

**Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2008
Part II compilation, followed by Part I**

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 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 will be invaluable for my academic work and teaching. It made me realize I have an academic community I never knew existed. I feel I now know 13 other people I can go to for advice, encouragement, teaching help, ideas, collaboration, anything. I am going to grow and evolve as an academic and a teacher as a result of these four days. I really had no idea what to expect to get out of this, but any expectation I MAY have had has been far, far exceeded. I am going away with knowledge, tools, approaches, and contacts that will improve the way I work and teach.

For those of us working in the spaces between disciplines, especially the spaces between science and other disciplines, this kind of intellectual community is invaluable. We are like lost sheep roaming the wilderness, and now I have my flock. I can't say enough about this experience.

I don't know if I will try to make my own workshop, but I would definitely volunteer to help run this if Peter ever tires of it. I doubt I could ever do as good a job, but if needed I will participate in any way I can (including seeking more funding) to make sure this keeps happening every year.

Thanks SO MUCH,
AMY LESEN

2. I am reminded of the Prologue to Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit in trying to answer this question: the answer to the question about the benefits of NewSSC is to be discovered not in something one can express in a paragraph of evaluation or chapter of a future book, but the benefit is to be lived into reality, a PROCESS through which one must personally pass, to understand its method, function, benefits, brilliance.

One comes, one struggles to understand what is/will be happening, one anticipates, explores, interacts, listens, listens, listens, finds one has learned to listen well, finds one hears others differently now, relates more "hearkeningly" to others. The various activities do not simply build connections with others, but they necessitate the discovery of the identity of others through their own self-articulations. But since those articulations follow their own path, one sees them not as simple reports of some static truth but as new explorations of self, in each case. Then one discovers this has happened to oneself as much as to others-one discovers oneself anew in the surprising revelations that emerge in the process of self-revelation. Ultimately, I believe we have all come to embrace, not only ourselves and each other, but the process! And I believe too that we all are in silent agreement that we depart better persons for the experience, refreshed from the supportive net of the community that has held us fast during this perilous self-discovery. Oh, and then!... one begins immediately to hatch plans for helping others to feel this same wonderful way.

Thank you so very much for including me in this wonderful experience!

3. I enjoyed the workshop very much. Participating the second time, I was able to concentrate more on specific details and was not as overwhelmed by the wealth of methods, processes, and group interactions. For me the process of group interaction is very important and the methods were intensified for me by taking part a second time. This workshop was less focused thematically than the first one, which I attended. I liked both forms: the more generic form of teaching and outreach as well as the more theme-centered one. But I think, not all workshops should be generic. Alternating will be productive. It is productive that some of the participants are new and some already were experienced with this format.

I appreciate very much the possibility to have a common space for thinking social interaction – the continuation of both, together with a not too short duration is the real productive thing, beyond having more detailed cognitive, scientific input. Of the methods I especially valued the dialogue process this time. It would be good to have a little more time (2-3 hours) for non-planned things (like Thursday afternoon).

4. This workshop model is something I would like to continue to engage in at various points throughout my academic career. It's something that is difficult to fully comprehend at the first go, and having come a second time, I am learning more and more how I can better integrate these techniques into my own work and pedagogy. The strength of a workshop like this seems to really depend on the mix of people participating in it. This (the 5th) year's workshop group seemed exceptionally well tuned to each and this is no small accomplishment, and it speaks a good deal to the connections of the organizers.

I think there needs to be a more explicit effort towards increasing the diversity of participants. This would most likely be accomplished by holding this workshop in a different location, such as New Orleans. If the idea is to engage boundaries, we need to be sure they are reflected in the participants as well.

There could be improvements and minor tweaks in a variety of places, such as including a free-writing reflection after each office hour session. I have great conversations then need to run off to the next person, which is fine, except I have no time to jot down the notes of all the great things I heard. Then, I go on to the next person, which, by the third person, makes a jumble of it. Perhaps we could do office hours over three days, but only do two at a time, with the reflections? I am not so interested in having time to center or meditate, but we do a LOT of listening, which is great, but it requires little time for reflection. More free writing would be helpful, and it seems we did quite a bit more of it last year.

