SUMMARY

Program
345 presentations
115 papers
Early Career Award = 1 paper
Donald O. Hebb Distinguished Contribution Award Address = 1 paper
President's Symposium = 3 papers
Symposium presentations: 7 symposia sessions (x 4 papers each) = 28 papers
Paper presentations: = 82 papers

230 posters
Poster Session A = 58 posters
Poster Session B = 55 posters
Poster Session C = 60 posters
Poster Session D = 57 posters

Registrations/Sales
435 attendees
Online preregistrations = 413
Faculty, PDF or Other Member (early) 25
Faculty, PDF or Other Member 100
Other Non-Member 8
Student Member 217
Student Member (early) 19
Student Non-Member 37
Student Volunteers 7

Onsite registrations = 22
Faculty, PDF or Other Member 5
Other Non-Member 4
Student Member 6
Student Non-Member 4
One-day registration ($80) 3

120 reception attendees
Reception tickets sold online = 114
Reception tickets sold on site = 9
Reception tickets refunded on site = 3
Extra t-shirt sales($10) = 1

Comparison with 2013
Attendance 124% (435 versus 352)
Papers 117% (115 versus 98)
Posters 139% (230 versus 165)
Awards
Donald O. Hebb Distinguished Contribution Award: Ian Whishaw, University of Lethbridge
Early Career Award: Shayna Rosenbaum, York University
Richard Tees Leadership Award: Peter Graf, University of British Columbia
Donald O. Hebb Graduate Student Awards:
  Best Paper: Jenni Karl, University of Lethbridge (#45)
  Honorable Mention: Kylee Ramdeen, University of Ottawa (#50)
  Best Poster: Sabrina Lemire-Rodger, York University (A17)
  Honorable Mention: Galina Goren, York University (D233)

CSBBCS 2014 POST-CONFERENCE SURVEY (n = 83)

Mode overall satisfaction with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Satisfaction Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference Schedule</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSBBCS t-shirt</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster sessions</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper sessions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference website</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday reception</td>
<td>5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-conference catering &amp; venue</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference-associated accommodations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSBBCS 2014 as a whole</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mainly it seems due to confusion over the amount of food to be provided (listed as ‘reception’ and ‘hors d’oeuvre style’ and ‘buffet-style dinner’ in various places). If attendees had been charged the actual amount per head ($35), I’m sure this number would have been lower.

Individual comments:

The paper sessions/symposia were too short. An hour and a half would be better.

Scheduling of poster sessions was not good - several students were double-booked for two different posters in the same session, and only some of these were even in the same room. Scheduling all posters on one topic in the same session also prevents presenters from interacting with the researchers in their area - it would be better to have a selection from all topics at each session. Also, some time should be allotted between the end of a poster session and the start of the next talk session to allow presenters to pack up and get to a talk without interrupting by entering late.

I felt there were too many parallel paper sessions. This not only reduced attendance in each individual session, but also made it so that one could not attend sessions of interest due to conflicts. I would suggest a maximum of two parallel sessions.

Water bottles would have been nice :)

Proofreading of program document is important!
8:30AM sessions are really difficult to attend, especially for those who are not staying near the conference location. The food wasn't replenished at the Thursday reception, meaning that those who arrived a little later were left with nothing to eat. Some of the talks were very lengthy (e.g., past president's symposium). The poster session was great though! Good number of posters per session, good amount of time - really enjoyable and informative.

Presenter view available for paper sessions

Could use a little longer for lunch. Loved the t-shirt (baseball) design with 3/4 sleeves and XS sizes.

More events scheduled on the first day :)

T-shirts were A-1, good idea to have posters in separate but close-together rooms, as this allowed the noise-level to stay relatively low. Having the poster session start a bit later would have allowed some of us to get to Toronto on Thursday instead of Wednesday night, saving us the cost of an extra night at the Hotel.

I couldn't find anyone to sign in with on the Saturday date. Maybe just having a clearly identified location for people to sign in (get nametags, etc.). Other than that, it was a great experience!

hold Hebb and AGM at more convenient times

Minor quirks: Conference badge holder was exceptionally unfriendly. Major suggestions: Larger rooms for poster sessions with more posters in one room would probably be more convenient. A reception format that encourages communication beyond a small group of people you already know would also be an improvement. Thank you for the CSBBCS2014!

I really enjoyed the posters being split up among different rooms. It was less crowded that way and resulted in better conversations.

I appreciated the close proximity of the meeting rooms, posters, and refreshments.

Start time no earlier than 9am. Posting all conference details in easily accessible location on web site. Would prefer mug or pen to t-shirt.

it would be ideal to start later on in the morning for people traveling from out of town or commuting

Put 5 minutes between poster sessions and symposia and between all symposia. Reception was advertised as a dinner and I would not have booked it as $30 was already expensive; several people were disappointed by this. Conference overall was very successful with high attendance and energy; poster sessions were well laid-out physically with plenty of lighting and room to circulate. Management school is a good venue and their snacks were delicious.

