

Spring 2011 Workshop, Arouca, PORTUGAL

"Collaborative production of knowledge: Health, environment, and publics"

Synthesis

Evaluation 1: The workshop certainly seems to be applicable for many environments, assuming those involved are motivated. Since PBL [problem-based learning] got me the most mentally "activated," I think this is a signal certain activities appeal more to others, and perhaps the particular activities can be tailored to the backgrounds of the group. Based on how the workshop was adapted in real time, this seems to fit the parameters of the workshop description. We definitely got to see how Portuguese culture influenced how the workshop ran, the values people brought certainly shaped the discussion and proposed projects, etc. It seemed successful so I think more info was gained on how to use this workshop formula across borders. I certainly hope I stay in contact with everyone I met, there seemed to be some major common interests. Couple that with diverse knowledge bases and there's exciting potential for future collaboration! Only time will tell how that works out, but the connection made at the workshop certainly seemed genuine.

Evaluation 2: This workshop allowed us to create bridges of cooperation between the various participants that will extend beyond the workshop itself. This workshop made visible new issues and problems surrounding my Ph.D. work. These issues and problems emerged during the workshop through the definition of a collective line of thinking.

Evaluation 3: It is a very heightened workshop. Intense, intellectually and emotionally, as well as individually and as a group. It was an experience for examining the way we used to do our work, it marks a turning point on, once [we] identified the objects [of] our interest, solving them taking advantage from the tools learned during this workshop.

Evaluation 4: Innovative workshop process. Goals met! Better met with richer suggestion of bibliography and concepts. What to read is a very good idea. Training. I learned about the conduct... of workshops and I would be interested in make more progress on leading / facilitating intensive interaction workshops. I am interested in the workshop model and how can I adapt this to SCRAM.

Evaluation 5: This workshop was a real "personal revelation" factory. Each of the exercises and activities demands that we draw out most of our potential, both intellectual and relational. They also "force" you to step out of your comfort zone in a non-invasive manner. This causes the tearing down of some self-erected barriers. Entering this workshop, one embarks on a journey of self-discovery, but also one learns to discover and look at things we consider familiar and uninteresting from a new perspective. Great, great workshop!

Evaluation 6: Overall, I found the workshop to be personally rewarding in that I was able to bring some of my own research interests and inquiries to the table. I was also able to focus more on the processes of facilitating such a workshop, which gave me stronger insights into the challenges of running such a gathering. It was interesting to see that many of the same processes that sought

Arouca workshop evaluations 24/5/2011

connection, individual exploration, and group articulation used in the Woods Hole gathering, worked well here as well. At the same time, the tone of the two spaces was quite different. The structured, yet flexible, design of the workshop allowed for the interests and concerns of the group to be expressed and Peter's ability to grasp these and translate them into useful activities was a key component. It also seems that tone created within this context easily allows researchers and participants who are unfamiliar with one another to build some connection and commonality in a manner that supports the overall experience.

Evaluation 7: The simple, unique, straightforward, well-coordinated, competent nature of the workshop was a great surprise, and these are the elements that would make me strongly recommend the workshop to others. The rhythm and relaxation have a perfect balance.

Evaluation 8: To me, this workshop cleared the many meanings that the word collaboration can have. It also made me grow the will to work more closely to publics. To me the strengths of this workshop are the fact that it supplies simple, but genius strategies to think cooperatively and also to cooperatively do problem-solving. I can't remember, really, of any negative aspect from this inspiring experience.

Evaluation 9: The new schema, which conveys process vs. topic, tangible vs. experiential, the now vs. subsequently, set the scene well. It should be translated into revised bullet point objectives that outsiders can understand, where some of the outsiders may be potential hosts and participants in future open spaces ("flexible engagement") workshops. The new schema also integrated the 4Rs, which could be woven into the descriptions of each phase (or day) of the workshop. Assistants need to be lined up and the organizers should work with them beforehand so that less time is needed in the workshop to keep the locomotive moving forward so that they can nudge the organizer to clear the space needed.

Evaluation 10: I liked the workshop. At the beginning I felt scared and out of my comfort zone, but that was the best part to get into a new thing, a new context. Even if in my work (for now) I couldn't use these tools, certainly I will use them in my every day life and to improve my abilities as a professional.

Evaluation 11: The workshop was highly successful, and it provided an interesting and strong example of how both facilitating and development of collaborative work may shape. I expect that further editions of the workshop, as well as "offshoots" of it in the form of other activities, will take place over the next years.

