

Workshop evaluation by Participants
New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2007
(Compilation of Part II responses; scanned versions of Part I)

Part II

Write out neatly a synthetic statement (1 or 2 paragraphs) evaluating this workshop. (You might build on/build in your comments from Part I.) Please make comments both to help us develop the workshop in the future and to enable some third party to appreciate the workshop's strengths and weaknesses. (Imagine a reader who may not be willing to wade through all the notes on the other side, but who wants to see more than averages from a "1-5" numerical evaluation.)

1. This workshop, for me, seemed to accomplish quite well the goals that were set and given to possible participants. I really appreciate that. It was a great pleasure to be part of a group focused on process in relation to a topic experienced by participants from somewhat varied perspectives. As someone interested in the "issue at hand" I feel that this workshop provided me with a great opportunity to discover more detailed directions to explore both from others and from considering my own experience in this context.

I would have liked a bit more time for reflection and reframing during the process and time to refocus on my personal goals.

A more diverse group of participants would have been interesting.

This was a great environment to focus on and explore ideas that I hope will be very important and central to work I will be involved in the future. Thank you.

2. The goals and objectives guiding this workshop are extremely valuable and timely. The need to think and work collaboratively in the field of environmental problems across different disciplines and social realities cannot be more important given the current state of the world's environment – ecologically and socially. This kind of workshop would be useful for all people involved in education and research at all levels of education. I highly recommend it.

3. One of the most interesting dimensions of this workshop is to be able to deal with very different experiences, backgrounds and diversity and to focus on our particular interests and develop fruitful and real collaborations with those who are more in line terms of their own interests.

From the diversity of experiences and activities, this workshop gives us tools to develop and take with us our future activities, including facilitation models which are very helpful...

4. The workshop was quite successful in creating a space in which participants could take risks and explore ideas about collaboration to generate new environmental knowledge. Although all participants had strong professional connections with the environmental topics, the discussion often was applicable more generally to the collaborative process rather than only environmental knowledge and inquiry. There was a very good blend of personal, theoretical, pedagogical, institutional, theoretical, and pragmatic approaches to

collaboration, and exploration of issues. The facilitation was excellent – flexible and responsive to participants needs, but sufficiently structured that we didn't seem to be floundering or trying to make up things to do. That said, I think that there might be ways to build more continuity across the activities by introducing certain exercises early in the workshop then letting participants revisit them later and revise what was produced. Examples could be our pictures of collaboration (for the visual/graphic learners) and the teaching scenarios. I did little preparation beforehand, other than visiting the website a times to download logistics and required readings (plus a couple of recommended readings) and read the participants extended bios. I think that I could have gotten more from the workshop had I done two advance homework assignments: brainstorm several questions I have about collaboration, and write a short statement about my experience as a collaborator in the generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry.

5. This workshop is created by and depends on the quality of participants, in both their ability to share/teach others and to be open to learning. It is structured in such a way that (most) academic markers are removed from consideration so all participants are expected to play all the time. Its difficult to be solely an observer_– you would miss out on all the fun people are having. It's also difficult to keep your own knowledge/experience hidden as you start to see and make connections and links across disciplines, ages, genders, and different levels of skill. The workshop tries to employ multiple ways of knowing and learning about the world, so everyone is uncomfortable at least some of the time. As one participant noted, he was learning the most during the times he was most uncomfortable. By the end of the workshop you've gained a few/many new skills and, more importantly, serious connections to a group of people you were unlikely to meet/work with in your daily life.

6. Only at the end can I state that this workshop was effective for my goals. I ask myself: did I come away with what I wanted and share something that others wanted, and on this final day I can say “yes.” However, this is not to say that this was my response every day. Was this the expected? Maybe, but sometimes it is good to hear like they used to tell me in organic chemistry class – “don't worry it will make sense soon.”

I knew why I wanted to come to the workshop. I read info available online and it meshed with what I had been thinking in my mind. I don't think it is entirely positive that at the end of the first day I was asking myself, “why did I come?” This became apparent at the end.

A workshop on collaboration optimally should be collaborative. I don't think this workshop was, for the most part. Yet, I know that there were certain goals/objectives out of the control of the participant. Does the goals of one preclude the others in a collaborative endeavor. This is one of many questions that remain unanswered.

If I were to design this workshop myself, I would invite a few select individuals and openly invited others to develop the workshop goals. These don't have to exclude the institutional goals (i.e., experimental goals, meeting the requirements of the funding limits, etc.) but could be the personal/professional that each person brings to the workshop. These could be focused on one case study which also can be selected (with

facilitation), or can be also collaboratively selected. The objective/exercise of allowing a group to decide may meet, for example, some process goals (i.e., the realization that collaboration, from the start, is not easy!” But, the spirit would be that participants feel that they participate in the entire workshop process.

7. This workshop was a very collegial experience. Participants were able to use their disciplinary knowledge to generate activities that addressed the process of collaboration in many different contexts. The workshop’s format is flexible and open to directions that the participant’s as a whole want to take; consequently individual goals or expectations may not always have been met.

8. This workshop achieved a cohesiveness of effort towards addressing a messy question: Is there collaborative generation of environmental knowledge, and if so what ought to be done to support it? I remain vague on the answer to the first part, but optimistic about the process required for the second. I take this outcome to border on paradox!

In any event, I benefited most from learning of the range of activities that the participants take to constitute their contributions to environmental knowledge – that is, in their “day jobs.” I also have become convinced that the interdisciplinary field on environment science is in need of conceptual work at the foundations of their (its) epistemology. Perhaps more explicit instruction/reading on this issue would be beneficial for future workshops.