Overall, I sincerely hope I can continue to do these workshops in some capacity or another. However, the torch needs to be passed as I think Peter has done an absolutely fantastic job of putting these together, but I think he could use a break and just be a participant. Thank you for the wonderful experience!!

5. The primary strength of this workshop was in bringing together diverse people from diverse yet intersecting fields and allowing them to exchange expertise and to share inspiration and support for innovative educational/activist efforts. The format of the workshop is itself a model to replicate: as Marshall McLuhan has famously noted, "the medium is the message." Accordingly, its impact seems very difficult to evaluate fully and effectively, as it involves examining methodological shifts and perhaps subtle rearrangements in infrastructure or organizational relationships at multiple locations following the workshop itself. These "products" are not documented on paper.

The prime weakness, as I see it (and quite possibly i[s] an exception to the common perspective), was the lack of "work" in a "workshop" (my concept of work being focused narrowly on development of a

concrete product and plan, rather than a shift or transformation of attitudes or imagined possibilities). I see evaluation in terms of observable benefits and deficits and applicable contexts more than perceived "connections."

This workshop provided a strong model in its use of "office hours" -- formalizing the casual, intimate interactions that happen elsewhere at conferences in coffeehouses, pubs and the corners of a hotel between formal scholarly presentations. One could amplify the value of this element by providing time afterwards for consolidating the information gleaned and focusing it in work on a particular project (envisioning, planning, expanding, revising).

The workshop provides a strong model for cross-disciplinary interaction. However, it could benefit from being more explicit about articulating each of those perspectives before negotiating their interaction.

The workshop is a strong model for reflective practice at many levels. However, it could benefit from working on only one level (or perspective) of reflection at a given time, working only gradually from the concrete and particular to the more abstract and general -- possibly deepening over the course of several days.

The workshop format will benefit from an explicit model of leadership/facilitation skills showing how to alternate deftly between centralized control and focus, on the one hand, and distributed authority and unrestricted scope on the other. (This workshop seemed to suffer from lack of temporary centralized authority when needed for clarity of group cohesiveness and focal purpose.) That is, decentralization was sometimes chaotic, not enriching, while when more focused at other times, quite fruitful.

6. This workshop introduced me to a wonderful range of new techniques for facilitating deeply satisfying group processes, creating cohesion, mutual understanding, lasting bonds and transformative learning. I would strongly recommend it for dedicated educators seeking to make their teaching practice stronger and more emancipatory, especially those dealing with social aspects of science and technologies.

7. This year I have enjoyed in a very particular way the things I used to consider the "details." Probably because I was not so available after workshop hours to think specifically on activities to develop, the "regular" parts of the workshop assumed a very different and much more structuring dimension in my representation of the workshop. This is to say how well organized and thought out it is. Sometimes this may lead you to "naturalize" what is a collective process. I think the model is a very good one, and it enables one to develop in very different ways, depending on the group.

8. The workshop more than met with my expectations. I thought that the Dialogue exercise was very helpful for setting the bar at the beginning. "Office Hours" allowed for focused conversations with members -- I was able to benefit a great deal from this exercise. The activities went well because the various groups were allowed a large amount of creative space for experiment.

9. This workshop was a very valuable experience, which helped me to develop my understanding of the wealth of collaboration and participatory forms of producing new knowledge, both intuitively and from the point of view of the development of adequate[?] procedures. Autobiographical presentations, office hours, collective exercises and dialogue processes provided a broad and very effective repertoire for exploring both the meditative and methodological aspects of the topics dealt with.

I was particularly appreciative of the way the workshop provides a challenging and nurturing environment for the free experimentation of innovative work of enjoying and collaborating for new forms of generating knowledge.

10.

11. The 2008 Workshop was especially valuable for me because I was able to observe the responses of individuals who were unfamiliar with its exercises in comparison with those of Workshop veterans. Most of the new attendees seemed a bit disoriented at first, but certainly gained quickly from the activities. The energy level of all attendees was remarkable given our considerable duties as professors and researchers and the fact that most of us squeezed in our Workshop attendance between difficult parts of our respective semesters. In my conversations with Workshop veterans (and in their autobiographical reports) I noted how much they benefited over time from the Workshops. All of the veterans were proceeding with incredible energy and resilience in their careers, which they credited in large part to the inspiration and support they received from the Workshop. As online education takes over many of our duties as faculty members, intense workshops of the kind that Peter Taylor has designed should be utilized to replenish our enthusiasm for teaching and remind us of what our fellow educators can provide us in terms of support. As a business school teacher, I would certainly recommend that Peter Taylor "franchise" the nicely-crafted Workshop notions.

