

Evaluation Summary for All Courses Combined

Event Registration Count: 2042

Unique Survey Count: 401 (20% of registrants)

Attendee Professions	Survey Count	Percentage
Psychologist	1782	98.5075%
Other	24	1.3267%
Physician	3	0.1658%

Attendee Degrees	Survey Count	Percentage
Masters	26	1.4723%
Other	149	8.4371%
Ph.D.	1587	89.8641%
M.D.	4	0.2265%

Attendee Survey Responses	μ	σ
3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.88	0.39
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.79	0.49
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.86	0.40
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.80	0.51
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.77	0.50
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.58	0.62
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.70	0.57
10. The handouts were useful:	4.49	0.71
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.71	0.52
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.61	0.61
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.65	0.63
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.62	0.61
15. This program should be offered again:	4.49	0.70
16. The registration was efficient:	4.47	0.93
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.24	1.01
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.43	0.68
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	4.24	0.87
Average of Questions 3-19	4.6	0.64

Scale Reference

For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23	For Question(s): 18	For Question(s): 19
1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree	1 = I learned nothing	1 = Not useful at all
2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree	2 = I learned very little	2 = Somewhat useful
3 = Neutral	3 = Neutral	3 = Neutral
4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied	4 = I learned a fair amount	4 = Very useful
5 = Strongly agree or satisfied	5 = I learned a great deal	5 = Extremely useful

Instructor Information

Instructor	Fadel Zeidan
Course ID	4699
Title	CE Workshop 01: Mindfulness Meditation Induced Analgesia Engages Multiple Unique Brain Mechanisms
Attendees Registered for CE	66
Surveys Completed	51

Attendee Professions

Survey Count

Percentage

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	50	98.0392%
Other	1	1.9608%

Attendee Degrees

Survey Count

Percentage

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	43	84.3137%
Masters	4	7.8431%
Other	4	7.8431%

Attendee Survey Responses

μ

σ

3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.98	0.14
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.94	0.24
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.94	0.24
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.94	0.31
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.94	0.24
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.84	0.36
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.94	0.24
10. The handouts were useful:	4.71	0.64
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.94	0.24
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.92	0.27
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.94	0.24
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.94	0.24
15. This program should be offered again:	4.88	0.43
16. The registration was efficient:	4.35	1.10
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.39	0.86
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.71	0.46
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	4.63	0.56
20. I can recognize if mindfulness reduces pain	4.90	0.36
21. I can describe brain mechanisms supporting mindfulness-based pain relief	4.78	0.41
22. I am able to list the physiological systems supporting mindfulness	4.76	0.47

Average of Questions 3-23

4.82

0.4

Scale Reference

For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

- Excellent workshop!
- Great speaking ability!

- An absolutely terrific program of research, very well presented!
 - This was the best lecture I have attended in awhile. The mix of practical clinical information and the science behind it was powerful and informative.
 - Thank you for this very interesting and stimulating presentation.
 - Thank you for this very interesting and stimulating presentation.
 - Great presentation. I really enjoyed this talk
 - I learned a lot from this presentation and really enjoyed it! I especially enjoyed the practice exercises we did as a group. I would like to see more on this topic in the future.
 - In addition to being quite knowledgeable, Dr. Zeidan is a skilled and warm presenter.
 - Excellent talk on a useful subject.
 - Dr. Zeidan is a very engaging speaker and it was a pleasure to attend this CE workshop!
 - Dr. Zeidan was an outstanding presenter. He connected very well to the audience. He presented at a very appropriate level. I found the information to be clinically applicable. Really appreciated that he lead the audience in two mindfulness exercises.
 - Dr. Zeidan's talk was interesting and informative. He tried to condense an 8 hour training into 3 hours and that is never easy.
 - Thank you! My hope that I would discover ways to make mindfulness accessible to my patients was met.
 - Took a little bit for presenter for figure out the neuro knowledge level of his audience but I think he got there.
 - This was one of the best CE programs I have attended in quite some time. I love to learn about practical strategies and therapies for patients.
 - This was a highly valuable and well delivered CE !
 - I was glad to see this kind of "non-traditiol" INS programming.
-

Instructor Information

Instructor	Suvarna Alladi
Course ID	4700
Title	CE Workshop 02: Bi/Multilingualism and its Impact on Stroke/Neurodegenerative Disease
Attendees Registered for CE	100
Surveys Completed	75

Attendee Professions	Survey Count	Percentage
-----------------------------	---------------------	-------------------

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	73	97.3333%
Other	2	2.6667%

Attendee Degrees	Survey Count	Percentage
-------------------------	---------------------	-------------------

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	64	85.3333%
M.D.	1	1.3333%
Other	10	13.3333%

Attendee Survey Responses

	μ	σ
3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.79	0.52
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.79	0.55
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.85	0.45
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.88	0.36
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.64	0.67
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.55	0.64
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.63	0.65
10. The handouts were useful:	4.35	0.90
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.68	0.61
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.55	0.72
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.52	0.82
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.60	0.71
15. This program should be offered again:	4.55	0.84
16. The registration was efficient:	4.29	1.02
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.19	0.96
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.32	0.77
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	4.20	0.92
20. I am able to describe the impact of bilingualism on age at onset and cognitive manifestations of dementia and stroke	4.39	0.75
21. I can discuss the mechanisms that underlie the potentially protective effects of bilingualism in dementia and stroke	4.40	0.78
22. I can now describe the role of bi/multilingualism on cognitive reserve/resilience in disorders of the brain	4.08	1.10

Average of Questions 3-23	4.51	0.74
----------------------------------	-------------	-------------

Scale Reference**For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23**

1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
 3 = Neutral
 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

1 = I learned nothing
 2 = I learned very little
 3 = Neutral
 4 = I learned a fair amount
 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

1 = Not useful at all
 2 = Somewhat useful
 3 = Neutral
 4 = Very useful
 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

- the slide presentation did not conform to the handouts. it was difficult to follow as a result.
 - fabulous, interesting presentation. I am glad I attended.
 - The slide handouts were out of order of Dr. Alladi's presentation, which made it hard to follow along and take notes. Dr. Alladi was a great presenter. She was engaging and humorous.
 - Outstanding presentation and absolutely fascinating.
 - Good CE course, though the content could have been covered in two hours. There appeared to be a number of redundant slides. The level of the first half of the CE was not appropriately geared to neuropsychologists (i.e., there was no presumed level of mastery in the audience resulting in redundant or non-useful information in the initial portion of the course). The final hour was excellent.
 - Outstanding presentation and absolutely fascinating.
 - Question 22 is not applicable to the CE program. Presentation was excellent, I learned exactly what I was hoping to and Dr. Alladi was engaging and easy to listen to - even for 3 hours! She did fantastic and I would happily attend other talks from her in the future.
 - I only chose "somewhat agree" for the last 3 items as it was a lot of info and I will review later to feel fully comfortable with my ability to describe and discuss the information.
 - This was a valuable presentation but should have been 60-90min rather than nearly three hours
 - This was a very interesting talk by an engaging speaker.
 - She was a delightful and engaging speaker. Enjoyed my time!
 - I really enjoyed the content and the speaker. The location was farther from the main things in San Diego like gas lamp, mari, and little Italy. Registration was very difficult and I had to check everyday multiple times if I was registered. Jamie was amazing dealing with it. However INS just felt much more disorganized this year
 - Thank you for inviting Dr Alladi to INS; she has been working in this area for several decades and is the exact person you want discussing these issues. She even spoke on how best to conduct assessments and develop and validate comparable/culturally appropriate tests as opposed to mere translations of US-based tasks.
 - Incredible speaker with valuable knowledge and research.
 - CEU was amazing, so was the instructor! Registration at INS was disorganized, first day CEUs did not have breakfast, and often did not offer coffee during coffee breaks.
 - This was an excellent lecture.
 - This course and presenter were excellent
 - Excellent speaker!
 - Very engaging presentation, was my favorite of those I attended.
 - The meeting rooms needed microphones set up in aisle(s) for questions.
 - Fantastic presentation; knowledgeable and engaging speaker; loved how interactive she made the talk and included really great examples of the culture and landscape of bilingualism in India
 - I loved this talk, but when I spoke to someone else about it, he commented that a lot of the studies the conclusions presented in this talk were based on were flawed by SES bias. So now I don't know what to believe
 - Great presentation!
-

Instructor Information

Instructor	Robyn Westmacott
Course ID	4701
Title	CE Workshop 03: Stroke in the Developing Brain: Mechanisms, Outcomes, and Intervention
Attendees Registered for CE	122
Surveys Completed	91

Attendee Professions	Survey Count	Percentage
----------------------	--------------	------------

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	89	97.8022%
Other	2	2.1978%

Attendee Degrees	Survey Count	Percentage
------------------	--------------	------------

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	79	86.8132%
Other	7	7.6923%
Masters	5	5.4945%