9. The workshop was of tremendous value to me for various reasons. First, it was wonderful to have the time to work on myself, and my own skill set. (I have very little time for this these days.) Second, the other members of the group brought a tremendous amount of energy and engagement to the table, without which the workshop would’ve been difficult or more painful. Third, the workshop was well run and quite well planned. Much was open-ended, but that didn’t result in a loss of quality. If we were to do this again, I think a small pre-workshop assignment would be good, such as everyone prepping a case of theirs that could be developed further during the time. Something like a one or two page case explanation.

10. This workshop clarified for me the need for emphasis on duality in collaborative generation of knowledge - on one side, addressing the (evolving) issue at hand; on the other side, enhancing skills and dispositions to participate and be stretched in participation (e.g., working with people who are different, including some less inclined to engage in open-ended process). The workshop itself provided many experiences and tools for the second side, but the group -- with our knowledge and growing participation skills/dispositions -- was not tested as it would be if we had to confront or be consulted seriously on a specific real case. In short, there are challenging open questions remaining at the end of the workshop.

11. This workshop provided me with a number of appropriate, and what looked like, effective facilitation techniques and activities in order to assist with the building of collaboration around environmental issues. I was also exposed to, shared with, and made connections with a variety of individuals who would likely be a part of such a discussion, which in my mind is an important and valuable experience in and of itself. I was able to

come away with two of my personal goals met, on directly, the other indirectly, and left with good questions with which to think and wrangle. I also learned some important things about myself, the way I interact with others in a collaborative setting, and my facilitation style. The one area I felt the workshop could be improved, and this may have been due to my own difficulties in navigating the multiple layers of meaning happening all at the same time, would be to provide a more explicit framework so that it is better understood when it was time to reflect on the activities and how we, as facilitators ourselves at some point in the near future, would incorporate these techniques.

12. The workshop worked very well at engaging participants, allowing time to learn about each other, and encouraging deep listening, both to ourselves and others. Many ideas and technologies for enhancing collaboration were shared, potentials for application to environmental knowledge were clear and many.

There were perhaps too many individual activities (not certain about this). The idea of introducing a whole group project and building on it for the 3rd and 4th days might serve as a better way to understand how real world projects and real world groups interact. When weather serves, some break-out groups might work well. At the end a “report” could be developed on the actual project, with sidebars to highlight issues and concerns around the collaboration. Such a format could incorporate much of the process work we did (sidebars), along with specific content (narrative text).

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2007

Part I -- The primary goal of here is to make notes as prep. for Part II (=a synthetic statement).

1. Start with a self-evaluation: In what ways did you achieve your personal goals? How could you have proceeded differently if you were participating in this workshop again? What have been your major personal obstacles to taking more from this workshop?

Well one thing that comes to mind in thinking about how I achieved my personal goals is that I think I have uncovered a nice base of resources & information related to them which I can explore further. The "case study" approach was also something I think I will use to help me achieve my goals. If I were participating in this workshop again I might try keeping my predefined personal goals more front + center. One of my major obstacles I think has been my ability to articulate my thought on the subject at hand and finding a way to work within the very structure of the workshop best.

1b. What have you learned about making an experimental, interaction-intensive workshop stimulating and productive? What would your advice be to prospective workshop participants about how to get the most from a workshop like this?

Variety of activities - inward + outward time
- be open, but keep your goals in mind - check in on them + adjust them regularly
- mentally prepare yourself for an action? packed few days

1c. What are some things you have you learned about "Collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry"

- that term could refer to a large + diverse set of circumstances
- preparation for collaboration takes time
- ~~at~~ that acknowledging collaborations (which may take place many times without really being recognized) may help us to become better at it as individuals + ~~from~~ as groups

2. General evaluation: How did the workshop meet or not meet your expectations? How did your attitude to doing the workshop change through the four days? How do you think the workshop could be improved? What was special about this workshop (negative & positive)? How does it compare with other workshops? What would be your overall recommendation to prospective participants?

I didn't expect "academia" to be so central (as a player in our discussions, etc.) I did expect it to be very different from any other workshop I've attended and to be focused on participation and social contextualization of science as over-arching themes - and I think it was. I think the workshop could have been improved by being a little longer + giving more time for both attention to personal goals + for quiet reflection time. What was special? - rather loosely designed but yet very structured and defined

3. Re-read the workshop description/goals (below, from the prospectus).

Comment on how well the goals expressed there were met and make general and specific suggestions about how these could be better met:

NewSSC organizes innovative, interaction-intensive workshops designed to facilitate discussion, teaching innovation, and longer-term collaboration among faculty and graduate students who teach and write about interactions between scientific developments and social change.

Specific objectives of NewSSC:

1. To promote the social contextualization of science in education and other activities beyond the participants' current disciplinary and academic boundaries.
 2. To facilitate participants connecting theoretical, pedagogical, practical, political, and personal aspects of the issue at hand in constructive ways.
 3. To train novice and experienced scholars in process / participation skills valuable in activity-centered teaching, workshops, and collaboration.
 4. To provide a workshop model that can be repeated, evolve in response to evaluations, and adapted by participants.
- [The issue at hand in '07=] "How do we make sense of the growing attention to the collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry?"

- ① I think this goal was met well in that the idea was definitely promoted - (though it does come to mind that it may have been a bit of preaching to the choir) Still the affirmation was helpful and I do think that participants were encouraged to stretch and expand the way that they approach + carry-out this idea
- ② I think that we did spend a lot of time focused on collaboration in general and often strayed from the "generation of environmental knowledge + inquiry" part, but since most of us (all of us almost) work within a framework closely tied to environmental knowledge this didn't bother me very much. Maybe this goal could be better met if there were some activities specifically designed to focus + re-focus on it. Maybe even writing the question on the wall. (the issue at hand)
- ③ yes in learning through experience maybe a "list" or something of activities people have tried.
- ④ I think this is self-evidently being accomplished!