12. Strengthen the workshop with a sharper focus at the gate—participants could submit better readings and think about presentations. The “take away” stuff is on the wiki and that will be real good.

13.

I Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2008
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 my personal goals and then some! This workshop far exceeded all my expectations. I wouldn't do much else differently except I would prepare better in terms of actually reading everyone's homework/inspirational readings and also bringing something with me to read for "bedtime" reading.

I found the wiki setup to be very user-unfriendly (I've used other wikis, but did not like the look, organization or feel of this one), and therefore I didn't use it much before the workshop, but now that I've been here I feel much more comfortable with the wiki.

I don't think I encountered any major obstacles in taking a HUGE amount from this 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?

I leaned a HUGE amount about running workshops here. A) Activities are good and necessary! You can't just expect to have everyone sit around and talk. I found activities such as the dialogue to be AMAZING. B) It was clear at the workshop, in general, how much time and effort and thought went into it, it wasn't just something thrown together. It was crafted like a VERY well-planned course.

In terms of preparation advice, I would just advise to do what I myself plan to do next time: do all the homework and read the wiki before.

1c. What are some things you have you learned about " Teaching and engaging across boundaries "

Theater of the oppressed!

Dialogue activity!

Challenge your assumptions!

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 have never really been involved with a small, intense, workshop like this before, and I must say it works MUCH better for me than a typical professional conference. I love this format, and I think this is a self-selecting, self-organizing group of amazing individuals. I really have no negative comments whatsoever. I would highly recommend this workshop to ANYONE who is willing to work hard, think hard, and be really engaged over four days. It was invaluable and will change my work and teaching forever. I LOVE the setting: I asked Peter in the car on the way up about the choice to do it in Woods Hole, and I agree it is a GREAT setting because it really does allow you to only focus on the workshop. There isn't much to do in Woods Hole and it's perfect for this type of thing: if we were in a big city with lots of distractions, it would have been much harder to focus. Next year I would love to invite everyone to New Orleans, I bet we could find a great setting there!

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. **YES, this was absolutely accomplished.**
2. To facilitate participants connecting theoretical, pedagogical, practical, political, and personal aspects of the issue at hand in constructive ways. **YES, this was absolutely accomplished.**
3. To train novice and experienced scholars in process / participation skills valuable in activity-centered teaching, workshops, and collaboration. **YES, this was absolutely accomplished.**
4. To provide a workshop model that can be repeated, evolve in response to evaluations, and adapted by participants. **YES, this was absolutely accomplished.**

[The issue at hand in '08=} "learning from and advancing our efforts to produce new curriculum or outreach activities based on those workshops and to use them in our 'teaching and engaging across boundaries.'"]

I know I will definitely be able to use the tools I learned here both in academic and intellectual work and collaboration and in my teaching.

2] Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2008
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 hoped for (though cannot say “expected”) the workshop to be a “retreat.” It was this—and so much more for me!

I was utterly lost, did not know what we were here “to achieve” or “produce”...and it took me 3 days to become comfortable with this lack of direction...and then learn to love it!

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?

Just a word or two more about direction IF ONLY to say “self-organizing workshop”...we will see what will emerge!. Since some members were veterans, and others new,,,I assumed my own ignorance rather than assuming that there WAS no plan!

1c. What are some things you have you learned about " Teaching and engaging across boundaries "

I learned that the teaching ‘envelope’ can be pushed beyond all boundaries of exploration. Only decency and time constrains us!

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 workshop FAR exceeded my expectations.. I learned that one could become intimately connected with strangers in a short number of hours, rather than months or years, if we actively seek out that connection through certain strategies of engagement. I also learned that excellent communication techniques are best modeled through dialogue rather than through a list of rules.