Evaluation 12: In my perspective this workshop is very well conceived, and has an original structure, and a different way to explore paradigms. This "interaction-intensive" puts all the participants to be active and leads to a multivoicedness environment of sharing ideas, goals and projects. I think that doing this workshop twice, is the best way of improving my participation and taking more advantage from it, because of its originality and intensity, I think that this was a good idea. I really enjoyed it.

Evaluation 13: Retrospectively, the most fascinating part of this experience was to make a daily evolution in my ability to focus on the ideas I have and to share them with others, as well as the growing urge to listen to other's ideas not just as a complement but as a true collaborative work. I already had a perfect notion of how the "urgent" is corroding the "important," but I believe this

workshop gave me some tools to deal more effectively with that problem – or idea to turn it into an advantage, it's "just" a question of discipline, sharing and creativity.

Full Evaluations

Evaluation 1

1) I came into this having a vague sense of what I wanted, which was to improve my thinking towards solving research problems. I definitely achieved that, but through seeing how collaboration itself, and thinking about tangential issues related to my topic can lead to improved clarity on my topic. Since I came into it with a blank slate, and I came out of it feeling great about how I should mentally approach problems, I don't think I would want to have approached it differently. My major personal obstacle was being fairly shy, but the nature of the workshop created an environment that nullified that.

1b) I've learned that the balance of input, and reevaluating one's own thought processes and the process of engaging in a topic are vital. My advice to future participants would be to come in not worrying about not knowing what the end goal is, it's a bad idea to assume you know what you need.

1c) I learned a lot more about what sociologists and anthropologists do, and it's exciting to see that interaction with scientific types of knowledge. It's amazing to hear these types of knowledge and phrases like "knowledge production" and interaction, imperfect knowledge etc all related to understanding a complex process and the many strands with multiple explanations based on who you ask or believe. And yet this workshop seemed to be it plausible that solutions can be attained. There's more but I bet I should keep it more brief.

2) I came into this with no solid expectations, besides that it would likely be interesting. I expected it to be better than my previous experiences with dialoging etc since everyone attending is likely more motivated. My attitude went from interested/apprehensive to very excited and motivated to return to my research. The workshop got a lot better once I was comfortable with everyone, perhaps for transnational workshops the first few activities should be always centered to that end. What is special about this workshop is that rather than being a detailed plan mapping out the premises to the conclusion, it's more of a skeleton that the participants fill in, and I think that creates the great atmosphere. My recommendation would be to come into the workshop with a blank slate like I did.

3) This was my first exposure to these topics, and I think I got a great behind the scenes view into the reality of the sociopolitical/scientific issues involved in health/enviro concerns of my fellow attendees research in Portugal. I think it makes much more sense to me now than when I would see reports on the news, and I feel like others with more experience in these matters gained a lot too. The workshop certainly demystified and contextualized these complex and multidimensional topics.

Evaluation 2

1 a) This workshop enabled me to observe and understand the communicative dynamics of a collective involved in a collaboration. In an upcoming workshop I would have tried to develop and apply a

Arouca workshop evaluations 24/5/2011

methodology that would allow me to map and produce a cognitive ethnography of the collaboration.

1 b) I learned that in a workshop of this kind, the interests will be multiplied around a common line of reflection that is being consolidated collaboratively through a process of intensive dialogue that will alternate between collective discussions, individual moments of reflection and office hours that allow us to talk in pairs. The best way to participate is through the mobilization of our own anxieties and ignorances.

1 c) I learned that in a collaborative process there is a tense relationship between individual projects and the collective common project. I also learned about the Importance of the creation of commitments around this boundary. These commitments will enable the collaboration to become self-sufficient.
2) This workshop met my expectations to make visible the communicative and relational dynamics involved in a collective collaboration. I became more flexible in the relationship between personal interests and collective interests (articulating them in creative ways). I objectify more accurately my interests and concerns and improved my ability to answer questions from others.

To improve the process I believe you could extend the time spent in Office Hours and put more emphasis on daily writing. What touched me the most during the workshop was the creation of conditions to foster communication between colleagues with whom I share office every day and with whom I rarely discuss my personal work. On the other hand I enjoyed the moment of reflection and objectification promoted by daily writing. This differs from other workshops which I attended because really promotes reflection and discussion and thus the production of a collaborative knowledge. I will recommend participation to all.

3)

1. Promote a PBL exercise in which participants perceive the limits of their individual disciplinary knowledge, and how such partial knowledge can help resolve and clarify the various ignorances mobilized.

2. Clarify the flexibility of the boundaries between individual and collective projects and demonstrate how they both feed off each other.

3. Enhance the perception of the merits of each of the exercises developed during the workshop to produce lines of collective and individual knowledge.

4. At the end of the workshop produce, by email, and in a collaborative manner, an improved structure for a future workshop, which incorporates the experiences and views of the earlier workshop.