Happy to have attended:

The coffee/tea/fruits/snacks were really appreciated. The wifi situation was a disaster; I couldn't get the wifi on location to work on my tablet or my phone and it was hard to get it at the International Living Learning Centre as well.
try to do something about the culture of people bickering and trying to take each other down. no one acts that way at CNS or HBM, and it's particularly inappropriate at BBCS, since it's basically a local student conference

Pushing the start time of posters/papers from 8:30 to 9:30am may help with attendance of those events, and only pushes things to go an hour later.

fairly low attendance, perhaps due to holidays; would skip the t-shirt and put money toward other uses; would not group papers out of same lab in same session; would choose more expensive hotel in better section of town.

- I enjoyed the conference overall and especially the location. - A light duty printed program illustrating the program, important info and room numbers would have been sufficient, with abstracts etc. available online. This is the approach that SFN has taken with great success. It will save on funds and cut back on paper waste. - Along these lines of reducing costs and increasing enviro-friendliness, please discontinue the custom of using registration funds to buy swag bags: while this is not uncommon at conferences, the t-shirt and tote bags are frankly an unnecessary and wasteful use of science funds that will quickly become waste for most attendees. If others desire them, small runs of t-shirts could be available for a small fee with online registration up to some deadline prior to the conference, which would ensure they are prepared in sufficient quantities in each size, and that they are made only for those who want them. - Based both on last year's reception and the price, I think a lot of people expected dinner at the reception. Whether dinner will be included should be made more clear during registration. I think it was a mistake not to have a reception event more like the one in Calgary, which people enjoyed a great deal. - The turnout was also low at the reception; those more junior of us who arrived and were not already well-connected with the society's members felt awkward to be there but not knowing anyone. Is there a way of setting up a more interactive/inclusive format or boosting attendance? - While it likely can't be helped by CSBBCS, I was disappointed that UofT Psychology was so poorly represented at the conference even when it was held in their city. Was it advertised in that dept? - I loved the debate format of the president's symposium and encourage CSBBCS to replicate this! - Coffee and snack service was nice, but came too late in the afternoon. I think it is needed in the mid-afternoon burrito digestion zone around 2pm to keep people alert, rather than late afternoon at 4:30-5.

Serve an actual meal at the banquet, and think more about the organization of the sessions.

Would be nice to have a dinner reception on the Thursday night as opposed to only appetizers. Some better signage would have been helpful to all of the rooms for the poster sessions.

1) The reception night needs to be clarified ahead of time whether it is to be a dinner or simply a cocktail mixer because everyone was expecting a dinner (after all it was held at dinner time) and all we were provided with was finger food (very disappointing, especially given that a lot of people were drinking). If this was due to a cost issue, either change the venue or charge a bit more, or at the very least inform attendees on the registration page what to expect. 2) Better signage is needed for the events at the conference. For example, many people were totally unaware of the 3rd poster session because it was separate from the two main rooms. This confusion could be avoided in the future by having a main sign at the front entrance of the conference venue with the location of all the events. 3) The notification about the abstracts to be published in CJEP has still not happened.
even though the conference is over. All authors should have the opportunity to review the abstracts to be published in the event of transcription errors. Also, authors should be given the proper citation and/or URL of the published abstracts. 4) The website needs to be better updated with current information, instead of defaulting to earlier versions of postings. This is incredibly confusing for attendees. 5) Any changes to the conference information, such as poster sessions (re: sizing, times, etc.) and paper sessions, need to be emailed to the attendees instead of simply posting the information on the conference website in the hope that the attendees might read it (most people do not read the website after submitting the abstracts and other relevant information). 6) Do not inform people ahead of time that they have been shortlisted for the Hebb award.

An award for undergrad presenters!

Scheduling the reception at the end of the conference typically helps to ensure that the poster and paper sessions towards the end of the meeting see a better attendance rate.

t-shirts are superfluous. The Thursday reception should include a full meal.

Please re-design your website. Different log in information and error messages made registering quite frustrating.

The best paper and poster sessions should be selected by a vote from the attendees.

Most talk sessions contained 4 presentations from same lab, which led to talks being repetitive. More diversity in presenters would be appreciated.

Don't schedule the attention and perception talks at the same time in different rooms please.

A dinner is better than a reception. Schedule the NSERC presentation and business meeting to occur back to back in the same room.

The t-shirts are made of poor material and likely a bad investment for the conference. The conference website needs to do a better job linking between csbcs membership and conference registration, i.e., a singular login for both. The talks on saturday morning were very poorly attended, perhaps a later start time in the future.

Lunch served on one of the days would be excellent. Also, it wasn't obvious where each of the poster session rooms were located; better signage needed for those.