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 '08=} "learning from and advancing our efforts to produce new curriculum or outreach activities based on those workshops and to use them in our 'teaching and engaging across boundaries.'"]

met and exceeded. But these goals do not say enough. I am neither a scientist nor a sociologist but was very much at home in this workshop; I learned about my boundaries and that my idea of boundaries was largely self-imposed.

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2008

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?

My personal goals where to deeper my understanding of the NEW SSC - "Toolbox" for my own purpose and to connect to the people (again). In context in that my second participation helped to achieve this goal. Next time I would try to prepare an activity of my own. Obstacles: exhaustion after a stressful period through the last weeks.

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 have learned to be open and patient, reserve time for thinking and lateral communication and valued the strong personal aspects (biographical introductions) as an important means to intensify the workshop.
Advice: be open and patient!

1c. What are some things you have you learned about " Teaching and engaging across boundaries "

I learned especially the high value of having time and of leading non-controversial introductory communication (dialogue process).

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?

My expectations were to get inspiration and intensification of ^{the} previous experiences. There were not so many completely new things (surprises), which I, however, learned to value as a useful form of repetition. I learned also to value the wild character - retreat in group from the "normal" academic process. I would recommend to alter between more thematically focussed and more general workshops.

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 '08=} "learning from and advancing our efforts to produce new curriculum or outreach activities based on those workshops and to use them in our teaching and engaging across boundaries."]

- 1) met well, due to the highly interdisciplinary nature of the group, with open people.
- 2) in an somewhat indirect way: help for being creative in developing new methodologies on the basis of suggestions
- 3) well met, as cooperation, interaction was highly interactive and developing in terms of a social networks during the days
- 4) Can be repeated in parts by others, should and can be repeated by later. Still not easy to produce specific products which would allow easier evaluation.

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2008

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 my goals of listening well, and attempting to connect as directly as possible with as many participants as possible. I was able to get some of my own interests addressed and got a head start on a project I will be working on in the coming months looking at values implicit in the understanding of GHG footprints. Next time I would like to have some more time to prepare. For me, these workshops come right before the last week of classes, so I tend to feel quite unprepared. Thus, I would have done more to prepare. My major personal obstacles to taking more from this workshop are still based in having more patience. I tend to be a very solitary person, so this kind of intensive group work is always a bit extractive for me and it takes me some time to transition into my comfort zone.

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 that it is quite important to keep instructions simple. Keeping instructions simple is key because complex, theoretical, or abstract sets of instructions can really take more time to understand than the allotted time for any given exercise. This goes for group created activities as well as for the workshop as a whole. Inevitably participants will undermine your assumptions in any given exercise that you may design, and participants are creative enough to fill in the spaces as much as possible. My advice would be to just be open to the situation, you will inevitably get a lot from the experience. Listen and participate with a beginner's mind. This is something I would recommend to old and new participants, not just the newbies.

1c. What are some things you have you learned about " Teaching and engaging across boundaries "

I learned the usefulness of the theater scenarios. I find listening is something we rarely, if ever, teach. Dialogue is wonderful for this. I'm less certain, however, as to what exactly constitutes a boundary.

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?

Again, I try not to have explicit expectations for most anything. I find it much more interesting that way. My attitude changed less in relationship to the workshop, but it did change in relationship to the all of the participants. I found myself comparing this to the previous workshop and quite enjoyed this group. The workshop could be improved by having more silent moments. By the end, I was tired of listening to people. This group was exceptionally special. I only went the 4th and 5th year and I liked this workshop because it had fewer "frivolous" activities which I thought was the case last time. For prospective

participants, I would highly recommend this. I feel these sorts of workshops are quite self-selective, but I wouldn't try to "market" it to a wider audience.

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.

This was more an implicit component of workshop participants, as opposed to being so explicitly designed within the workshop.

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

I think these workshops really begin more from the personal, and extend into the theoretical, practical, and political, and result in pedagogical innovations. In this regard, I think it does a very good job of bringing the personal into conjunction with these other aspects.

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

This has certainly been the case for me. I really had very little opportunity to learn participation skills, even though I was widely read across participatory design and PPGIS.

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

[The issue at hand in '08=} "learning from and advancing our efforts to produce new curriculum or outreach activities based on those workshops and to use them in our 'teaching and engaging across boundaries.'"]