Attendee Survey Responses

	μ	σ
3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.92	0.30
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.87	0.37
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.91	0.32
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.87	0.40
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.82	0.41
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.58	0.56
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.67	0.59
10. The handouts were useful:	4.63	0.69
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.67	0.65
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.67	0.51
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.77	0.49
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.77	0.52
15. This program should be offered again:	4.67	0.61
16. The registration was efficient:	4.44	0.95
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.02	1.07
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.33	0.66
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	4.27	0.81
20. I can describe the epidemiology, pathophysiology, and neurological outcomes associated with stroke in infants and children	4.67	0.54
21. I can illustrate the variability in neuropsychological outcomes after pediatric stroke and highlight important determining factors of these outcomes	4.53	0.82
22. I am able to apply current research into outcomes and treatments to neuropsychological practice	4.45	0.86

Average of Questions 3-23	4.63	0.61
----------------------------------	-------------	-------------

Scale Reference**For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23**

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

- Um, the last questions about pediatric cancer didn't make sense. However, I did learn a great deal about cognitive impairment in prenat, perital, and childhood stroke.
 - Re the facilities - the internet access was quite bad.
 - you asked in question 21 and 22 about pediatric cancer.... My CE topic was about pediatric stroke
 - The last two questions on this survey that you asked are for the wrong CE.
 - 21 and 22 are for different talk
 - I think items 21 and 22 may be from another session, but I responded favorably anyway because the material on pediatric stroke was excellent. Issues with WiFi in the room.
 - The objectives on this survey are not correct for the talk
 - questions 21-22 pertain to cancer not stroke
 - Excellent presentation!
 - This was an excellent CE. Thank you for having pediatric specific CEs and for making them useful/relevant to clinical practice.
 - The conference rooms were very hot.
 - Well prepared presentation.
 - Font on slides could have been bigger to make it easier to see Lighting in the room further made it challenging to see the slides from a distance, even after dimming.
 - This was a very valuable presentation. Thank you!
 - Fantastic, clear, useful presentation, from a very knowledgeable speaker.
 - Fantastic presentation!
 - This was an invaluable learning experience, Dr. Westmacott is an expert and was able to convey and share her knowledge in an accessible way. 10/10 would take this course again! The only issue with the facilities were that the slides were hard to see without dimming the lights.
 - I am an adult focus neuropsychologist, so the impact of this presentation on my practice is minimal, but I did find the presentation to be excellent and I did add to my overall knowledge base in neuropsychology. I particularly found the demonstration of delayed onset hemiparesis as a remote effect of pediatric stroke to be very interesting and informative.
 - N.B. I am not a pediatric neuropsychologist.
 - In my opinion this was hands down the best presentation at the conference. Well Done!
 - I felt the speaker was effective, however none of the research presented included demographic information or information regarding languages spoken by the child, which would have been useful.
 - This was an incredibly well organized and informative talk. One of my favorite for the conference!
 - My comments are not related to the speaker but to the logistics of the visual aids and the power points. I did not have access to the power points before I left for the conference so I could not print them out. Therefore I had nothing to refer to or to write notes on during this presentation, which for me was very inconvenient. It was hard to see the screen because the room was very large and the lighting was way too bright for us to see the slides. There are many of us who prefer to have a paper copy of the presentation so that we can follow along, which means that the power points need to be sent at least a week before the conference starts, and the lighting needs to be better..
 - Excellent speaker and well organized and informative presentation.
-

Instructor Information

Instructor	Kevin Krull
Course ID	4702
Title	CE Workshop 04: Cancer Survivorship Across the Lifespan: Mechanisms and Modifiable Factors
Attendees Registered for CE	79
Surveys Completed	57

Attendee Professions

Survey Count

Percentage

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	56	98.2456%
Other	1	1.7544%

Attendee Degrees

Survey Count

Percentage

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	47	82.4561%
M.D.	1	1.7544%
Other	8	14.0351%
Masters	1	1.7544%

Attendee Survey Responses

μ

σ

3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.84	0.49
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.44	0.86
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.67	0.68
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.61	0.67
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.49	0.94
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.40	0.93
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.44	0.80
10. The handouts were useful:	4.56	0.68
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.58	0.70
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.47	0.88
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.35	1.07
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.46	0.96
15. This program should be offered again:	4.46	0.88
16. The registration was efficient:	4.44	0.92
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.04	1.17
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.25	0.84
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	4.05	0.98
20. I can describe direct and indirect sources of cognitive impairment in long-term survivors of pediatric cancer	4.49	0.78
21. I can discuss how cognitive impairment may change over the lifespan of survival following treatment for pediatric cancer	4.40	0.86
22. I am able to identify modifiable targets for interventions to facilitate cognitive health in long-term survivors of pediatric cancer	4.30	0.92

Average of Questions 3-23

4.44

0.85

Scale Reference

For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23

For Question(s): 18

For Question(s): 19

1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree

1 = I learned nothing

1 = Not useful at all

2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree

2 = I learned very little

2 = Somewhat useful

3 = Neutral

3 = Neutral

3 = Neutral

4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied

4 = I learned a fair amount

4 = Very useful

5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

5 = I learned a great deal

5 = Extremely useful

Comments

- first part too general, interventions could be more be elaborated on
- I am not sure the 3 learning objectives that note technologies are supposed to be connected to this CE topic. Also, the internet was terrible and not acceptable.
- These learning objectives do not match the topic presentation. I think they are for a different CE.
- Way too many detailed statistics made slides very busy and difficult to decipher at times.
- This was one of the best talks presented at INS in years.
- There was almost too much information for the allotted time, but it was valuable information
- The last 3 items are from another session. However, I strongly believe that the session met all of its learning objectives. Issues with WiFi.
- The talk was very research heavy with little conceptualization on its relevance to clinical practice. It felt more like a literature review. Also the objectives on this survey are inconsistent with this talk.
- The course content was excellent and relevant to my practice. However I notice the objectives vary significantly from the course content. This may be an error.
- The course learning objectives listed in this evaluation form appear to be for a different workshop...
- The presenters slides were too busy and he attempted to cover too many studies. The presentation was so convoluted that we were left trying to figure out what the main points/messages are. It was clear that he was just going over study after study after study and the theme was list over time. Facilities: i am thankful for the committee and the amount of work that goes into all of this. That said,, while the ballrooms were adequate overall accommodations were sub par. While the employees working tried their best to assist, I had multiple issues with my room. A run down bathroom with chunks torn out of the door, a dingy scuffed floor,, the bathroom door didn't even close, stains on the sheets/pillowcases, a tattered rug, and inefficient heating/cooling system. The accommodations are such a far cry from the norm and I was truly disappointed. For the talks, there was no communication regarding when continental breakfast was going to be included or not. Day 1 nothing available, day 2 breakfast included. Better communication on things such as these would be appreciated.
- I think that there were possibly too many slides and to some extent too much content. That being said, the graphs and visual aids were effective.
- At the end, an attendee asked why none of the research seemed to have assessed or controlled for depression or anxiety in the subjects. He gave a strange response (to an audience of neuropsychologists), saying he believes, "Depression is ultimately brain-based". That is certainly the perspective of neuropsychologists as well. However, it is a huge confounder in research on cognitive outcomes, so the fact that this doesn't seem to be addressed is concerning. It is suggested he familiarize himself with the very large literature on the relationship between depression/anxiety status and subjective and objective cognitive symptoms. It is critical to control for this confounder in the research field that he reviewed. Aside from this issue, I appreciated his talk.
- Online access during conference was terrible.
- Excellent talk!
- Excellent talk and Dr. Krull was extremely knowledgeable about the subject. My only minor critique is that the slides were so data heavy in very small print that it was almost impossible for the vast majority of the audience to actually see what was on the slides. Would prefer to see a little less data and to have what is included in larger print, as well as including more slides about what the findings actually were (although Dr. Krull explained these during the talk, but always nice to have on the slides to refer back to later).
- Thank you!
- I wanted a lifespan approach addressing the consequences of cancer treatment in adults as well as kids. This was really about pediatric cancer. even within this limit I learned almost nothing. basically the take home message was that long term consequences were worse the earlier the treatment was given...duh. There was almost no differentiation between the different types of treatment or between the different . Lastly he wrote off the utility of special education, without acknowledging or considering the differences in this vast field. All in all it was a waste of my time and my money.