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2007

Part I -- The primary goal of here is to make notes as prep. for Part II (=a synthetic statement).

1. Start with a self-evaluation: In what ways did you achieve your personal goals? How could you have proceeded differently if you were participating in this workshop again? What have been your major personal obstacles to taking more from this workshop?

I stayed with the process of working with a group of people to explore the idea of collaboration. If I were to do this workshop again, I would probably try to have more one on one conversations. One of my personal obstacles was dealing with the "exercises" component of the process - maybe I should think of them more as rituals.

1b. What have you learned about making an experimental, interaction-intensive workshop stimulating and productive? What would your advice be to prospective workshop participants about how to get the most from a workshop like this?

I've learned that it takes generosity + active engagement by all participants. If some are not engaged or open (but already know what it should be) it's not as productive or stimulating.

1c. What are some things you have you learned about "Collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry "

I've learned that the "environment" often gets left out and I find that curious. How can we sustain an integration/connection to the "environment" as part of "environmental knowledge" (embodied ecology)

2. General evaluation: How did the workshop meet or not meet your expectations? How did your attitude to doing the workshop change through the four days? How do you think the workshop could be improved? What was special about this workshop (negative & positive)? How does it compare with other workshops? What would be your overall recommendation to prospective participants?

I learned a lot about the process of working together and trying to get to know each other in a short period of time. I think a couple of improvements might be having the participants be involved in setting the agenda a bit more - sometimes it felt like being put through a process rather than engaged in one. The workshop was special to me in that I saw 12 people put in time, effort, creativity to figure out how to work together.

3. Re-read the workshop description/goals (below, from the prospectus).

Comment on how well the goals expressed there were met and make general and specific suggestions about how these could be better met:

NewSSC organizes innovative, interaction-intensive workshops designed to facilitate discussion, teaching innovation, and longer-term collaboration among faculty and graduate students who teach and write about interactions between scientific developments and social change.

Specific objectives of NewSSC:

1. To promote the social contextualization of science in education and other activities beyond the participants' current disciplinary and academic boundaries.
2. To facilitate participants connecting theoretical, pedagogical, practical, political, and personal aspects of the issue at hand in constructive ways.
3. To train novice and experienced scholars in process / participation skills valuable in activity-centered teaching, workshops, and collaboration.
4. To provide a workshop model that can be repeated, evolve in response to evaluations, and adapted by participants.

[The issue at hand in '07=] "How do we make sense of the growing attention to the collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry?"

I think that overall the goals of the workshop were met and I think that there was enough diversity in the group to get out many perspectives/ approaches to the issues at hand.

I think that we still need to deal with and figure out and explore in a collegial way how to deal with conflict + disagreement. I felt that there was ~~some~~ some resistance and discomfort in allowing conflict to play itself out - to me that can lead to people shutting down or being inauthentic in their engagement (playing along to appease the group). How do we address/practice situations in which conflict arises - and do it in a productive + non-judgemental way?

(Cont.) My major personal obstacles are also the major challenges, that is trying to know and interact with the group, which is always something that keeps it nice to do. 3

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2007

Part I -- The primary goal of here is to make notes as prep. for Part II (=a synthetic statement).

1. Start with a self-evaluation: In what ways did you achieve your personal goals? How could you have proceeded differently if you were participating in this workshop again? What have been your major personal obstacles to taking more from this workshop?

I think I have achieved my personal goals through having time to reflect, sharing and being available to participate in all the proposed activities, these were all part of the learning process I have experienced and that's always the best part. I don't think I can identify a different way of proceeding outside the context of the WS. and ~~that's~~ the present model is the one I have. Other WS will always be different.

1b. What have you learned about making an experimental, interaction-intensive workshop stimulating and productive? What would your advice be to prospective workshop participants about how to get the most from a workshop like this?

That there are several different and/or complementary ways of making these processes both stimulating and productive. I can't enumerate just a few... My advice would be: be prepared to take risks and enjoy all the opportunities of knowing others and interacting with them.

1c. What are some things you have you learned about "Collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry"

I wasn't expecting to find the concept of "environmental knowledge", or at least "knowledge", so linked to scientific knowledge (especially ~~western~~ western model). That's part of what I've learned on how this collaborative generation of environmental knowledge is ~~being~~ ^{being} ~~thought~~ ^{thought} about. I've also learned about contexts of application that I know nothing about.

2. General evaluation: How did the workshop meet or not meet your expectations? How did your attitude to doing the workshop change through the four days? How do you think the workshop could be improved? What was special about this workshop (negative & positive)? How does it compare with other workshops? What would be your overall recommendation to prospective participants?

I didn't have my expectations clearly defined (besides re/thinking these issues, learning, interacting, sharing...). In a process like this expectations are being defined as time and activities advance. Different activities create different expectations. My attitude changes as my knowledge about these I'm with gets deeper. When we feel more comfortable we are more open to be in the process. (ooo)

(cont.) But I think I've learned most concerning collaborative processes/procedures.

3. Re-read the workshop description/goals (below, from the prospectus).

Comment on how well the goals expressed there were met and make general and specific suggestions about how these could be better met:

NewSSC organizes innovative, interaction-intensive workshops designed to facilitate discussion, teaching innovation, and longer-term collaboration among faculty and graduate students who teach and write about interactions between scientific developments and social change.

Specific objectives of NewSSC:

1. To promote the social contextualization of science in education and other activities beyond the participants' current disciplinary and academic boundaries.
2. To facilitate participants connecting theoretical, pedagogical, practical, political, and personal aspects of the issue at hand in constructive ways.
3. To train novice and experienced scholars in process / participation skills valuable in activity-centered teaching, workshops, and collaboration.
4. To provide a workshop model that can be repeated, evolve in response to evaluations, and adapted by participants.