This is a very excellent model to work from. For participants who have not "run the gamut" of different exercises that could be used in classes, it would be helpful to know or have access to a handbook of different exercises, so they know what else is out there.

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2008

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 hoping to use feedback & available time to develop my project (curriculum module) further. I was able to get plentiful feedback and comments but there was not adequate time for updating and writing while it was all fresh. Nevertheless, I was able to help launch a parallel activity for another participant (~4 hrs.).

"Office hours" following introductory biographies were very helpful for formalizing what might happen over lunch or beer -- but does not always occur with full schedules.

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 helps when leadership roles are clear, even if the leadership is quite open and encourages participation.
- It helps to have clarity in activity objectives for them to be scaled appropriately to available time, and to be addressed in successive stages when there are several layers of complexity or reflection.

1c. What are some things you have you learned about " Teaching and engaging across boundaries "

That the foreignness of this concept is far more widespread —and apparently liberating— than I imagined.

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?

Very few expectations. Limits noted in 1a.
100% engagement is too exhausting, I discovered. One must be selective and recede from some activities in such a full, active schedule.

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.

I found this envisioned, but not concretely enacted and evaluated "in real time" during the workshop time.

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

OK.

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

I did not find that this was more valuable than many standard workshops at home institutions led by Centers for Teaching and Learning (or some such) -- but the effect on younger faculty/ teachers seemed quite definite.

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

In my own vision, I would ask participants to bring half-finished material or ideas and provide the environment (and time & resources) for developing and "testing" it further.

[The issue at hand in '08=} "learning from and advancing our efforts to produce new curriculum or outreach activities based on those workshops and to use them in our 'teaching and engaging across boundaries.'"]

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2008

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?

My major goals: to make more contact with Peter; to find out more about his group process works; + learn more about teaching — all achieved.

Major personal obstacles: I've found I've been having some trouble listening, + after I've heard the directions I don't know what they are. Also if I had more experience teaching I'm sure I would have gotten all kinds of benefits beyond what I got.

How to proceed differently: be better prepared + organized. Spell out more detailed objectives beforehand.

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 seen some specific techniques in action — the dialogue ritual, the biographies, theater of the oppressed, problem-based learning, some others. The best next step may be to go back to Peter's book and reread in more abstract discussion now that I have these things to peg it to. Advice: come prepared, and without fixed expectations.

1c. What are some things you have you learned about "Teaching and engaging across boundaries"

People like it. I've already been a big proponent of violating boundaries, so it isn't where my attention went.

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 count it a success. I've tangibly learned important things and been transformed, which is rare for a conference of what kind you. I get that it's important to include probably all other things we did, but I think it would work better if people had a comfortable amount of time to ourselves. I began to feel like I was being shoved around like a piece of furniture without volition... that said, I'm hypersensitive to feeling like that so it reflects largely on me and I respect the need for a strong facilitator/coordinateur function.

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 '08=} "learning from and advancing our efforts to produce new curriculum or outreach activities based on those workshops and to use them in our teaching and engaging across boundaries."]

As a scholar who writes about and intervenes in interactions between scientific developments and social change, I found my perspective fairly marginal, as the workshop was really about teaching, for the most part. Nonetheless, since I'm interested in teaching, I have taken a good amount of benefit from it, and much of the insight I've gleaned relates to group processes more broadly defined than only the classroom.

Regarding the specific objectives, an STS-like standpoint seemed to be pretty much assumed, so the 1. item wasn't directly addressed; since the focus was on STS teaching it's not clear what the 'issue at hand' is — it's not any particular science issue, it's apparently how to teach — so I'm not sure we connected those aspects of it or were taught how to connect them better. The focus seems to be largely on ~~issues~~ 3. and 4., which were very well addressed.

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2008

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?