5. Mapping the dynamics of the collaborations developed at the workshop.

6. Create a collaborative platform that brings together all the participants of these workshops.

Evaluation 3

1) After taking part in this workshop I started to think on practical terms about the fieldwork, about the

Arouca workshop evaluations 24/5/2011

inherent characteristics of the people I would talk to and maybe the most important thing I have realized the importance of thinking about the vocabulary used.

On the first day I found myself searching for guides or tools in order to evaluate both the personal and the group work that was being done on the complexity studies, specifically on the Portuguese forestal case. As result of the lack of those guides and tools as well as the continued meditation/reflection it led me to the thought of necessity of autodiscipline habits (freewriting, thinking about how to solve specific situations). If I were given the opportunity of retaking the workshop once again, I would be more focused on learning and assimilating the discussions and considerations rather than on paying too much attention to understand the language, that means, for the next time I should have a better knowledge on/of English.

1b) I learned that working outside office encourages the analysis of the own daily dynamics and interpersonal relationships, it also promotes the search of new approaches to known problems. In order to obtain the most productive experience from this workshop, I would definitely advice to the new participants to be open-minded and to have the best disposition not only to listen to others but also to expose their own personal and professional ideas.

1c) I learned that the collective construction of knowledge can be understood as a sequence of groups one inside the other. The way these groups interact (one with each other), the mutual goals, depends on the interests and capabilities they own.

2) Before the workshop started, I was expecting a general frame for the approaching of studies of complexity studies, instead of this, I positively found a space for constantly sharing group ideas. Even though the exciting sensation of being in the middle of crossfire of ideas, the effort I had to make to understand as much as possible let me exhausted and practically blocked.

The general intensity and dynamism of the workshop must be highlighted; it promotes the focusing and reflection from participants, on the other hand it can also result mentally and emotional demanding. In order to avoid this overload of work, it could [be] interesting to incorporate some less-formal dynamics.

I found special in this workshop the amount of original activities, it is a place designed for learning to listen. Nevertheless, when I compare it to other workshops structured according to participatory action research, it results [were] little playful.

I believe the workshop could [be] interesting for all people looking for a space for critical reflection and with the aim of generating a change in their daily way of acting.

3) In my opinion, all the goals were thoroughly fulfilled. The schedule and activities were well structured and led to know the general working model. Activities were explained and evaluated with help from participation rounds. Group discussions were focused on contextualizing the individual skills in the work done as well as on relating/connecting the academic work to (the) society.

Since this was the first workshop in Portugal I took part in, it [is] difficult to make a contrast between American and Portuguese ways to conduct them. I consider that the final evaluation on the impact

produced by the workshop will come within the following weeks, since we will have the opportunity to put into practice the knowledge and tools acquired (during the workshop).

Evaluation 4

1a) My personal goals were a “team diagnostics” of the proximity we established in our workplace in terms of enabling the creation of a laboratory of social sciences.” I learned that daily proximity is not enough; structure for enabling research discussion is needed. It also led me to question my “role” in team building and help to create a good research environment, and how I can renegotiate or change the collective at CES. I also achieved personal goals of connecting better with the IBMC team. And feeling less “stuck” and “afraid” and feeling more confident to move forward. Some of the tools too and problem-based learning mostly. I had the time during this workshop to listen more to the team and their anxieties, even when they were not talking - especially when they were not talking. This observation came back to me to rethink my own expectations towards them and make the necessary adjustments. If I did the workshop again, I would like to think of an activity to develop. A major personal obstacle is that I feel tired and must conform to rhythms where I do not have most of my attention and capacities running.

1b) To start, it is necessary to get out of the daily routine. A new routine is established and structured to facilitate collaborations and re-engagement between people that previously knew each other. And this re-engagement is productive. Listening to others and... writing forces you to critically think and reflect upon others suggestions. This iterative set of the pool of ideas each gives is very productive. For future participants, I would say bring an open mind and be prepared to give something of yourself.

1c) I learned facilitation methods and a lot of “loose ends” from discussion such as trying to find thoughts from new discussions, but also pay equal attention to the collaborations already ongoing and the collaborations that may be established in the future. Intensive workshops create a place for experimental assessment of the background of the participants and their capacities to interact. The theme of environment and health was not brought up to the discussions in its specificities. Collaboration did.

3. Promote said contextualization of science. I don't know the narrative I suppose.

Evaluation 5

1a. Through the participation in this workshop I could see that there are practical, rather simple ways, to put aside some existential concerns in regard to the work I'm developing. If I was to participate again, I would pick the brain of those more senior in a more extensive / intensive manner as to get the most of their own experiences. I would also try to interact more with the new people I got to meet, as in opposition to seek refuge amongst the group I already did know. This tendency to remain within a certain comfort zone was the major personal obstacle that hindered me from getting more out of the workshop.