[The issue at hand in '07=] "How do we make sense of the growing attention to the collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry?"

Generally I think all the goals were achieved, especially

3 and 4.

(...)

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2007

Part I -- The primary goal of here is to make notes as prep. for Part II (=a synthetic statement).

1. Start with a self-evaluation: In what ways did you achieve your personal goals? How could you have proceeded differently if you were participating in this workshop again? What have been your major personal obstacles to taking more from this workshop?

I was somewhat able to apply what we were discussing; exploring to the use of Sustainability indicators, but not as well as I had hoped. If doing this again, I think that I would brainstorm before coming a range of questions about collaboration, and write down some thoughts about my history of collaboration... a little auto-biography of Me, the Collaborator
 Major personal obstacle probably to focus too much on my topic, not free-associate more

1b. What have you learned about making an experimental, interaction-intensive workshop stimulating and productive? What would your advice be to prospective workshop participants about how to get the most from a workshop like this?

Keep people active and provide a variety of situations — allow opportunities to redo or revisit the same activity (I kept wanting to redraw my picture) — use a mix of writing and talking in small groups, talking in large groups // Do the 2 things I wish I had done in advance

1c. What are some things you have you learned about "Collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry"

Types of collaborations — when collaboration can be useful; productive — connections between institutional change, social change, and collaborative generation of knowledge — limits of "environmental" (and permeability of those limits)

2. General evaluation: How did the workshop meet or not meet your expectations? How did your attitude to doing the workshop change through the four days? How do you think the workshop could be improved? What was special about this workshop (negative & positive)? How does it compare with other workshops? What would be your overall recommendation to prospective participants?

I didn't have many expectations, to be honest. At the beginning, the time allotted seemed long (perhaps too long) but it felt like the time was used well — didn't seem too long by the end.

Special because it focused very intentionally on quality of interaction, and because the "sidetrips" (for a walk, to the beach) could be done as part of the workshop instead of surreptitiously

Overall recommendation positive — think about bringing someone with whom you would like to collaborate more.

3. Re-read the workshop description/goals (below, from the prospectus).
 Comment on how well the goals expressed there were met and make general and specific suggestions about how these could be better met:

NewSSC organizes innovative, interaction-intensive workshops designed to facilitate discussion, teaching innovation, and longer-term collaboration among faculty and graduate students who teach and write about interactions between scientific developments and social change.

Specific objectives of NewSSC:

1. To promote the social contextualization of science in education and other activities beyond the participants' current disciplinary and academic boundaries.
2. To facilitate participants connecting theoretical, pedagogical, practical, political, and personal aspects of the issue at hand in constructive ways.
3. To train novice and experienced scholars in process / participation skills valuable in activity-centered teaching, workshops, and collaboration.
4. To provide a workshop model that can be repeated, evolve in response to evaluations, and adapted by participants.

[The issue at hand in '07=] "How do we make sense of the growing attention to the collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry?"

- ① Met fairly well — could be met better by introducing 2-3 case studies with different kinds of collaborations (rather than just one)
- ② Met very well through a successful mixture of techniques
- ③ Met fairly well — I didn't feel that I learned new skills here, or had an opportunity to practice them — but I've used activity-centered teaching for years as my favored method
- ④ Met very well

2. General evaluation: How did the workshop meet or not meet your expectations? How did your attitude to doing the workshop change through the four days? How do you think the workshop could be improved? What was special about this workshop (negative & positive)? How does it compare with other workshops? What would be your overall recommendation to prospective participants?

I didn't have many expectations to be honest. At the beginning of the workshop I was a bit skeptical but it felt like the workshop was well-organized and the participants were very helpful. I learned a lot about the importance of collaboration in science and education. The workshop was a great experience and I would recommend it to others. I think the workshop could be improved by having more time for discussion and collaboration. Overall, the workshop was a great experience and I would recommend it to others.

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2007

Part I -- The primary goal of here is to make notes as prep. for Part II (=a synthetic statement).

1. Start with a self-evaluation: In what ways did you achieve your personal goals? How could you have proceeded differently if you were participating in this workshop again? What have been your major personal obstacles to taking more from this workshop?

Found it was very difficult to change hats back and forth. Participation in activities tired me out in a way that made it harder as the workshop went on to attend to group process. This will take building up capacity although the opp's are few.

1b. What have you learned about making an experimental, interaction-intensive workshop stimulating and productive? What would your advice be to prospective workshop participants about how to get the most from a workshop like this?

Come in with an ~~important~~ open mind and heart - stay generous with people as they struggle with the new idea that they ~~are~~ are responsible for shaping the workshop.

1c. What are some things you have you learned about "Collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry "

I'm disappointed w/ didn't spend more time talking about what happens in group when they actually start to generate knowledge - we acted as if it would automatically happen - I think groups generate a lot of stuff I wouldn't call knowledge

2. General evaluation: How did the workshop meet or not meet your expectations? How did your attitude to doing the workshop change through the four days? How do you think the workshop could be improved? What was special about this workshop (negative & positive)? How does it compare with other workshops? What would be your overall recommendation to prospective participants?

The idea of "pulsing" was interesting - I liked the way ~~our~~ our energy exploded during pair conversation, settled during individual writing, and wandered during group discussions.

Overall, the workshop was great - people participated, questioned, revealed vulnerabilities, and made connections very quickly. I think the size (12 people) was perfect - any fewer would have kept us spinning in too little juice. I would advise anyone

Never quite enough time - how to learn to estimate (close to accurately) how much time things will take

5

3. Re-read the workshop description/goals (below, from the prospectus).

Comment on how well the goals expressed there were met and make general and specific suggestions about how these could be better met:

NewSSC organizes innovative, interaction-intensive workshops designed to facilitate discussion, teaching innovation, and longer-term collaboration among faculty and graduate students who teach and write about interactions between scientific developments and social change.