My PERSONAL GOALS WERE ACHIEVED BOTH IN TERMS OF COLLECTIVE ENGAGEMENT AND OF THE TYPE OF ACTIVITIES DEVELOPED DURING THESE DAYS. THE GROUP AS A WHOLE SHARED SEVERAL COMMON INTERESTS, AND, AT THE SAME TIME, WAS DIVERSE ENOUGH IN ORDER TO LEARN INTENSIVELY ~~FROM~~ FROM OTHER BACKGROUNDS AND PERSONAL EXPERIENCES. ACTIVITIES DEVELOPED CONFIGURE EXACTLY THE TYPE OF THINGS I'M INTERESTED IN USE, ADAPT, THINK OF. MY MAJOR PERSONAL OBSTACLE WAS HAVING TO DEAL WITH PROFESSIONAL DUTIES OUT OF

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?

NOT BEING THE FIRST TIME I ATTEND NEWSSC, I WOULD SAY THAT WHAT IS ALWAYS SURPRISING, IN A VERY GOOD WAY, IS THE VARIETY OF MODES IN WHICH DIFFERENT FORMS OF ENGAGING PEOPLE AND ~~DIFFERENT~~ DIFFERENT SUB-GROUPS CONFIGURATIONS ARE VERY HELPFUL IN CREATING CONDITIONS FOR PRODUCTIVE MODES OF CREATIVITY

EXPERIMENTATION

1c. What are some things you have you learned about "Teaching and engaging across boundaries"

- (RE)MEMBERING
 - USING TOOLS FROM VARIOUS AND DIFFERENT BACKGROUNDS
- ~~THE SIMPLE FACT OF MEETING~~ HERE IS ALREADY AN EXAMPLE OF TEACHING AND ENGAGING ACROSS BOUNDARIES

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 WORKSHOP FULLY MET MY INITIAL EXPECTATIONS. FOR PERSONAL REASONS ^{during} THE FIRST TWO DAYS I COULDN'T BE AS CONCENTRATED AS I WOULD WISH BECAUSE OF WORK OVERTIME DURING NIGHTS TRYING TO FINISH OTHER WORK RELATED PROJECTS. I TOTALLY UNDERSTOOD THAT THIS TYPE OF INITIATIVE DESERVES FULL TIME DEDICATION.

WHAT IS FOR ME THE WAY OF GETTING MORE INSIGHTS AND LESSONS / THOUGHTS TO CONTINUE TO DEVELOP EVEN AFTER THE WORKSHOP. (CONT. ENCL)

MY ADVICE WOULD BE THAT ANYONE SHOULD ENJOY THE FACT THAT ACTIVITIES TO BE DEVELOPED ARE COLLECTIVELY DEFINED AND CO-CONSTRUCTED. ~~MEANING~~ PARTICIPANTS SHOULD THIS BE PART OF THE DEFINITION OF THE VERY PROCESS.

2. (CONT.)

ONE OF THE THINGS THAT PROBABLY COULD BE DONE WOULD BE THE POSSIBILITY TO CREATE SOME SPACE IN FUTURE EDITIONS TO SHARE WHAT SOME OF THE PARTICIPANTS HAVE LEARNED ~~THE~~ AND PRACTICED ~~AFTER~~ PREVIOUS ~~THE~~ WORKSHOPS (IF THAT IS THE CASE)

THE MOST SPECIAL THING OF THIS WS IS THE POSSIBILITY OF COLLECTIVELY CREATE INITIATIVES TO ENGAGE WITH OTHER PARTICIPANTS AND BEING CHALLENGED. ANOTHER VERY POSITIVE ASPECT IS NOT HAVING EVERYTHING FRAMED FROM THE VERY BEGINNING, WHICH ALLOWS ~~THE~~ FEELING OF CONTRIBUTING TO THE RESULTS WHATEVER THEY ARE. HAVE TIME TO THINK, HAVE TIME TO LEARN.

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2008

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?

Yes, I did achieve my goal of reaching out to members of the workshop in order to learn more about the fields of STS and environmental justice as they relate to education. I also realize how unique this particular workshop is to the return participants. If I return, I will reach out to the new participants and offer support just as the veterans did for me. This over

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?

Just among participants allows for spontaneity and experiment among workshop participants. A schedule needs to be adhered to, but the activities should allow for some flexibility and spontaneity. An open mind

1c. What are some things you have you learned about " Teaching and engaging across boundaries "

Listening is critical. I came into the workshop knowing and willing to learn from the other participants from other disciplines. The participants all spoke different professional languages.

