pm EDT time slot, how would you rate the relevance/usefulness of the session topic, information and discussion to your research?

- Excellent Fair
- Very Good Poor
- Good

12. If you have feedback for the symposia session(s) you viewed from the Day 1 broadcasts, particularly with regard to what might be done moving forward, please describe:



13. Regarding the Trainee Awardee Highlight Talks originally broadcast on Day 1 (June 1st) from (3:30pm-4:30pm EDT), how would you rate the quality of the session panel/presentations?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

14. Regarding the Trainee Awardee Highlight Talks you viewed from the Day 1 (June 1st) 3:30pm-4:30pm EDT time slot, how would you rate the relevance/usefulness of the session topic, information and discussion to your research?


- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

15. If you have feedback for the Trainee Awardee Highlight Talks you viewed from the Day 1 (June 1st) 3:30pm-4:30pm EDT time slot, particularly with regard to what might be done moving forward, please describe:



16. Please indicate your overall satisfaction with the 2020 virtual BRAIN PI Meeting Plenary Address originally broadcast from 4:30pm-5:30pm EDT on Monday, June 1st:

- Very satisfied Dissatisfied
- Satisfied Very Dissatisfied
- Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied


17. Regarding the Science Communications Keynote originally broadcast on Day 1 (June 1st) from (5:30pm-6:30pm EDT), how would you rate the quality of the session presentation? 

- Excellent Fair
- Very Good Poor
- Good

18. Regarding the Science Communications Keynote you viewed from the Day 1 (June 1st) 5:30pm-6:30pm EDT time slot, how would you rate the relevance/usefulness of the session topic, information and discussion to your research?

- Excellent Fair
- Very Good Poor
- Good

19. If you have feedback for the Science Communications Keynote session originally broadcast on Day 1 (June 1st), particularly with regard to what might be done moving forward, please describe:



20. Please indicate your overall satisfaction with the 2020 virtual BRAIN PI Meeting Plenary Address originally broadcast from 10:30am-11:30am EDT on Tuesday, June 2nd:

- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied



21. Please indicate which Symposia Session(s) you viewed, originally broadcast on Day 2 (June 2nd) from (11:30am-1:00pm EDT):

- Toward Petascale and Exascale Connectomics?
- Advances in Human Neuroscience
- Did not attend any of these

22. Regarding the Symposia Session(s) you viewed from the Day 2 (June 2nd) 11:30am-1:00pm EDT time slot, how would you rate the quality of the session panel/presentations?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

23. Regarding the Symposia Session(s) you viewed from the Day 2 (June 2nd) 11:30am-1:00pm EDT time slot, how would you rate the relevance/usefulness of the session topic, information and discussion to your research?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

24. Please indicate which Symposia Session(s) you viewed, originally broadcast on Day 2 (June 2nd) from (1:30pm-3:00pm EDT):

- Molecular Taxonomies of Brain Cells
- Emerging High-Throughput Microscopy Methods for Imaging Brain Activity
- Did not attend any of these

25. Regarding the Symposia Session(s) you viewed from the Day 2 (June 2nd) 1:30pm-3:00pm EDT time slot, how would you rate the quality of the session panel/presentations?

- Excellent Fair
- Very Good Poor
- Good

26. Regarding the Symposia Session(s) you viewed from the Day 2 (June 2nd) 1:30pm-3:00pm EDT time slot, how would you rate the relevance/usefulness of the session topic, information and discussion to your research?

- Excellent Fair
- Very Good Poor
- Good

27. If you have feedback for the symposia session(s) you viewed, originally broadcast on Day 2 (June 2nd), particularly with regard to what might be done moving forward, please describe:

28. Regarding the Trainee Awardee Highlight Talks you viewed, originally broadcast on Day 2 (June 2nd) from (3:30pm-4:30pm EDT), how would you rate the quality of the session panel/presentations?

- Excellent Fair
- Very Good Poor
- Good

29. Regarding the Trainee Awardee Highlight Talks you viewed from the Day 2 (June 2nd) 3:30pm-4:30pm EDT time slot, how would you rate the relevance/usefulness of the session topic, information and discussion to your research?

- Excellent Fair
- Very Good Poor
- Good

30. If you have feedback for the Trainee Awardee Highlight Talks you viewed, originally broadcast on Day 2 (June 2nd), particularly with regard to what might be done moving forward, please describe:



31. Please indicate your overall satisfaction with the 2020 virtual BRAIN PI Meeting Plenary Address, originally broadcast from 4:30pm-5:30pm EDT on Tuesday, June 2nd:

- Very Satisfied
- Somewhat Satisfied
- Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- Somewhat Dissatisfied
- Very Dissatisfied

32. Regarding the Science Communications Social Media Workshop you viewed, originally broadcast on Day 2 (June 2nd) from (5:30pm-6:30pm EDT), how would you rate the quality of the panelists/presentations?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

33. Regarding the Science Communications Social Media Workshop you viewed from the Day 2 (June 2nd) 5:30pm-6:30pm EDT time slot, how would you rate the relevance/usefulness of the session topic, information and discussion to your research?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

34. If you have feedback for the Science Communications Social Media Workshop you viewed, originally broadcast on Day 2 (June 2nd), particularly with regard to what might be done moving forward, please describe:



35. If you visited the virtual Poster Hall, how would you rate the organization (e.g. materials provided, etc.) of the poster session?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor



36. If you visited the virtual Poster Hall, how would you rate the opportunity for question, answer and exchange of ideas via chat options?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

37. If you visited the virtual Exhibit Hall, how would you rate the organization (e.g. materials provided, etc.) of the exhibit booths?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

38. If you visited the virtual Exhibit Hall, how would you rate the opportunity for question, answer and exchange of ideas via chat options?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor



39. If you visited the virtual Networking Room, how would you rate the opportunity for question, answer and exchange of ideas via chat options?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

40. If you visited the virtual Networking Room, how relevant did you find the chat topics - whether you participated in a discussion or viewed discussion text after the fact?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

41. Regarding the virtual environment: how easily were you able to orient yourself and navigate within and across the platform?

- Very easy
- Easy
- Neither easy nor difficult
- Difficult
- Very difficult

42. Regarding the virtual environment: how easily were you able to orient yourself to view broadcast presentations and participate in the live typed chat or Q & A opportunities?

- Very easy
- Easy
- Neither easy nor difficult
- Difficult
- Very difficult

43. Regarding the virtual environment: did you find the chat features (personal messaging or chat rooms) useful to engage with other viewers?

- Yes
- No
- I did not chat.

44. Regarding the virtual environment: did you enjoy the "game" feature, wherein points were acquired based on site use, tracked in a public leader board, and could result in prizes from non-government entities?

- Yes
- No
- I did not realize there was a "game."

45. Regarding the virtual environment: if you required help, how easily were you able to secure an answer from the help desk or other resource?

- Very easy
- Easy
- Neither easy nor difficult
- Difficult
- Very difficult