Specific objectives of NewSSC:

1. To promote the social contextualization of science in education and other activities beyond the participants' current disciplinary and academic boundaries.

2. To facilitate participants connecting theoretical, pedagogical, practical, political, and personal aspects of the issue at hand in constructive ways.

3. To train novice and experienced scholars in process / participation skills valuable in activity-centered teaching, workshops, and collaboration.

4. To provide a workshop model that can be repeated, evolve in response to evaluations, and adapted by participants.

[The issue at hand in '07=] "How do we make sense of the growing attention to the collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry?"

1. Good job - we drifted for awhile on this, but came back to the ideas more intentionally as workshop went along.
2. I think participants kept shying away from the theoretical aspects; Peter always brought this in and was a good model of finding way to move among the specific, experiential, and theoretical.
3. Participant led activities very successful except at the "meta-level" - why are we doing this? why this way? how can this change with different audiences, experience, directions, etc also, individual feedback might be helpful - esp. w/ younger practitioners. Maybe help people learn to provide constructive and critical feedback.
4. I think multiple points to debrief, reflect on what worked/ what didn't kept participants and organizers informed about how things are going. This info can also be used to frame future workshops - although if the focus remains on participant generation it will always be an adventure.

who expresses interest in the workshop that you learn a lot about the process of learning and also make connections w/ people/ideas you never thought of being linked with - its very exciting and exhausting.

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2007

Part I -- The primary goal of here is to make notes as prep. for Part II (=a synthetic statement).

1. Start with a self-evaluation: In what ways did you achieve your personal goals? How could you have proceeded differently if you were participating in this workshop again? What have been your major personal obstacles to taking more from this workshop?

I would have liked to get more feed-back on my current research, especially ~~if~~ as it relates to collaboration and interdisciplinary work. I think if I were to ~~proce~~ participate again in this wkshp, I would have voiced this specifically at the beginning and been more proactive in seeking this out (ie during "free time", dinners etc.)

1b. What have you learned about making an experimental, interaction-intensive workshop stimulating and productive? What would your advice be to prospective workshop participants about how to get the most from a workshop like this?

- 1.) A good facilitator is really important.
- 2.) Breaks and freetime is really important (to maximize intensity during on-time)

1c. What are some things you have you learned about "Collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry "

It is damn hard, and collaboration can mean different things. I continue to view collaboration as ~~an~~ optimal when it is a win win situation, where previous and conceptual knowledge among participants is combined and synthesized to generate a new thought, idea, concept, etc.

2. General evaluation: How did the workshop meet or not meet your expectations? How did your attitude to doing the workshop change through the four days? How do you think the workshop could be improved? What was special about this workshop (negative & positive)? How does it compare with other workshops? What would be your overall recommendation to prospective participants?

I think ~~that~~ am a firm believer in ~~g~~ using the very technique within an instructive contexts (ie learning by doing) to learn (if in fact, even possible) to collaborate is probably best done by collaborating and being evaluated. I don't feel this workshop was particularly collaborative, in its design or its objectives.

3. Re-read the workshop description/goals (below, from the prospectus).

Comment on how well the goals expressed there were met and make general and specific suggestions about how these could be better met:

NewSSC organizes innovative, interaction-intensive workshops designed to facilitate discussion, teaching innovation, and longer-term collaboration among faculty and graduate students who teach and write about interactions between scientific developments and social change.

Specific objectives of NewSSC:

1. To promote the social contextualization of science in education and other activities beyond the participants' current disciplinary and academic boundaries.
2. To facilitate participants connecting theoretical, pedagogical, practical, political, and personal aspects of the issue at hand in constructive ways.
3. To train novice and experienced scholars in process / participation skills valuable in activity-centered teaching, workshops, and collaboration.
4. To provide a workshop model that can be repeated, evolve in response to evaluations, and adapted by participants.

[The issue at hand in '07=] "How do we make sense of the growing attention to the collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry?"

1) Well done by ^{each} participant bringing their own construction of science to the table. Having a ~~wide~~ ~~group~~ diverse group of participants is key.

2) This is in itself a process which comes clear only @ the end of the workshop (or does it?) ~~Maybe~~ These ^{were} ~~are~~ only realized by me after a period of self reflection, metacognition, and this prompt.

3) I think that participation skills is something we talked about the last 2 days when doing activities. I believe that understanding the activity/task is key for good participation.

4.) This workshop, given its goals, could be improved by asking participants to help mold the (maybe ~~primary~~ secondary) objectives. Goals can be developed viewed in different ways, and institutional goals (ie meeting the expectations of funding institutions) is ^{would be an} ~~but~~ one way. A collaborative construction of workshop goals ~~is~~ ^{is} interesting exercise.

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2007

Part I -- The primary goal of here is to make notes as prep. for Part II (=a synthetic statement).

1. Start with a self-evaluation: In what ways did you achieve your personal goals? How could you have proceeded differently if you were participating in this workshop again? What have been your major personal obstacles to taking more from this workshop?

I succeeded in most of my personal goals. If participating again, I would try to have ideas for an activity a bit earlier.

1b. What have you learned about making an experimental, interaction-intensive workshop stimulating and productive? What would your advice be to prospective workshop participants about how to get the most from a workshop like this?

Be flexible, keep a sense of humor handy, don't feel that things need to be perfect...