Instructor Information

Instructor	Maria T. Schultheis
Course ID	4703
Title	CE Workshop 05: Technology and Cognition: Examining new trends and opportunities for neuropsychology
Attendees Registered for CE	147
Surveys Completed	104

Attendee Professions

Survey Count

Percentage

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	102	98.0769%
Other	2	1.9231%

Attendee Degrees

Survey Count

Percentage

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	91	87.5%
Other	13	12.5%

Attendee Survey Responses

μ

σ

3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.76	0.55
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.64	0.65
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.72	0.60
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.85	0.41
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.51	0.84
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.26	0.93
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.49	0.77
10. The handouts were useful:	4.28	0.86
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.45	0.86
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.29	0.95
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.22	0.97
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.26	0.99
15. This program should be offered again:	4.14	1.08
16. The registration was efficient:	4.35	1.09
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.26	1.01
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.03	0.93
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	3.73	1.13
20. I can now identify 3 technologies that are currently employed in neuropsychological research	4.14	0.97
21. I am able to assess the strengths and weakness of novel technologies for brain-behavior interface	4.01	1.08
22. I can examine current clinical applications of neuromodulation technologies and portable brain-imaging technologies	3.99	1.09

Average of Questions 3-23

4.32

0.89

Scale Reference

For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

- Learning objectives are incorrect for this workshop

- Questions 20-22 do not relate to the course title, the course was about new technologies, not about cancer. The talk was very inspiring. However, the overall level could have been a little bit higher (more research results etc.), as the conference is for professionals, not for students.
- I don't think questions 20-22 are for this workshop. This workshop did meet its learning objectives, however.
- Q20-Q22 are not correct for this technology presentation.
- Questions 20-22 do not relate to Maria Schultheis' presentation. They relate to another presentation.
- The learning objectives listed here are for the wrong CE lecture. This was technology and cognition.
- Questions 20-22 are for a different course, it appears
- The questions #20, 21, and 22 appear to be related to a different CE offering. In general, the CE on technology could have included a bit more content and more content about using technology in rehabilitation.
- It looks like the wrong course learning objectives are listed above.
- The last 3 questions do not appear to relate to the CE referenced (technology). I selected neutral because a response was required.
- I believe the above-listed learning objectives are pasted from another talk on a separate topic - my answers pertain to CE Workshop 05: Technology and Cognition: Examining new trends and opportunities for neuropsychology
- Learning objectives are incorrect for this workshop
- Learning objectives on this page don't match the course. I found the presentation to be fairly routine in terms of the current state of VR. Nothing that I would consider a "new trend."
- The last 3 questions don't have to do with the Technology and Neuropsychology CE.
- These questions are incorrect for the CE course!
- Dr. Schultheis is an excellent presenter!
- Practical science and not just science for science's sake
- Practical science and not just science for science's sake
- Practical science and not just science for science's sake
- Practical science and not just science for science's sake
- Practical science and not just science for science's sake
- The presenter was actually really good and did a nice job conveying their findings, but they appeared slightly dated as the field has generally accepted the technology discussed. I think the idea of calling his "new trends" is my biggest problem with the entire lecture. Dr. Schultheis is quite accomplished and has done a wonderful job considering all of the limitations of this research subject. Thank you for your presentation.
- Dr. Schultheis is an excellent presenter and should continue to present new information in this field at subsequent INS meetings.
- Overall, CE was quite vague in many respects. Aside from the driving simulator, I was disappointed in the number of technologies discussed.
- Excellent presenter, content interesting but not as clinically relevant
- Great job
- The presenter indicated the updated version of the slides would be available through the INS website. I believe the website has yet to update the provided slides.
- Facilities needed better access to microphones for questions
- I work in rehabilitation neuropsychology, so much of what she reviewed reflected what I'm already familiar with, hence the lower ratings. She was a good speaker though.
- I don't think questions 20-22 are for this workshop. This workshop did meet its learning objectives, however.
- Great talk. Very informative, great practical recommendations. I always attend the technology-oriented talks, and this one stands out in recent years.

Instructor Information

Instructor	Adam R. Cassidy, Jacqueline H. Sanz, Kelly R. Wolfe
Course ID	4704
Title	CE Workshop 06: The Cumulative Burden of Congenital Heart Disease Across the Lifespan: Implications for Neuropsychologists in Pediatrics Through Geriatrics
Attendees Registered for CE	81
Surveys Completed	68

Attendee Professions	Survey Count	Percentage
-----------------------------	---------------------	-------------------

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	67	98.5294%
Other	1	1.4706%

Attendee Degrees	Survey Count	Percentage
-------------------------	---------------------	-------------------

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	64	94.1176%
Other	2	2.9412%
Masters	2	2.9412%

Attendee Survey Responses

	μ	σ
3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.91	0.51
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.79	0.61
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.87	0.54
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.87	0.57
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.85	0.55
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.63	0.68
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.62	0.73
10. The handouts were useful:	4.56	0.74
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.78	0.61
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.71	0.62
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.66	0.68
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.74	0.63
15. This program should be offered again:	4.69	0.65
16. The registration was efficient:	4.50	0.88
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.16	0.98
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.57	0.55
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	4.38	0.77
20. I am able to describe the mechanisms by which congenital heart disease (CHD) impacts brain development and functioning across the lifespan (from infancy to older adulthood).	4.40	0.94
21. I understand the neurodevelopmental/neuropsychological sequelae of CHD for children, adolescents, and adults.	4.41	1.10
22. I can explain the role of clinical neuropsychologists in evaluating, supporting, and optimizing the neuropsychological trajectories of individuals with CHD across the lifespan.	4.29	1.24

Average of Questions 3-23	4.62	0.73
----------------------------------	-------------	-------------

Scale Reference

For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

- The fill three objectives listed in this survey are inaccurate for this course, but high marks were assigned as the actual objectives were met exceedingly well. Excellent talk!
- On 20, 21, and 22, I believe you are asking about the wrong CE, there were no cancer treatment discussion as it was about congenital heart disease.
- The last three questions you asked are about the wrong CE.
- The learning objectives above were not the correct ones for this particular CE. This was a FANTASTIC presentation. My only concern was the pace. There was SO MUCH amazing information at times it was challenging to keep up with the pace of the speakers.
- I really appreciated the approach to look at illnesses across the lifespan. I think more talks that look at the lifespan would be important.
- questions 20-22 not applicable to the course content
- This was a great CE. Thank you for having CEs that are relevant for pediatric providers and for ensuring that these CEs are relevant to clinical practice.
- Conference rooms were very hot. Food was terrible.
- Conference rooms were very hot. Food was terrible.
- Conference rooms were very hot. Food was terrible.
- Very clear, enjoyable workshop.
- excellent review of related literature and presentation of key research issues
- I wish more time was dedicated to implications in adulthood - felt this was much more centered in peds than I
- Great topic! There is a huge need for lifespan content as many of the congenital or pediatric sustained injury patients will need to be treated as adults.
- It was difficult to see the visual aids/slides. The screen appeared to be too small for the room.
- This was an issue with the room and not the speakers. The brightness/resolution of the projector made slides hard to see unless you were close to the front of the room.
- I did not get the power point well enough in advance to be able to print it out and write notes on it, thus it was hard to follow the workshop and very hard to see the powerpoint in the front of the room. The lighting was very poor. ,

Instructor Information

Instructor	Brenna C. McDonald
Course ID	4705
Title	CE Workshop 07: Cognitive Effects of Cancer and Treatment: "Chemobrain" and Beyond
Attendees Registered for CE	178
Surveys Completed	128

Attendee Professions	Survey Count	Percentage
----------------------	--------------	------------

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	126	98.4375%
Other	2	1.5625%

Attendee Degrees	Survey Count	Percentage
------------------	--------------	------------

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	113	88.2812%
Other	11	8.5937%
M.D.	1	0.7812%
Masters	3	2.3437%

Attendee Survey Responses

	μ	σ
3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.90	0.35
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.78	0.51
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.87	0.46
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.84	0.49
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.78	0.53
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.62	0.65
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.57	0.84
10. The handouts were useful:	4.55	0.78
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.77	0.53
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.63	0.66
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.64	0.75
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.69	0.68
15. This program should be offered again:	4.68	0.66
16. The registration was efficient:	4.46	0.92
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.16	1.04
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.46	0.71
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	4.36	0.82
20. I can explain commonly affected cognitive domains after non-CNS cancer and treatment	4.67	0.53
21. I understand the structural and functional brain changes related to cancer, chemotherapy, and other treatments	4.66	0.54
22. I am able to describe treatment interventions being investigated to treat cancer- and treatment-related cognitive symptoms.	4.63	0.59

Average of Questions 3-23	4.64	0.65
----------------------------------	-------------	-------------

Scale Reference**For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23**

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

• Clearly a highly knowledgeable presenter, but Dr. McDold's slides were 1) slightly blurry (others in my row agreed), and 2) FAR too text-dense. As a result, it was frustrating to try to locate the meaningful information in her slides, and this distracted from her otherwise brilliant presentation.

• This will help my clinical work which includes cancer patients

• Superb!

• I was taking a back by the fact that most of the results presented were just "trends" which I think should prompt the question whether there are any actual effects to be had in this area. I believe they're probably are, but if you continue to do research and only come up with non-significant trends, there's something wrong with something there. The fact that lumosity was mentioned in a way that made it sound almost legitimate. Ignore the fact they had a 50 million fine for fraud. I was surprised mention was made it all of ginkgo biloba, which has been disproven entirely as an aid to memory. The topic is important. Would like to see someone else do this. The screens were too small and they didn't turn down the lights enough making the slides useless. Overall, very disappointed with this talk..