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 workshop more than met with my expectations. I thought that the Dialogue exercise was very helpful for setting the bar at the beginning. "Office Hours" allowed for focused conversations with members - I was able to benefit a great deal from this exercise. The activities went well because the various groups were

sense of collegiality is what builds the trust among the workshop participants so that productive critical thinking can take place. I probably would have benefitted more from the workshop if I had been in contact with the participants before hand. Jeremy's idea of ^{establishing} a social networking site before the workshop would allow participants to at least introduce themselves before arriving at Words & Ink.

With introductions made before hand, participants would arrive focused and engaged so that the goal of the workshop - a finished product - would be realized.

and willingness to experiment and challenge oneself is important - central to achieving individual goals during the workshop.

Listening and questioning are the skills needed to cross language boundaries.

allowed a large amount of creative space for experiment.

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2008

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?

Having been here before, I managed to make the most of the workshop. I was particularly interested in reflecting more on the anthropological perspective and their uses or tools for connecting and relating (and re-membering, as I learned in the workshop).

The major obstacle to making more of the workshop was undoubtedly the need to have my mind pretty elsewhere, because of urgent personal commitments.

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 is difficult to identify what one has learned at one workshop after having been here before. It is the repetition of the experience that grants the learning. I found the workshop in particular especially challenging for trying to find new ways of connecting to people who shared some or similar concerns.

1c. What are some things you have you learned about " Teaching and engaging across boundaries "

I learned about how to create and design a resource base that can be used for different purposes and different audiences. But I also learned more about how to translate across boundaries (disciplinary, professional, geographic) through the biographical accounts, office hours and dialogue process.

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?

My general evaluation of the workshop follows that of previous workshops: it is a challenging and interesting space where you can engage in new and innovative ways with people sharing concerns or interests with you, but also putting connections with those apparently doing something quite different. It is for me a space and time out of the frame of daily work, which allows me, above all, to think collectively.

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 '08=] "learning from and advancing our efforts to produce new curriculum or outreach activities based on those workshops and to use them in our 'teaching and engaging across boundaries.'"]

I believe that over its year of existence NewSSC has ~~met~~ ^{achieved} these goals with a remarkable degree of success. During the ~~workshop~~ ^{workshops}, it is easy for participants to follow and assess this process. Beyond the workshops, and based on my experience and on what I could see from those who have returned to the workshop after having been here a part time, I believe that it has contributed to the development of my own skills, ~~as a researcher~~ and ~~researcher~~ ^{as a teacher, a researcher and also as someone engaged in work with children and communities.}

I would certainly like NewSSC to continue, or at least some similar form of self-organizing workshop allowing people to find this type of environment for some days every year to be continued, under this or other forms.

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2008

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?

Personal goals: To organize, delegate, facilitate and participate = Very do-able (except for paper-work on last day) + some heavy handedness out of tiredness)
To get a clear roadmap for completing products & getting them out there = lots of work still to be done, but Douglas provides a model for ed; Topic matters for public participation
To get new insights => themes to check = not as many as I had thought
To make and further connections with people = very easy with this group

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?

Firewall against emails inserting outside stuff. -> Get an email address for the workshop.
Dialogue sessions are powerful mutual-respect builders early in the workshop.

1c. What are some things you have you learned about " Teaching and engaging across boundaries "

Self-selected experimenters can make boundaries almost invisible.
Need to allow for range of participants/students, some of whom need more ramping up.

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 ^{participant-generated} activities were interesting, but didn't seem central to the participants' right-here-and-now teaching challenges => More preparatory work with almost ready participants in advance of the workshop.

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 '08=} "learning from and advancing our efforts to produce new curriculum or outreach activities based on those workshops and to use them in our 'teaching and engaging across boundaries.'"]

- 2 ✓✓
- 3 ✓✓
- 4 ✓✓

1. Uncertain ~~about~~ how to demonstrate this

11. missing

Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2008

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?

My personal goals included getting re-energized about teaching and contributing to the future success of the NEWSSC workshop. I achieved the first and the second looks promising. If I were participating again, I would do more homework for a participant generated activity. My major personal obstacle was being able to focus simultaneously on more than just one or two goals.