1c. What are some things you have you learned about "Collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry"

Maybe not as much ^{on the way that} ~~and~~ I imagine it works in a formal academic setting; but by use of case-studies, the informal generation of knowledge & use of collaborative processes were made visible.

2. General evaluation: How did the workshop meet or not meet your expectations? How did your attitude to doing the workshop change through the four days? How do you think the workshop could be improved? What was special about this workshop (negative & positive)? How does it compare with other workshops? What would be your overall recommendation to prospective participants?

attitude: peripheral at first, integrated at end
Improvement of workshop - more "down time"; time to socialize in evening (maybe once) that is not an actual exercise; the rest was fine
This workshop was special because the group came together really well; interactive activities allowed for different skill sets

3. Re-read the workshop description/goals (below, from the prospectus).
 Comment on how well the goals expressed there were met and make general and specific suggestions about how these could be better met:

NewSSC organizes innovative, interaction-intensive workshops designed to facilitate discussion, teaching innovation, and longer-term collaboration among faculty and graduate students who teach and write about interactions between scientific developments and social change.

Specific objectives of NewSSC:

- 1. To promote the social contextualization of science in education and other activities beyond the participants' current disciplinary and academic boundaries. *met*
- 2. To facilitate participants connecting theoretical, pedagogical, practical, political, and personal aspects of the issue at hand in constructive ways. *in all met*
- 3. To train novice and experienced scholars in process / participation skills valuable in activity-centered teaching, workshops, and collaboration. *met*
- 4. To provide a workshop model that can be repeated, evolve in response to evaluations, and adapted by participants. *-*

[The issue at hand in '07=] "How do we make sense of the growing attention to the collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry?"

in the early days of wshp *what*
 Maybe a go-around where everyone relates ^{what} their perceptions of the workshop theme would be useful.

Also, an eval. even a week later could be useful, as participants would have had time to digest + think about their workshop experience. *i* actually feel too close to it right now to be completely objective.

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2007

Part I -- The primary goal of here is to make notes as prep. for Part II (=a synthetic statement).

1. Start with a self-evaluation: In what ways did you achieve your personal goals? How could you have proceeded differently if you were participating in this workshop again? What have been your major personal obstacles to taking more from this workshop?

I have worked on patience and tolerance during this week - attempting to moderate my responses to views with which I disagree. I also learned about interdisciplinary efforts that others have undertaken, and took solace in the fact of their success.

1b. What have you learned about making an experimental, interaction-intensive workshop stimulating and productive? What would your advice be to prospective workshop participants about how to get the most from a workshop like this?

It seems crucial to balance work and fun, and to make the former ~~rather~~ as much like the latter as possible. Liberations are also crucial!

1c. What are some things you have you learned about "Collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry "

I have come to the conclusion that both 'collaboration' and 'knowledge' are problematic concepts, though I remain optimistic about useful (i.e. pragmatically based) clarification of both.

2. General evaluation: How did the workshop meet or not meet your expectations? How did your attitude to doing the workshop change through the four days? How do you think the workshop could be improved? What was special about this workshop (negative & positive)? How does it compare with other workshops? What would be your overall recommendation to prospective participants?

I learned much less about environmental knowledge than I had anticipated, and much more about the process (which I here assume to be portable) of eliciting fruitful exchanges from participants of diverse backgrounds, methodological commitments, etc.

3. Re-read the workshop description/goals (below, from the prospectus).

Comment on how well the goals expressed there were met and make general and specific suggestions about how these could be better met:

NewSSC organizes innovative, interaction-intensive workshops designed to facilitate discussion, teaching innovation, and longer-term collaboration among faculty and graduate students who teach and write about interactions between scientific developments and social change.

Specific objectives of NewSSC:

1. To promote the social contextualization of science in education and other activities beyond the participants' current disciplinary and academic boundaries.
2. To facilitate participants connecting theoretical, pedagogical, practical, political, and personal aspects of the issue at hand in constructive ways.
3. To train novice and experienced scholars in process / participation skills valuable in activity-centered teaching, workshops, and collaboration.
4. To provide a workshop model that can be repeated, evolve in response to evaluations, and adapted by participants.

[The issue at hand in '07=] "How do we make sense of the growing attention to the collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry?"

I feel all of the 4 goals were achieved to some degree. For my purposes, goals 2 & 3 were most directly and fully achieved. I don't really understand 'social contextualization of science' in goal 1, or if I do understand it I probably don't share that as a goal in the same way that others do.

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2007

Part I -- The primary goal of here is to make notes as prep. for Part II (=a synthetic statement).

1. Start with a self-evaluation: In what ways did you achieve your personal goals? How could you have proceeded differently if you were participating in this workshop again? What have been your major personal obstacles to taking more from this workshop?

I achieved a new understanding of collaboration and process. I felt I could have learned more specific methods. Sometimes I feel collabs can be fingerpointing for adults, but we have so little play that this was a real treat. I'm not sure, I felt I participated w/ an open heart and had few expectations. My personal obstacles are that maybe I am anxious for results or applicability, and am all too often analyzing in a direction of instrumentality.

1b. What have you learned about making an experimental, interaction-intensive workshop stimulating and productive? What would your advice be to prospective workshop participants about how to get the most from a workshop like this?

I learned a lot of new methods, and have a great sense for how I might, say, approach team building efforts on a multidisciplinary project. I would say for people to come w/ some case prepared. I think free writing is important.

1c. What are some things you have you learned about "Collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry "

I learned about a variety of fantastic projects and perspectives. I learned more about the terms of PBL. I am more hopeful and optimistic.

2. General evaluation: How did the workshop meet or not meet your expectations? How did your attitude to doing the workshop change through the four days? How do you think the workshop could be improved? What was special about this workshop (negative & positive)? How does it compare with other workshops? What would be your overall recommendation to prospective participants?