• Conference rooms were hot. Food in am lectures was terrible and cold. Market and restaurant food was expensive and tasted awful. Market ran out of things all the time. Long lines all the time.

• Conference rooms were hot. Food in am lectures was terrible and cold. Market and restaurant food was expensive and tasted awful. Market ran out of things all the time. Long lines all the time.

• Excellent, comprehensive talk -- thank you!

• Excellent talk!

• Dr. McDold was clearly very knowledgeable about the topic, however, a great deal of time was spent summarizing articles and discussing methodological flaws. A bit more content context and background would have been helpful.

• Excellent presentation!

• Internet in conference area and hotel was terrible

• This was a very interesting talk on a topic I was unfamiliar with.

• Excellent presentation! I learned a great deal.

• Excellent CEU

• The facilities need better access to microphones for questions

• This was incredibly helpful to my practice as I am getting more and more referrals from our Onc team. Thank you

• Perhaps a consequence of time but felt like too many slides in too short of time.

Instructor Information

Instructor	Alex Bahar-Fuchs
Course ID	4706
Title	CE Workshop 08: Theory and Practice in the Design and Evaluation of Cognition-Oriented Treatments in Aging and Dementia
Attendees Registered for CE	123
Surveys Completed	81

Attendee Professions

	Survey Count	Percentage
--	--------------	------------

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	80	98.7654%
Physician	1	1.2346%

Attendee Degrees

	Survey Count	Percentage
--	--------------	------------

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	72	88.8889%
Other	8	9.8765%
Masters	1	1.2346%

Attendee Survey Responses

	μ	σ
--	-------	----------

3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.88	0.36
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.79	0.46
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.85	0.50
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.86	0.38
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.73	0.54
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.67	0.50
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.67	0.57
10. The handouts were useful:	4.70	0.60
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.77	0.48
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.69	0.54
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.59	0.68
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.63	0.60
15. This program should be offered again:	4.63	0.62
16. The registration was efficient:	4.42	1.03
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.43	0.90
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.42	0.61
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	4.33	0.77
20. I can summarize basic theoretical assumptions and key techniques underpinning cognition-oriented treatments	4.68	0.49
21. I am able to recognize key person-related and intervention-related factors moderating response to cognition-oriented treatments	4.68	0.49
22. I can now design appropriate clinical trials to evaluate cognition-oriented treatments	4.38	0.73

Average of Questions 3-23

4.64	0.59
------	------

Scale Reference

For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

• I found that I was already familiar with much of the content of this course and I was hoping for something more innovative.

• Well presented.

• Thank you!

• Wonderful lecture and program overall. Beautiful location but slow wifi made for difficulty in registering onsite or getting online from room.

• This presentation had useful content, especially the more clinically applicable material in the beginning. I was dissatisfied with the facilities aspect. There was a breakfast with "real" plates, silverware, etc. that was quite noisy, and the presentation was started too early before everyone was seated. Perhaps if the provided breakfast is advertised, attendees will arrive earlier and not make so much noise during the presentation.

• This presentation had useful content, especially the more clinically applicable material in the beginning. I was dissatisfied with the facilities aspect. There was a breakfast with "real" plates, silverware, etc. that was quite noisy, and the presentation was started too early before everyone was seated. Perhaps if the provided breakfast is advertised, attendees will arrive earlier and not make so much noise during the presentation.

• This was one of the best CE workshops that I've attended in awhile!

• The slides were a bit busy and made it difficult to read/see. The information might benefit from being on separate slides.

Instructor Information

Instructor	Robert Ploutz-Snyder
Course ID	4709
Title	CE Workshop 09: Cast Aside Traditional Notions of Statistical Significance, and Focus Instead on Characterizing the Magnitude of Effects that are Clinically or Scientifically Relevant
Attendees Registered for CE	133
Surveys Completed	94

Attendee Professions	Survey Count	Percentage
----------------------	--------------	------------

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	94	100%
--------------	----	------

Attendee Degrees	Survey Count	Percentage
------------------	--------------	------------

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	80	85.1064%
Other	12	12.766%
Masters	2	2.1277%

Attendee Survey Responses

	μ	σ
3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.95	0.27
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.90	0.36
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.93	0.30
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.90	0.39
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.86	0.43
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.85	0.41
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.76	0.56
10. The handouts were useful:	4.77	0.51
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.86	0.43
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.83	0.48
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.85	0.46
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.88	0.41
15. This program should be offered again:	4.85	0.53
16. The registration was efficient:	4.71	0.79
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.35	1.01
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.66	0.65
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	4.60	0.75
20. I understand what p-values mean and how they are commonly misinterpreted.	4.80	0.43
21. I can explain the leading arguments promoted by the American Statistical Association with regard to why science should carefully reconsider if and how p-values should continue to dominate our decisions about what research should be published, and how scientists should be evaluating its worth.	4.76	0.50
22. I am able to apply new practices in how to evaluate and publish my own research, as well as how to evaluate research appearing in peer-reviewed journals, whether as a consumer, reviewer, or editor.	4.66	0.63

Average of Questions 3-23

4.79 0.51

Scale Reference

For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

- Fabulous workshop. one of the best I have attended at INS.
- Would like to see again . Great speaker. Screens too small and washed out by light in room. Facilities not good.
- What a surprisingly entertaining and interesting talk for such a typically dry subject. Dr. Ploutz-Snyder was a superior communicator.
- This or something like it should be offered every year. e.g., addressing the "replicability crisis"
- This was an excellent lecture but quite advanced. It would be great to have this topic presented as a 3 hour CE with opportunities for more examples and slower presentation of information.
- This speaker was excellent and the topic matter was incredibly helpful for those in research. I would highly recommend this type of topic again in the future or other advanced statistical update type courses. Thank you.
- I was shocked at how relatable and user friendly this talk was. Statistics at 7:20am is usually difficult, but the presentation was truly excellent. I am not a researcher but I found the discussion to be still relevant and engaging to my clinical practice.
- Outstanding presentation. I would also have liked to see some discussion about effect sizes in relation to p values. This would provide another way of addressing one of the audience member's example of a significant but meaningless p value for visual memory differences in right vs left temporal lobe epilepsy.
- Such an eye-opening topic and love that it was from someone outside our field who understands our science.
- Best workshop of the conference!
- this was a very timely presentation and would be extremely beneficial to trainees -- i would recommend looking at the opportunity to have Dr.Ploutz-Snyder present to trainees
- Super interesting and approachable talk, my favorite of all the CEs I attended at INS and I hate stats. Really persoble lecturer especially at 7am.
- This was potentially difficult or dry material presented so clearly and engagingly! Noise and attendees walking in and out frequently was disruptive
- This was potentially difficult or dry material presented so clearly and engagingly! Noise and attendees walking in and out frequently was disruptive
- Best presentation I saw
- Fantastically accessible information presented in an applied way with phenomel resources for deeper learning and application to everyday practice and research.
- Of all the presentations I attended, this was the most valuable for me. The presenter was extremely knowledgeable and presented the relatively dense topic in a digestible and helpful way! Please consider having this topic as a repeated presentation!
- Excellent CEU - strongly recommending having Dr. Ploutz-Snyder return for future conferences.
- Great talk. Would highly recommend offering this CE again.
- This topic should become a workshop at all future meetings if we want to see real change in the field
- I still need to download Dr. Ploutz-Snyder references from slides. I hope they are accessible.
- This was an excellent presentation. I appreciate the semir and the reference list. I will be reviewing and referencing this presentation when designing/conducting my research studies.
- This was an excellent presentation. I appreciate the semir and the reference list. I will be reviewing and referencing this presentation when designing/conducting my research studies.
- Excellent, my favorite talk of the conference this year.