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 that "front end loading" helps make a workshop more productive, and I would advise other participants to read through the prep documents and contribute some of their own. Once at the workshop, stay engaged and in the moment—try not to let yourself get too tired or numb so that you begin to withdraw.

1c. What are some things you have you learned about " Teaching and engaging across boundaries "

We usually think about boundaries as social/cultural, whether nationalities, race, gender, or discipline etc. But boundaries also include issue of ego and personal head space that can hold us back from open engagement with other workshopers. Listening carefully in the card circle really helps.

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 workshop generally met my expectations very well. My attitude was very open at the beginning and sort of a blank slate; as the days ticked past, it remained open but was much more goal oriented. The goal of this workshop was diffuse to begin with, but participants did generally self organize around some common purposes. This both negative (lacking a coherent initial focus) and positive (demanding of participants—they need to self organize and create the goal/purpose). I don't attend many workshops, as a workshoper but have been part of the staff/faculty on several. In my other workshop experiences, it's up to the staff/faculty to structure a goal and provide the tools/information for participants to achieve that goal. I would like to try to create more self organization/student-centered learning in other types of workshops that I'm involved with. This might be hard, since our audience (mostly K-12 teachers) seem to demand/expect the content & structure to meet accreditation or certification etc demands. Also, the funding agencies usually emphasize content learning. Maybe this will change.

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 '08=} "learning from and advancing our efforts to produce new curriculum or outreach activities based on those workshops and to use them in our 'teaching and engaging across boundaries.'"]

Well, gee, the general statement really nails it. Though to be honest, the scientific changes—social change could be better focused. We might even think reflexively about the extensive emphasis on communication technologies in this workshop and the linked social changes.

1. Very high marks on expressing and meeting this objective. Good diverse mix of scholars.
2. Also good. More prep work would help.
3. Very good.
4. We hope so.

13 Workshop evaluation New England Workshop on Science and Social Change 2008
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?

My goals were fairly vague. I supposed that I would discover some novel and helpful teaching methodologies, and indeed I did get some interesting ideas. Other than that I'm not sure how to calibrate my personal success. In terms of personal obstacles, coming down ill in the midst of things didn't help much! For that I'm eternally sorry....

In terms of getting more from the workshop, I think a change in expectations is probably most important. I had imagined that we would discuss, analyze, and perhaps work through materials generated in previous workshops, and I came having read most of them and expecting to work on them with other participants in a more detached, analytic way. Instead I felt like the other participants (and myself, not the materials per se) were the focus of the workshop. This is certainly not a bad thing! But it means that from the outset you need to think more about what kinds of things you'll take away from interactions with others rather than engagement with materials per se. I'm not sure if that makes sense.

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'm not sure whether it helps to have goals (or to not have goals) when thinking about participating. If anything, it may help to set aside goals in advance since the agenda is so fluid once you arrive. Again, I would focus on leveraging other people less than engaging with existing materials. I wonder if there is any way to do this other than simply posting and reading bios? Some of the bios were not entirely revealing. Maybe there is some way to elicit more specific information from people in advance?

1c. What are some things you have you learned about " Teaching and engaging across boundaries "

I'm not sure if I saw the "boundaries" crop up too often in the workshop. This could reflect the fact that, despite the different intellectual interests and agendas of the participants, we actually weren't that diverse of a group: we were all (more or less uniformly white and middle-aged) academics interested in critical pedagogy. Moreover, the "crossing boundaries" theme was not really explicitly discussed in the course of the workshop, even though it was present in some of the exercises (e.g., theatre of the oppressed, 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?

This workshop may be confusing for beginners. Its unstructured nature makes it very different from other workshops I've been part of, quite unfamiliar. While I get the sense that there *are* in fact rules, structures, and priorities underneath what is happening they aren't really articulated anywhere – they may be more apparent to people who have been to previous workshops. I think I've begun to have a sense of the workshop's idiom, albeit a very naive one.

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 '08=} "learning from and advancing our efforts to produce new curriculum or outreach activities based on those workshops and to use them in our 'teaching and engaging across boundaries.'"]

I like these goals. One thing that I might say is that they are exceptionally broad, and I still don't think I quite understand the specific issue that we were tasked with for this workshop.