I thought we would be working more on case based issues in ENV. Knowledge, and I thought we would focus more on specific literatures. As I mentioned I felt the group got smaller as time went by. The workshop could be improved by having each person prepare a case beforehand that could provide material for activities.

It compares to other workshops as more intensive, with a stronger emphasis on team taking.

Only come if you are committed to collaboration processes.

3. Re-read the workshop description/goals (below, from the prospectus).

Comment on how well the goals expressed there were met and make general and specific suggestions about how these could be better met:

NewSSC organizes innovative, interaction-intensive workshops designed to facilitate discussion, teaching innovation, and longer-term collaboration among faculty and graduate students who teach and write about interactions between scientific developments and social change.

Specific objectives of NewSSC:

1. To promote the social contextualization of science in education and other activities beyond the participants' current disciplinary and academic boundaries.
2. To facilitate participants connecting theoretical, pedagogical, practical, political, and personal aspects of the issue at hand in constructive ways.
3. To train novice and experienced scholars in process / participation skills valuable in activity-centered teaching, workshops, and collaboration.
4. To provide a workshop model that can be repeated, evolve in response to evaluations, and adapted by participants.

[The issue at hand in '07=] "How do we make sense of the growing attention to the collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry?"

1.)

I think most participants do this already

2.) ~~It is~~ Much success in sharing, particularly in one-on-one intensive discussions.

3.) I'm not sure I have a full enough sense of this, walking away from this w.s. ~~but~~ I can't say I know a literature I can really point to... something that would help me write grants on this topic would be quite helpful

4.) I think this was somewhat successful though, I didn't come here w/ the intention of creating another workshop. I do think I have learned skills I will apply in my classes

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2007

Part I -- The primary goal of here is to make notes as prep. for Part II (=a synthetic statement).

1. Start with a self-evaluation: In what ways did you achieve your personal goals? How could you have proceeded differently if you were participating in this workshop again? What have been your major personal obstacles to taking more from this workshop?

Went with the evolving flow. Confident about this ✓
 Connected with each person one-on-one - not really
 Getting clearer about theory understanding ~~and~~ ~~at~~ piece of collaboration - not so much

Obstacles: Work distractions.

Proceed differently: Clear work distractions one day before. Good nights' sleep on days before workshop.

1b. What have you learned about making an experimental, interaction-intensive workshop stimulating and productive? What would your advice be to prospective workshop participants about how to get the most from a workshop like this?

Participants who choose to come to such a workshop are flexible & creative in developing activities. It is somewhat more difficult to make activities that get to specifics of the workshop theme.

Advice: Trust in the emergent process - be open to surprises & taking risks.

1c. What are some things you have you learned about "Collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry"

- Theoretical ~~theories~~ ^{basis} is not a burning issue for most of those who attended
- This is a piece w/ 2 parts: issue at hand + developing capacity for future engagements
- Coaching is important to move people along

2. General evaluation: How did the workshop meet or not meet your expectations? How did your attitude to doing the workshop change through the four days? How do you think the workshop could be improved? What was special about this workshop (negative & positive)? How does it compare with other workshops? What would be your overall recommendation to prospective participants?

Workshop met expectations, except I'd hoped for more experiences & future plans among participants around workshop theme.

Attitude shifted when I noticed we were suddenly near the end of day 3 - a little sad that it was going by so quickly.

3. Re-read the workshop description/goals (below, from the prospectus).
 Comment on how well the goals expressed there were met and make general and specific suggestions about how these could be better met:

NewSSC organizes innovative, interaction-intensive workshops designed to facilitate discussion, teaching innovation, and longer-term collaboration among faculty and graduate students who teach and write about interactions between scientific developments and social change.

Specific objectives of NewSSC:

1. To promote the social contextualization of science in education and other activities beyond the participants' current disciplinary and academic boundaries. ★
2. To facilitate participants connecting theoretical, pedagogical, practical, political, and personal aspects of the issue at hand in constructive ways. ✱
3. To train novice and experienced scholars in process / participation skills valuable in activity-centered teaching, workshops, and collaboration. ✱✱
4. To provide a workshop model that can be repeated, evolve in response to evaluations, and adapted by participants. ✱✱

[The issue at hand in '07=] "How do we make sense of the growing attention to the collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry?"

~ maybe
 ✱ = good
 ✱✱ = excellent
 ✱✱✱ = couldn't be better

~

To improve:

1. Bring in more participants engaged in actual cases.
2. Talk more beforehand.
3. Redistribute cases.
4. Organizers allow/make time for 1-3.
5. Organizers coach/assist each other in 1-4.

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2007

Part I -- The primary goal of here is to make notes as prep. for Part II (=a synthetic statement).

1. Start with a self-evaluation: In what ways did you achieve your personal goals? How could you have proceeded differently if you were participating in this workshop again? What have been your major personal obstacles to taking more from this workshop?

Of the two "hopes" I delineated during the first day of the workshop, I feel that I was able to **directly** address one ("How does one facilitate a shared sense of ownership and leadership") and **indirectly** address the other (a question over the scalability of environmental knowledge, connecting local to global and vice-versa). A major personal obstacle was the fact that it was difficult for me at times to navigate the layers that were occurring at the same time, it was difficult to realize that while I was participating in a discussion or activity, that I could use the same/adapted activity plus think about the significance of the discussion/activity.

1b. What have you learned about making an experimental, "interaction-intensive workshop stimulating and productive? What would your advice be to prospective workshop participants about how to get the most from a workshop like this?