Instructor Information

Instructor	Steven J. Luck
Course ID	4710
Title	CE Workshop 10: Advances in Event-Related Potential Methods for Assessing Clinical Populations
Attendees Registered for CE	23
Surveys Completed	13

Attendee Professions	Survey Count	Percentage
----------------------	--------------	------------

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	13	100%
--------------	----	------

Attendee Degrees	Survey Count	Percentage
------------------	--------------	------------

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	12	92.3077%
Other	1	7.6923%

Attendee Survey Responses

	μ	σ
3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.92	0.27
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.77	0.42
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.85	0.36
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.77	0.58
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.69	0.46
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.38	0.74
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.69	0.46
10. The handouts were useful:	4.46	0.63
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.54	0.50
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.31	0.72
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.62	0.49
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.38	0.49
15. This program should be offered again:	4.23	0.89
16. The registration was efficient:	4.08	1.21
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.15	1.23
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.23	0.70
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	3.69	1.07
20. I can now evaluate and critically assess ERP studies of clinical populations that were published over the last decade, making use of advanced recording and analysis methods that are now widely used	4.23	0.97
21. I can evaluate and critically assess ERP studies of clinical populations that have been published recently or will be published in the near future that take advantage of state-of-the-art recording and analysis methods, such as dry electrodes and multivariate pattern analysis	4.31	0.91
22. I am able to integrate recent and emerging research findings into my research or clinical practice	4.31	0.91
Average of Questions 3-23	4.43	0.7

Scale Reference**For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23**

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments



Instructor Information

Instructor	Sallie Baxendale
Course ID	4712
Title	CE Workshop 11: The Cognitive Contraindications, Complications and Costs of Epilepsy Surgery
Attendees Registered for CE	115
Surveys Completed	79

Attendee Professions

	Survey Count	Percentage
--	--------------	------------

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	79	100%
--------------	----	------

Attendee Degrees

	Survey Count	Percentage
--	--------------	------------

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	71	89.8734%
Other	7	8.8608%
M.D.	1	1.2658%

Attendee Survey Responses

	μ	σ
--	-------	----------

3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.95	0.27
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.94	0.24
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.96	0.19
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.91	0.33
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.94	0.24
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.78	0.44
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.81	0.42
10. The handouts were useful:	4.76	0.56
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.91	0.28
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.76	0.58
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.85	0.45
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.87	0.40
15. This program should be offered again:	4.92	0.31
16. The registration was efficient:	4.67	0.63
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.47	0.82
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.62	0.56
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	4.59	0.68
20. I am able to recognize the distinction between cognitive contraindications, complications and costs in cognitive outcomes following epilepsy surgery	4.84	0.37
21. I can summarize the latest developments in non invasive epilepsy surgery investigations and techniques and their implications for neuropsychological function	4.71	0.53
22. I can apply neuropsychological data to predict postoperative cognitive outcomes and use these predictions to prepare surgical candidates for any anticipated changes.	4.68	0.52

Average of Questions 3-23

4.8	0.44
-----	------

Scale Reference

For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

- This was an excellent presentation. Dr. Baxendale is obviously extremely knowledgeable and she communicated the material clearly, concisely and in an extremely engaging manner.

• This talk was exceptional. Dr. Baxendale is a truly a subject matter expert and I really appreciated the role of rehabilitation psychology throughout the presentation. The presentation brought up important questions and concerns in this line of clinical care and I appreciate the perspective provided by Dr. Baxendale.

• This was an amazing talk. I learned a great deal and the presentation was easy to understand and remain engaged with. This was my favorite presentation this year.

• Dr .Baxendale was amazing and very knowledgeable!

• Really useful, appreciate how clinically applicable this was!! Wish more CEUs were clinically applicable like this

• Nothing about cultural factors or health disparities.

• Learned a lot and definitely appreciated the individualized approach - changed my thinking of risk, COST, and informed consent

• This was great, not just for Epilepsy neuropsychology practice, but for neuropsychology practice generally.

Instructor Information

Instructor	Jamie Near
Course ID	4713
Title	CE Workshop 12: Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy for in vivo Assessment of Neurochemistry in Neuropsychology Research
Attendees Registered for CE	25
Surveys Completed	11

Attendee Professions

	Survey Count	Percentage
--	--------------	------------

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	11	100%
--------------	----	------

Attendee Degrees

	Survey Count	Percentage
--	--------------	------------

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	10	90.9091%
Other	1	9.0909%

Attendee Survey Responses

	μ	σ
--	-------	----------

3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.91	0.29
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.73	0.45
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.82	0.39
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.91	0.29
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.64	0.48
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.36	0.64
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.64	0.48
10. The handouts were useful:	4.36	0.77
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.45	0.66
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.36	0.64
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.45	0.66
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.27	0.75
15. This program should be offered again:	4.27	0.96
16. The registration was efficient:	4.27	0.96
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	3.91	1.44
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.18	0.83
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	3.73	1.14
20. I can describe how magnetic resonance spectroscopy experiments are conducted, including methods of data acquisition, processing, analysis and interpretation.	4.36	0.77
21. I am able to list examples from recent literature of how MRS has been used in neuropsychological research.	4.27	0.86
22. I can apply and devise new experiments involving the use of MRS for neuropsychological research.	4.09	0.90

Average of Questions 3-23

4.4	0.72
-----	------

Scale Reference

For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

- I do not have much exposure to MRS in research and it is not a tool used in the clinical/medical setting that I work. I found the talk interesting.

• The registration process was difficult --- had to register in person at the conference for this CE course. Unfortunately, the table was understaffed and there were long lines. Keeping the online option open would have been helpful.

• The registration process was difficult --- had to register in person at the conference for this CE course. Unfortunately, the table was understaffed and there were long lines. Keeping the online option open would have been helpful.

Instructor Information

Instructor	Randall Scott Scheibel, Felicia C. Goldstein, Linda Ewing-Cobbs, Erin D. Bigler, Elisabeth A. Wilde
Course ID	4720
Title	Invited Symposium 1: Traumatic Brain Injury: Highlighting the Contributions of Dr. Harvey S. Levin Ph.D., ABPP-CN, FACS 1946 - 2022
Attendees Registered for CE	1
Surveys Completed	1

Attendee Professions	Survey Count	Percentage
----------------------	--------------	------------

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	1	100%
--------------	---	------

Attendee Degrees	Survey Count	Percentage
------------------	--------------	------------

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	1	100%
-------	---	------

Attendee Survey Responses

	μ	σ
3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	5.00	0.00
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	5.00	0.00
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	5.00	0.00
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	5.00	0.00
7. The abstract description was adequate:	5.00	0.00
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.00	0.00
9. The visual aids were useful:	5.00	0.00
10. The handouts were useful:	3.00	0.00
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.00	0.00
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.00	0.00
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	5.00	0.00
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.00	0.00
15. This program should be offered again:	2.00	0.00
16. The registration was efficient:	5.00	0.00
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.00	0.00
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.00	0.00
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	4.00	0.00

Average of Questions 3-20

4.29 0

Scale Reference**For Question(s): 3-17 and 20**

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

Instructor Information

Instructor	David S. Sabsevitz, Madison Berl, Monika Polczyńska
Course ID	4721
Title	Invited Symposium 2: The Need for a Highly Individualized Approach to Brain Mapping: Neuroanatomical, Lifespan and Cultural-Language Considerations
Attendees Registered for CE	166
Surveys Completed	113

Attendee Professions	Survey Count	Percentage
-----------------------------	---------------------	-------------------

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	110	97.3451%
Physician	1	0.885%
Other	2	1.7699%

Attendee Degrees	Survey Count	Percentage
-------------------------	---------------------	-------------------

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Other	13	11.5044%
Ph.D.	99	87.6106%
Masters	1	0.885%

Attendee Survey Responses

	μ	σ
3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.95	0.26
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.89	0.41
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.97	0.16
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.88	0.42
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.89	0.38
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.80	0.52
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.88	0.40
10. The handouts were useful:	4.79	0.52
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.87	0.36
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.83	0.42
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.82	0.50
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.89	0.34
15. This program should be offered again:	4.88	0.42
16. The registration was efficient:	4.39	1.05
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.28	1.07
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.72	0.51
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	4.58	0.69
20. I can discuss informed task selection based on cortical and subcortical functional neuroanatomy	4.68	0.64
21. I am able to explain how functional maps change with normal development and factors that should be considered when interpreting results for presurgical planning	4.73	0.52
22. I can assess differences between the bilingual and monolingual brain, factors that modulate the neuroanatomical representation of language in bilinguals and strategies in mapping multiple languages for surgical planning	4.71	0.56

Average of Questions 3-23	4.77	0.51
----------------------------------	-------------	-------------

Scale Reference

For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

- This was fantastic. Seriously, this is the level that the rest of the program this week should have been close to. While some talks this week were really good, far too many were not. All of the presenters were superb.
- This course was outstanding - likely the best of this year's INS meeting. If recorded, it should be made available after the meeting.
- Best session of conference for me- very informative and found Sabsevitz's videos a great teaching tool.
- Monika was excellent
- This was very helpful for more than just surgical purposes!
- This talk was so important as more and more individuals are bi/multilingual. I have always been concerned that the language networks between monolingual and bi/multilingual individuals was different and it was helpful to see it in this presentation. Extremely helpful and informative talk.
- This was an excellent group of presenters!
- All speakers were wonderful! I full CE with Dr. Sabsevitz and brain mapping would be fantastic for future meetings, as a lot can be covered and time was limited this time.
- Dr. Berl was a most enjoyable presenter--she has a wonderful sense of humor that she brought to her presentation. I learned so much from Dr. Połczyńska's presentation about how distributed language is in the brain based on multiple factors like age and method of acquisition and proximity to first language. Great presentations from all 3 presenters.
- Everyone was great! Fantastic talk. Extremely informative and enjoyable.
- Excellent set of talks
- Excellent set of talks
- Excellent presentation--all three presenters were humorous but down to earth and presented complex material in a highly accessible fashion.
- Excellent presentation--all three presenters were humorous but down to earth and presented complex material in a highly accessible fashion.
- Very informative presentation. I think it could have been a longer presentation as an hour consolidated it and I would like to hear more from the presenters. I was especially impressed with Dr. Połczyńska and her courage.
- Best presentation of the whole conference
- This was an excellent talk with speakers that clearly have a passion for what they do. Each speaker also let their personalities shine through and it wasn't just another stiff presentation but one that was both interesting and enjoyable. Thank you!
- This was an excellent talk with speakers that clearly have a passion for what they do. Each speaker also let their personalities shine through and it wasn't just another stiff presentation but one that was both interesting and enjoyable. Thank you!
- Excellent talk, please offer again.
- Exceptional learning experience.
- Speaker gave the impression that her perspective was slightly biased culturally and lacked sensitivity to inherent race and caste bias. Condescending towards other professions
- Second and third speaker's excellent. First had lots of anecdotes and footage, but was light on evidence for actual clinical practice.
- Great visuals and explanations.
- This was one of the best talks I've been to at INS!
- This was my favorite presentation of the conference. The videos of brain mapping were especially fascinating!
- Excellent CE!
- Fantastic presentation - very engaging