Reply: I'll be happy to discuss these comments (some useful, some not useful) off-line.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2015

Have complete overhaul of CSBBCS conference website
Keep Early Career Award talk (this was new for this year)
Keep and make explicit the criteria for the Hebb Student Awards (see attached materials)
Be explicit about what should be contained in the abstract (introduction, method, results, discussion).
This may seem patronizing but some idiosyncratic abstracts were submitted, rejected and then
complaints were made by the authors (again, best discussed off-line)
Be more explicit about the nature of any reception / food offerings
Select the abstract topic ‘tracks’ carefully- these are very useful in terms of creating sessions but I just
used the categories from last year.
Make sure internal discounts are provided where possible- remember you are bringing business to the
university in various forms (but this does not necessarily mean they will help you)

PERSONNEL

CSBBSC 2014 Conference Organizer
Ben Dyson

CSBBSC 2014 Conference Organizing Committee Members
Paolo Ammirante, Bonnie Armstrong, Sara Gallant, Todd Girard, Naomi Koemer, Lingqian Li, Lucy McGarry, Syb Pongracic, Kristina Safar, Raj Sandhu, Nicole Sugden, Pete Wegier, Naresh Vempala, Jonathan Wilbiks, Brenda Wong, Lixia Yang

CSBBSC 2014 Conference Volunteers
Pierre Bouche, Sara Gallant, Andrea Kusec, Lingqian Li, Amy-Jane McAuley, Lucy McGarry, Raj Sandhu, Galilee Thompson, Linda Truong, Brenda Wong, Lixia Yang

CSBBSC 2014 Hebb Award Judges (Chaired by Todd Girard)
Aimée Surprenant, Frank Russo, Douglas Cheyne, Debra Titone, Erin Austen, Biljana Stevanovski, Geneviève Desmarais, Mike Masson, Bill Hockley, Chris Oriet, Matthew Brown

CSBBSC 2014 Sponsors
Psychology Department, Ryerson University; Faculty of Arts, Ryerson University, Office of the Vice-President, Research and Innovation, Ryerson University; The Chang School, Ryerson University; Cortech Solutions
## FINAL BUDGET

### INCOMING

**Sponsorship**
- Cortech Solutions       $500  
- Psychology Department       $1000  
- Faculty of Arts       $1000  
- Vice President of Research and Innovation       $1000  

**Registrations**
- On-line preregistrations (413 x various rates)       $44230  
- On-site registrations (22 x various rates)       $3000  
- On-line reception tickets (114 x $30)       $3420  
- On-site reception tickets (9 x $30)       $270  
- 1 x extra t-shirt sale (1 x $10)       $10  

---

**OUTGOING**

**Printing and consumables**
- Ted Rogers food and drink       $20379.60  
- Conference posters       $177.98  
- Conference signs       $153.91  
- Conference program printing (480)       $3238.13  
- Name tags and printing (450)       $299.93  
- T-shirts (480)       $5508.75  
- Totes (500)       $1706.30  
- Pens (480)       $291  
- Pushpins       $7.91  
- Hebb student engraving and packing       $39.75  

**Rentals**
- Ted Rogers space rental       $7852.09  
- Ted Rogers AV tech hire       $3265  
- Poster board rental       $1384.25  
- Insurance policy       $324  

**Arts and Letters Reception**
- Deposit and cost       $4919.45  
- On-site reception refunds (3 x $30)       $90  

---

$54430

---

$49640.75
CSBBCS 2014: Hebb Student Award
ABSTRACT EVALUATION FORM

This form is for evaluation of all extended abstract submissions. The overall ratings should be done using a 5-point scale according to the following criteria and keeping in mind that all candidates are graduate level students (at the time of submission):

5 = Superior – Truly exceptional
4 = Excellent – Clearly above average
3 = Good – Expected level for graduate students
2 = Fair – Meets acceptable standards, but some notable issues
1 = Needs work – Below minimum standards, several areas for improvement

If you perceive a conflict of interest (i.e., supervisor, project collaborator), please either indicate “CI” or just omit your rating of the respective candidate(s). In forming your rating, consider the following aspects regarding the written extended abstract submissions: Clear and relevant rationale, methods, findings, reflections, and conclusions; quality of writing; general impression of the submission and the project conveyed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Last Name</th>
<th>Needs Work</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adnan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vito</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goren</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathias</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGarry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medimorec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendizabal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mueller</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennycook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajsic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramdeen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheerer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavin-Stewart</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall ratings should be done using a 5-point scale according to the following criteria and keeping in mind that all candidates are graduate level students (at the time of submission):

- **5** = Superior – Truly exceptional
- **4** = Excellent – Clearly above average
- **3** = Good – Expected level for graduate students
- **2** = Fair – Meets acceptable standards, but some notable issues
- **1** = Needs work – Below minimum standards, several areas for improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Needs Work</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scientific merit of study</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of study; relevance to field; relevance to society; interesting / intriguing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poster or slide content/informativeness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear focus and relevance; appropriate depth and coverage of rationale and findings; appropriate amount of material for talk/poster; accurate explanation of key terms and points; clear ‘take home’ conclusion(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poster or slide organization/style and delivery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective use of visual aids (figures, tables); logical and interesting flow of information; engaging (slides/poster, candidate); no typographical / grammatical errors; voice (volume, pace, articulation); enthusiasm; eye contact; body language; poise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to field questions</strong> (if none, indicate N/A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Demonstrates knowledge of material; relevant explanation; further elaboration; non-defensive; aware of own limits of knowledge; appreciation of good Qs; speaks to full audience | 1          | 2    | 3    | 4         | 5        | N/A