I learned, personally, about the range of backgrounds, areas of expertise, and personalities of the individuals who may be participating in a workshop such as this. I also learned a number of what seem like very successful and appropriate activities to foster participation and collaboration, especially the use of writing scenarios/cases and the importance of providing enough time for people to build connections with one another. I would recommend to others to be aware of the fact that there are many levels happening at once whenever an activity or discussion is happening, and to make sure to make note of the process and not just the content of these activities and discussions.

1c. What are some things you have you learned about "Collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry "

I learned about the effectiveness and utility of discussing a related paper in order to start an ideas sharing process, in connection with a larger agenda of activities and discussions. I also learned about the different forms this generation of understanding can take, and how often it can actually be quite surprising and serendipitous.

2. General evaluation: How did the workshop meet or not meet your expectations? How did your attitude to doing the workshop change through the four days? How do you think the workshop could be improved? What was special about this workshop (negative & positive)? How does it compare with other workshops? What would be your overall recommendation to prospective participants?

I came into the workshop not quite knowing what to expect, which may have led to my confusion around navigating the various layers which were simultaneously occurring. I feel like that over the four days I became more aware of these layers and how to learn from the experience. I think that workshop could be improved by offering more time/direction to unpack these layers and discuss the process and activities in a little more depth and be able to share impressions of the activities/discussions.

3. Re-read the workshop description/goals (below, from the prospectus). Comment on how well the goals expressed there were met and make general and specific suggestions about how these could be better met:

NewSSC organizes innovative, interaction-intensive workshops designed to facilitate discussion, teaching innovation, and longer-term collaboration among faculty and graduate students who teach and write about interactions between scientific developments and social change.

Specific objectives of NewSSC

1. To promote the social contextualization of science in education and other activities beyond the participants' current disciplinary and academic boundaries.
2. To facilitate participants connecting theoretical, pedagogical, practical, political, and personal aspects of the issue at hand in constructive ways.
3. To train novice and experienced scholars in process / participation skills valuable in activity-centered teaching, workshops, and collaboration.
4. To provide a workshop model that can be repeated, evolve in response to evaluations, and adapted by participants.

[The issue at hand in '07=] "How do we make sense of the growing attention to the collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry?"

I think that, in retrospect, the workshop was pretty successful in meeting the goals as stated (although 4 yet remains to be seen). These goals are very diverse as individual goals and while there is some overlap require a different set of skills in some ways on the part of the participants. I think that, for me, it would have been helpful to make more explicit when these goals were being addressed during the course of the workshop. While this was done on occasion, I think it would have been helpful for me to navigate what was going on if some of this was pointed out more directly.

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2007

Part I -- The primary goal of here is to make notes as prep. for Part II (=a synthetic statement).

1. Start with a self-evaluation: In what ways did you achieve your personal goals? How could you have proceeded differently if you were participating in this workshop again? What have been your major personal obstacles to taking more from this workshop?

I did not have set personal goals except to listen & learn -- which meant I exceeded them perhaps! If I attended in succeeding years the overall "purpose" may be clearer, but as I am not personally goal-driven (not consciously goal-driven) I wouldn't change much. Obstacles = time to think, absorb, apply.

1b. What have you learned about making an experimental, interaction-intensive workshop stimulating and productive? What would your advice be to prospective workshop participants about how to get the most from a workshop like this?

Engage people in multiple ways. Allow the 15' intro -- maybe add 5' question time for each person?? Structured but loose. Fun. (Knew all this, good to have it confirmed.)

1c. What are some things you have you learned about "Collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry"

Fully engaged people can develop exciting ideas & insights. Uncertainty about tasks → floundering. Single person can't group dynamics if egos are not equally strong. Environmental knowledge is wicked & knotty.

2. General evaluation: How did the workshop meet or not meet your expectations? How did your attitude to doing the workshop change through the four days? How do you think the workshop could be improved? What was special about this workshop (negative & positive)? How does it compare with other workshops? What would be your overall recommendation to prospective participants?

- 1 Broadened & focused thinking about collaboratⁿ.
- 2 Open to knowledge & Δ all 4 days -- tired by the end.
- 3 I more walk on the beach, longer office hrs activity
- 4 Getting to know diverse participants & viewpoints. 5 Always the best part -- which
- opportunity to think & work than most.
6. Go with all preconceived notions abandoned

3. Re-read the workshop description/goals (below, from the prospectus).

Comment on how well the goals expressed there were met and make general and specific suggestions about how these could be better met:

NewSSC organizes innovative, interaction-intensive workshops designed to facilitate discussion, teaching innovation, and longer-term collaboration among faculty and graduate students who teach and write about interactions between scientific developments and social change.

Specific objectives of NewSSC:

1. To promote the social contextualization of science in education and other activities beyond the participants' current disciplinary and academic boundaries.
2. To facilitate participants connecting theoretical, pedagogical, practical, political, and personal aspects of the issue at hand in constructive ways.
3. To train novice and experienced scholars in process / participation skills valuable in activity-centered teaching, workshops, and collaboration.
4. To provide a workshop model that can be repeated, evolve in response to evaluations, and ^{be} adapted by participants.

[The issue at hand in '07=] "How do we make sense of the growing attention to the collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry?"

(Note that I never saw these before the event because the link was so pale!)

1. What the f does "social contextualization" mean — really? Is using this kind of language productive, when the workshop is meant to be about collaboration? (These are pondering questions, not accusatory ones.)
(And I am answering your request.)

2-4 I think these goals were probably met on a spectrum of levels for individual participants. It was clear that some were able to leave their "stuff" at home, others weren't. Would "clearing the mind" exercises at the beginning help with this?

I think taking on a specific ^{—real} problem & working at it together could be very powerful, maybe start after the first fresh-air/beach walk break.

I was concerned that Jan was held back by her perceptions of the "gofer" role. She had a lot to contribute that we ^{Share the gofer-ing!} lost.