Instructor Information

Instructor	Celiane Rey-Casserly, Adam R. Cassidy, Andrew Heitzer, Lana Harder, Jennifer Longoria
Course ID	4722
Title	Invited Symposium 3: Pediatric Neuropsychology Medical Advances and Life Span Outcomes
Attendees Registered for CE	101
Surveys Completed	70

Attendee Professions

	Survey Count	Percentage
--	--------------	------------

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Other	2	2.8571%
Psychologist	68	97.1429%

Attendee Degrees

	Survey Count	Percentage
--	--------------	------------

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	65	92.8571%
Other	4	5.7143%
Masters	1	1.4286%

Attendee Survey Responses

	μ	σ
--	-------	----------

3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.86	0.46
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.79	0.47
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.87	0.33
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.87	0.37
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.86	0.35
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.76	0.46
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.79	0.50
10. The handouts were useful:	4.71	0.61
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.90	0.30
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.77	0.59
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.77	0.48
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.76	0.49
15. This program should be offered again:	4.80	0.50
16. The registration was efficient:	4.54	0.89
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.13	1.08
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.64	0.54
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	4.54	0.69
20. I can describe recent advances in medical care for pediatric sickle cell disease, demyelinating disorders, congenital heart disease, and cancer	4.77	0.42
21. I am able to explain long-term neuropsychological outcomes in pediatric medical disorders	4.73	0.75
22. I can assess the role of neuropsychology in advancing the field across pediatric medical disorders	4.80	0.43

Average of Questions 3-23	4.73	0.54
----------------------------------	-------------	-------------

Scale Reference

For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

• I really liked having several different speakers. It kept the talk very interesting. I think doing this model for 3 hour talks would be really great.

Instructor Information

Instructor	Natasha N. Ludwig, Peter Anderson, Gwendolyn Gerner, H. Gerry Taylor, Tricia Williams
Course ID	4723
Title	Invited Symposium 4: Innovations in Infant, Toddler, and Young Child Neuropsychological Models of Care
Attendees Registered for CE	69
Surveys Completed	37

Attendee Professions	Survey Count	Percentage
----------------------	--------------	------------

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	36	97.2973%
Other	1	2.7027%

Attendee Degrees	Survey Count	Percentage
------------------	--------------	------------

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	36	97.2973%
Masters	1	2.7027%

Attendee Survey Responses

	μ	σ
3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.78	0.70
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.89	0.39
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.86	0.34
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.78	0.53
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.81	0.39
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.73	0.50
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.86	0.41
10. The handouts were useful:	4.73	0.55
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.92	0.27
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.84	0.37
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.76	0.43
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.76	0.43
15. This program should be offered again:	4.81	0.39
16. The registration was efficient:	4.62	0.63
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.38	0.78
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.65	0.48
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	4.51	0.64
20. I am able to summarize several novel models of neuropsychological care for infants, toddlers, and young children.	4.70	0.46
21. I can recognize ways in which neuropsychologists work within interdisciplinary teams to serve infants, toddlers, and young children and their families.	4.84	0.37
22. I am able to apply these models of care to my conceptualization of the scope of neuropsychological services available for infants, toddlers, and young children.	4.70	0.46

Average of Questions 3-23	4.75	0.48
----------------------------------	-------------	-------------

Scale Reference**For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23**

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

- Lots of useful information for these populations.
-

Instructor Information

Instructor	Ida Sue Baron
Course ID	4707
Title	Plenary A: Presidential Address: Anesthesia: A Wake-Up Call. Part 2. Developmental Risk or Resilience?
Attendees Registered for CE	210
Surveys Completed	154

Attendee Professions	Survey Count	Percentage
----------------------	--------------	------------

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	152	98.7013%
Other	2	1.2987%

Attendee Degrees	Survey Count	Percentage
------------------	--------------	------------

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	144	93.5065%
Other	9	5.8442%
Masters	1	0.6494%

Attendee Survey Responses

	μ	σ
3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.79	0.51
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.80	0.48
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.89	0.35
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.64	0.75
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.78	0.50
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.66	0.59
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.71	0.55
10. The handouts were useful:	4.51	0.78
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.79	0.51
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.69	0.60
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.66	0.69
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.69	0.66
15. This program should be offered again:	4.56	0.84
16. The registration was efficient:	4.49	0.93
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.31	0.94
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.40	0.73
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	4.07	0.96
20. I understand the types of central nervous system disruption that result in animals following exposure to general anesthesia	4.48	0.87
21. I can identify neuropsychological domains at high potential risk following exposure to general anesthesia during the human critical growth spurt period	4.31	1.10
22. I am able to explain what is meant by 'vertical transfer'	4.07	1.22

Average of Questions 3-23

4.56 0.73

Scale Reference**For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23**

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

- Unfortunately, the learning objectives for this talk don't match the talk- Ida Sue Baron did not discuss Sheehan's or Balint's syndrome. The internet was terrible- not acceptable.
- These learning objectives do not match the topic that was presented. I think they are for a different CE.
- Excellent presentation. Very enjoyable. Informative...
- Q20-Q22 are for another presentation and not Dr. Barron's Plery.
- Questions 20-22 do not relate to Dr. Baron's lecture.
- I think you mixed up questions for 21 and 22. Facilities in general are weak.
- The fill three survey questions are inaccurate for this course, but objectives were met.
- questions 20-22 are for a different workshop/talk.
- I was completely unaware of this, having focused only on adults, very concerning
- These learning objectives do not match the program
- Questions 20-22 do not pertain to this lecture.
- The course learning objectives listed here are not applicable to this lecture.
- The last 3 items are from another session. However, I strongly believe that the session met all of its learning objectives. Issues with WiFi.
- questions 20-23 not applicable
- Objectives do not match the course content. Perhaps this is an error.
- well done and a great example of how neuropsych can contribute to and enhance adjacent fields of science/medicine
- The learning objectives listed here are for another talk....this happened in Kevin Krull's cancer lifespan evaluation form as well...
- Facilities: i am thankful for the committee and the amount of work that goes into all of this. That said, while the ballrooms were adequate overall accommodations were sub par. While the employees working tried their best to assist, I had multiple issues with my room. A run down bathroom with chunks torn out of the door, a dingy scuffed floor,, the bathroom door didn't even close, stains on the sheets/pillowcases, a tattered rug, and inefficient heating/cooling system. The accommodations are such a far cry from the norm and I was truly disappointed. For the talks, there was no communication regarding when continental breakfast was going to be included or not. Day 1 nothing available, day 2 breakfast included. Better communication on things such as these would be appreciated.
- This was terrific! and the speaker is clearly a master!
- Thank you!
- Well done talk and interesting topic but I still don't know if GA is bad for you and I'm not sure what the alternative is? Nevertheless, I appreciated the precision developing the talk.
- Well done talk and interesting topic but I still don't know if GA is bad for you and I'm not sure what the alternative is? Nevertheless, I appreciated the precision developing the talk.
- This was more like a research presentation (and not the research of the presenter) rather than a Presidential Address. disappointing.
- This was an excellent talk and it made me wish I had heard Part 1 of the talk (apparently given earlier this year)
- Fantastic call to action
- None

Instructor Information

Instructor	Tatia M.C. Lee
Course ID	4711
Title	Plenary B: The Pons is a Significant Neural Correlate of Affective Processing
Attendees Registered for CE	141
Surveys Completed	88

Attendee Professions

	Survey Count	Percentage
--	--------------	------------

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	87	98.8636%
Other	1	1.1364%

Attendee Degrees

	Survey Count	Percentage
--	--------------	------------

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	82	93.1818%
Other	5	5.6818%
Masters	1	1.1364%

Attendee Survey Responses

	μ	σ
--	-------	----------

3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.84	0.37
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.44	0.78
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.76	0.45
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.41	0.81
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.61	0.65
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.47	0.75
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.45	0.75
10. The handouts were useful:	4.28	0.92
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.59	0.67
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.48	0.77
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.28	0.98
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.36	0.86
15. This program should be offered again:	4.24	0.95
16. The registration was efficient:	4.27	1.09
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.18	1.01
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.22	0.87
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	3.92	1.06
20. I understand the functional roles of the pons in affective processing	4.44	0.77
21. I can recognize that the pons is a significant neural correlate of affective processing	4.51	0.69
22. I am able to list major neural correlates of the affective processing network	4.38	0.82

Average of Questions 3-23

	4.41	0.8
--	------	-----

Scale Reference

For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

- This questionnaire should go with Schretlen's Plery session and vice versa
- Very hard to deal with a virtual presentation, especially with a non-tive English speaker. She certainly tried!

- Handouts would be helpful for review of information after the presentation.
 - This was really interesting, such tract and locus research makes for good presentations
 - The zoom format, NOT the fault of the presenter , was problematic given technical issues . Add to that the poor screen size and washed out projection and the talk was not very good. I think you should ask her back to talk in person once the travel restrictions are lifted.
 - It was too bad it had to be done over Zoom. It took much away from the presentation.
 - I wish we would have been told in advance that the presenter would not be in person.
 - Thank you!
 - Excellent presentation. I would have liked to be able to download the handouts. My note taking had trouble keeping up with the presentation. I found the topic fasciting and clinically relevant.
 - The remote lecture coupled with the presenter's accent made understanding difficult at times. Not her fault, but it was less than ideal.
 - This presenter did not address the role of the pons as a major tract to the cerebellum where the affective processing is likely occurring. Dissapointing
 - The Zoom format was disappointing. The technical glitches interfered with the presentation. The speaker was difficult to understand.
 - None
-

Instructor Information

Instructor	David J. Schretlen
Course ID	4708
Title	Plenary C: Developing Tools for Global Neuropsychological Assessment
Attendees Registered for CE	210
Surveys Completed	145

Attendee Professions	Survey Count	Percentage
-----------------------------	---------------------	-------------------

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	143	98.6207%
Other	1	0.6897%
Physician	1	0.6897%

Attendee Degrees	Survey Count	Percentage
-------------------------	---------------------	-------------------

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	137	94.4828%
Other	8	5.5172%

Attendee Survey Responses

	μ	σ
3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.80	0.49
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.74	0.51
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.83	0.43
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.67	0.63
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.72	0.53
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.52	0.79
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.66	0.58
10. The handouts were useful:	4.38	0.86
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.72	0.57
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.57	0.72
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.61	0.71
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.54	0.81
15. This program should be offered again:	4.54	0.85
16. The registration was efficient:	4.37	0.99
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.31	0.99
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.37	0.77
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	4.19	0.94
20. I can describe two fundamental approaches to developing neuropsychological tests that are appropriate for international use.	4.57	0.58
21. I am able to explain at least one strength and limitation of each approach to global test and regression-based norms development.	4.54	0.63
22. I can assess how to personally engage in a project that aims to provide contributors with free access to a global neuropsychological test battery that is suitable for use worldwide in multiple languages.	4.54	0.67

Average of Questions 3-23	4.56	0.7
----------------------------------	-------------	------------

Scale Reference**For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23**

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

- wrong questions for the CE.
- Very enlightening presentation!
- Handouts would be helpful for review of information after the lecture. It was an excellent talk and very important topic.
- Provide the slides please. We need them. It's not enough without the slide access.
- Really great to hear the current status of a project I only just heard about a couple of years ago. So amazing what we can accomplish together! I will begin using this for some patients in my clinical practice.
- An engaging, compelling speaker, a great communicator.
- This was an exciting topic, however, how it was executed was unfortunate. While Dr. Schretlen has been doing this work for 10 years and has amassed a wonderful database file/files for use in the larger neuropsychological community and invested in statistical harmonization and language-based translational task building, much of his introduction to this work came across as if he discovered certain issues and wanted to share them with the audience (e.g., literacy issues). There are legions of others in this area using other non-statistical, non-translation based approaches to task development - and this moving beyond years of education to discuss quality of education and the sociocultural context of brain development and aging across the globe (as opposed to using country as a variable of interest), it would have been good to highlight those approaches as well or perhaps to have had a panel bringing together all of those doing work in this area so that consensus building could occur and/or the INS audience would hear a more well-rounded discussion of this incredibly important topic.
- Interesting presentation, not clear on how useful approach this will actually be for the practicing clinicians in different countries.
- Interesting presentation, not clear on how useful approach this will actually be for the practicing clinicians in different countries.
- I had no idea that neuropsychologists were already so involved in global health initiatives and that the field had evolved to this extent. Excellent and eye-opening presentation.
- The presenter didn't really discuss use in pediatric populations, which felt like a significant oversight. With that said, he fit a great deal of information into a limited time frame.
- While it is clear that the speaker was enthusiastic about the topic- i found his presentation to be rrow and in many ways in contrast to recommendations of other leaders in the field of global neuropsychology
- Did not include peds specific tools
- This session also was great in content and presenter, but too noisy with attendees coming in and out
- Dr. Schretlen's work in this area is a tour de force.
- Great as always
- No
- Very inspiring way to advance the field!!!
- There should be more presentations in this domain but this particular project is ill-conceived and lacking in multicultural expertise and sensitivity.
- None

Instructor Information

Instructor	Deborah Koltai
Course ID	4714
Title	Plenary D: Birch Lecture: Networking towards a Global Neuropsychology: An Invitation to Action
Attendees Registered for CE	164
Surveys Completed	115

Attendee Professions

Survey Count

Percentage

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	115	100%
--------------	-----	------

Attendee Degrees

Survey Count

Percentage

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	106	92.1739%
Other	9	7.8261%

Attendee Survey Responses

μ

σ

3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.85	0.42
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.87	0.36
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.87	0.38
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.71	0.67
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.78	0.52
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.66	0.63
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.73	0.53
10. The handouts were useful:	4.54	0.75
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.71	0.64
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.69	0.62
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.69	0.66
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.67	0.66
15. This program should be offered again:	4.66	0.68
16. The registration was efficient:	4.46	0.97
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.34	0.93
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.51	0.62
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	4.34	0.87
20. I am able to describe what we know of neuropsychology clinical practice, research, and teaching in Africa.	4.65	0.63
21. I can assess the challenges of developing neuropsychology as a field that are unique to Africa.	4.70	0.54
22. I can identify multiple ways that I can support the global development of neuropsychology, crossing topics that include cultural humility, instrument development and validation, shared resources, and mentoring.	4.70	0.56

Average of Questions 3-23

4.66

0.63

Scale Reference

For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

- Very inspiring!

- Great presentation . Thank you!
 - Great presentation . Thank you!
 - Excellent and very informative presentation. I'm very impressed with the comprehensiveness of the presenter's research in this area and her dedication to the development of pan-African initiatives to increase access to neuropsychology.
 - I really appreciated the focus on practical steps to work in a global setting, and how to center the needs and culture of the country we are hoping to partner with. Especially appreciated the resources to act as support and mentors for establishing care in underserved regions.
 - Exceptional talk- please have her speak again. "Everyone is a ninja at something" is my new motto.
 - Great!
 - Would have been a stronger talk if co-speakers from the countries and cultures discussed were present to communicate the issues from that perspective. As-is, it came across as white saviorism or colonialism, though I don't believe that was the intention.
 - Amazing speaker with real world experience in the area she was speaking; also provided resources for INS members to get involved which was really fantastic.
 - Very enjoyable and informative.
 - excellent presenter - engaging and its clear she has first hand experience in doing this work
 - No
 - I really enjoyed emphasis on sitting down, listening and forming collaborative relationships with local colleagues
 - None.
 - Excellent and highly informative presentation!
-

Instructor Information

Instructor	Barbara Wilson
Course ID	4715
Title	Plenary E: Learning from patients: people who have changed my way of thinking
Attendees Registered for CE	175
Surveys Completed	125

Attendee Professions

Survey Count

Percentage

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	123	98.4%
Other	2	1.6%

Attendee Degrees

Survey Count

Percentage

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	115	92%
Other	9	7.2%
Masters	1	0.8%

Attendee Survey Responses

μ

σ

3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.96	0.20
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.81	0.52
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.78	0.50
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.71	0.68
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.88	0.37
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.62	0.69
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.81	0.45
10. The handouts were useful:	4.51	0.82
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.82	0.51
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.67	0.63
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.82	0.45
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.77	0.58
15. This program should be offered again:	4.68	0.75
16. The registration was efficient:	4.53	0.90
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.34	0.96
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.52	0.73
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	4.43	0.86
20. I can describe the main purposes of neuropsychological rehabilitation	4.77	0.49
21. I have gained some knowledge about Sheehan's syndrome	4.72	0.50
22. I am able to explain the three components of Balint's syndrome	4.74	0.56

Average of Questions 3-23

4.69

0.61

Scale Reference

For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

• I found this talk to be an excellent plery. The presenter was clearly enthusiastic and passioate about the cases and her work. I found her style entertaining and engaging. It was a bit ambitious to try to get through six cases in an hour but I heartily enjoyed each one that was presented.

- I just bought her book to flesh out the presentation; there was too much information for the allotted time, it's good information
 - This was one of the most meaningful INS talks I've ever attended. Still find myself thinking about her patients. Highly clinically relevant, no doubt because it was delivered by a very seasoned clinician. There are insights that only longtime clinical neuropsychologists have, and more presentations of this sort should be included at EVERY INS conference. (Simply look at how well it was attended, relative to many of the strictly research-related talks.)
 - Excellent talk!
 - I would love more case based presentations like this.
 - Prof Wilson's presentation humanized our profession after all the imaging studies presented at INS. It is so important to be reminded that each individual we encounter as a patient is a human being--not a statistical data point on a chart. She should give this presentation at every INS meeting.
 - She was such a fantastic presenter - please invite her every year!
 - This was a touching and beautiful presentation. So good to see Dr. Wilson present this.
 - This was the best talk of the conference and maybe the best talk I've attended at any conference. Wonderful speaker and message. Thank you.
 - Part of the job of a neuropsychologist is giving good people bad news. It was an uplifting presentation and puts some bad outcomes in a hopeful perspective.
 - Inspiring reminder to not set limits on patients but give them room to set and achieve goals
 - I recommend more of this; having someone who talks about their work life experience and how it framed their professional perspective, using specific case examples. Seeing someone who is brave enough to be so vulnerable, honest, and transparent. Truly the best talk of the entire conference. It is also helpful to have topics that can be readily applied directly to one's practice.
 - Dr. Wilson's plenary session was among the most meaningful sessions I have attended in my 30+ years of INS meetings. Her messages of hope amidst the devastating injuries suffered by her patients practically brought me to tears. I cannot tell you how inspiring this single hour of CE was to this tired old neuropsychologist. Thank you Dr. Wilson and the INS CE committee for this treasure of an offering.
 - This was my favorite talk of the conference
 - Speaker obviously has a wealth of knowledge and experience and while that was clear, the pace / timing of her talk was such that a lot of time was dedicated to the first few cases she discussed but she rushed through the last couple because time ran out.
 - Beautiful and inspiring presentation. I really enjoyed this and learned a lot!
 - Great session. I thoroughly enjoyed listening to Dr. Wilson... probably could have been a longer session...
 - Several patient stories were rushed through or skipped due to time limitations. I wanted to hear more! Giving more time for this talk would have been appreciated.
 - Envious of the UK medical system
 - This was a great reminder to stay humble and keep an open mind when working with patients, especially tough cases!
 - None.
 - There was no time set aside for audience questions.
 - I always enjoy Dr. Wilson's talks!
-

Instructor Information

Instructor	Kristine Beate Walhovd
Course ID	4719
Title	Plenary F: Timing of Influences on Brain and Cognition: a Lifespan Perspective
Attendees Registered for CE	134
Surveys Completed	82

Attendee Professions	Survey Count	Percentage
----------------------	--------------	------------

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	81	98.7805%
Other	1	1.2195%

Attendee Degrees	Survey Count	Percentage
------------------	--------------	------------

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	76	92.6829%
Other	5	6.0976%
Masters	1	1.2195%

Attendee Survey Responses

	μ	σ
3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.88	0.33
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.78	0.54
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.85	0.45
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.82	0.52
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.77	0.50
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.78	0.47
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.71	0.57
10. The handouts were useful:	4.65	0.65
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.82	0.50
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.78	0.52
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.77	0.50
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.78	0.49
15. This program should be offered again:	4.74	0.62
16. The registration was efficient:	4.55	0.86
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.34	0.93
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.61	0.62
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	4.44	0.78
20. I can now recognize that differences in brain and cognition even at advanced age may reflect early life factors, rather than, or in addition to, differences in brain and cognitive change with age	4.83	0.49
21. I can describe consistency as well as diversity of factors' (such as SES) associations with brain and cognition across cohorts of different age and origin.	4.73	0.61
22. I am able to evaluate differences in factors present early in life, including at birth ("different offset") before attributing variance in brain and cognitive function to changes with age ("different slope")	4.80	0.45

Average of Questions 3-23	4.72	0.57
----------------------------------	-------------	-------------

Scale Reference**For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23**

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

- Excellent information and presentation
- Delightful human being, this presenter! I appreciated her using personal and family examples to illustrate ideas.
- Delightful human being, this presenter! I appreciated her using personal and family examples to illustrate ideas.
- Great talk! Thanks!
- She is an extremely excellent presenter
- She is an extremely excellent presenter
- I hope we pursue this line of presentations in the future
- I enjoyed the presentation very much. Research was presented that I was not previously aware of, and the presenter did an excellent job in conveying the primary findings and their implications.
 - The lack of a strong association of Educational level with later life outcome is surprising for those of us who view educational level as a primary component of cognitive reserve, and perhaps is deserving of a few minutes of brief discussion. Very interesting presentation. Thank you.
 - Excellent presenter and presentation and she was entertaining.
 - This was a spectacular presentation., The information presented as important and the research well done and explained. The presenter is a fantastic speaker, lively and hilarious at times, very engaging. I would LOVE to see her present in the future. Fantastic.
 - The registration was challenging this year, but I want to give a huge shout out to Jamie Wilson for going above and beyond to help me throughout the week of the conference. I greatly appreciate it!
 - a demo of a speaker!
 - In general a very nice talk. Unrelated to the talk but rather to the conference. The location was not ideal and it would have been preferential to be walking distance or closer to other main attractions for after the conference. Registration was a hassle at best. I was unregistered from courses multiple times. It felt like this conference was much more disorganized. There was no application to follow for INS and the website wasn't very mobile friendly. There were also no announcements that I was aware of for how to access the wifi.
 - At times it went too quickly through complex slides and concepts.
 - Very interesting and engaging presentation. Loved the presenter!
 - None
 - Fascinating work!

Instructor Information

Instructor	Jordan Grafman
Course ID	4718
Title	Plenary G: The Faithful Brain
Attendees Registered for CE	49
Surveys Completed	27

Attendee Professions

	Survey Count	Percentage
--	--------------	------------

1. Indicate your primary profession:

Psychologist	26	96.2963%
Other	1	3.7037%

Attendee Degrees

	Survey Count	Percentage
--	--------------	------------

2. Indicate your highest degree:

Ph.D.	23	85.1852%
Other	3	11.1111%
Masters	1	3.7037%

Attendee Survey Responses

	μ	σ
--	-------	----------

3. Instructor was knowledgeable in topic area:	4.78	0.63
4. Instructor communicated knowledge effectively:	4.70	0.53
5. Instructor was well-prepared and organized:	4.81	0.47
6. Instructor was responsive to questions/audience:	4.67	0.77
7. The abstract description was adequate:	4.70	0.53
8. I acquired new skills or knowledge:	4.48	0.74
9. The visual aids were useful:	4.56	0.63
10. The handouts were useful:	4.37	0.78
11. The teaching level was appropriate:	4.70	0.53
12. I now have a better understanding of the subject matter:	4.59	0.62
13. Overall, my expectations were fulfilled:	4.37	0.82
14. Overall, this was a valuable learning experience:	4.44	0.83
15. This program should be offered again:	4.26	0.93
16. The registration was efficient:	4.67	0.72
17. The delivery of the presentation content was satisfactory:	4.37	1.02
18. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	4.37	0.78
19. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	3.89	1.23
20. I am able to summarize the methods used to study the neural basis of religious belief.	4.41	0.68
21. I can now recognize which neural regions are key for mediating religious belief.	4.41	0.91
22. I am able to describe why this knowledge is important when working with patients who have to make important decisions.	4.30	0.94

Average of Questions 3-23	4.49	0.75
----------------------------------	-------------	-------------

Scale Reference

For Question(s): 3-17 and 20-23

- 1 = Strongly dissatisfied or disagree
- 2 = Somewhat dissatisfied or disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Somewhat agree or satisfied
- 5 = Strongly agree or satisfied

For Question(s): 18

- 1 = I learned nothing
- 2 = I learned very little
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = I learned a fair amount
- 5 = I learned a great deal

For Question(s): 19

- 1 = Not useful at all
- 2 = Somewhat useful
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Very useful
- 5 = Extremely useful

Comments

- Very valuable research in a little studied area.

• This was a great talk. Very interesting. I am sure it's true for many of us, but Dr. Grafman's research was one of the areas that was of most interest to me prior to getting into graduate school and was one of the driving forces that led me to want to become a neuropsychologist. It was a great pleasure seeing him talk, I hope INS has him back to talk on whatever topics he chooses. One of the all time best.

- Would be nice to see a greater diversity of religious diversity covered.
 - Great topic... more like this would be interesting...
 - The view of religion taken was parochial limiting the potential for understanding that the presenter intended.
 - None
-