1b. Diversity, alternating between quiet personal time to write and think and collective debate and discussion time, was of paramount importance to me. The sharing of what we thought and wrote

Arouca workshop evaluations 24/5/2011

allowed to realize that everything we think and say is OK, that there is no right or wrong within this context. I would advise prospective participants to not be afraid at all to share their thoughts and speak out their minds.

1c. I've learned that no matter how distant the fields of knowledge, each participant brings, there are always, and in some cases surprisingly strong, common grounds and / or points of contact. That all fields of knowledge can be connected and intersected to produce more new, robust and meaningful knowledge.

2) The workshop met more than my expectations, since I didn't set any particular expectations. I came into the workshop with certain reluctance or skepticism, but those feelings vanished away completely the very first day. A very positive aspect to me was exactly this shift in emotions, since I found myself craving more, rather than to keep being reluctant. This doesn't actually compare with any other workshop I've attended. The tendency has always been to follow the expectations of the teacher, rather than our own. My overall recommendation to prospective participants would be to let go of what they think is a workshop and just let themselves be surprised, and to actively engage in participation.

3) Almost all of the goals for the workshop were met, except for maybe goal 5 and 6, in a rather surprisingly efficient manner. Since I didn't have the US-context experience, I find that goal 5 is thus unattainable for me. But I did find that it did give social contextualization of the work and research I'm pursuing, I could really feel the innovative workshop processes, it has built up my capacities, very surprisingly, and I do see the potential to replicate a similar workshop even if it applied to different objectives.

Evaluation 6

1a.

I got some new insights about collaborative process (i.e. negotiation, compromise, ignorance as common ground). I also felt like I took my support role for the facilitation process more formally and much like a participant. I think my own internal dialogues about not performing or being disappointing got in the way of me really getting more out of the experience.

1b.

I really found the personal interactions with the researchers from CES/IBMC the most stimulating. Seeing the commonalities and differences of institutional settings was particularly interesting. I had some insights that my own experience in community-based settings might prove to be more useful than I would have thought. I would tell future participants to really engage in the processes and not worry so much about "product" outcomes and to enjoy the interpersonal dynamics and reflect on those.

1c.

Again, I think the insights I got from Daniel and Rita were particularly important to me – these ideas about negotiation, compromise, ignorance, mapping interactions in the field, understanding the interpersonal dynamics of a situation.

2.

I think the workshop met my expectations quite well. I had hoped to gain some insights into how

participants in this workshop were similar and different than participants in the previous Woods Hole workshop. I think I have a much better understanding of the particular constraints, challenges and opportunities of researcher here. I started to see over the four days how processes such as daily writing, office hours, etc. could really act as transformative concepts for individual and group work. These activities seemed even more meaningful to this group than the group in Woods Hole. It seems to me the self-adjustment is built into the design of the workshop; improvements are constantly being incorporated. It seems for this particular group, the dialogue process was not as dynamic or engaging with only a very few people participating. I am not sure if this is about culture norms, the structure of the process, linguistic issues, or group dynamics. The overall structure feels open and inviting, yet bounded which differs from both the formal and open space activities I've been involved in. Prospective participants would benefit from a mindset that embraces the flexible and adaptive nature of the program as well as feel empowered to participate actively.

3.

In terms of promoting the social contextualization of science, this group already seemed well versed and involved in these activities. I do think the workshop gave space for participants to explore deeper their own work in these areas and inquire more about the role of the social scientist within scientific environments. The innovative workshop processes were clearly embraced by the group and created a good deal of enthusiasm about the possibilities for such tools in their own work. Even more than the Woods Hole group, these researchers seemed to conceptualize and understand how new processes for collaborative, engagement and learning environments might transform, focus and improve their individual research as well as the research done at the project and institutional levels. These processes were definitely presented in a manner that explained the relevance and potential for the tools to be used in different settings. Peter was sure to make transparent some of the thinking behind the tools and process as well provide encouragement that these could be used beyond this specific setting. The workshop activities evolved even in the context of this 4-day workshop and all materials and activities are or will be made available to the participants via the wiki. Also, the structure and process of each workshop activity was consciously articulated and present. While individuals may not walk away with the capacity to present activities in exactly the same manner, I do think there is enough structure, documentation, and personal experience with the activity to practice and adapt to other settings. In terms of studying the evolution of the workshop dynamics from the U.S. to Portuguese setting, I only have the one Woods Hole workshop to compare. However, the activities and overall design of the workshop worked for both groups. There were variations between the groups, but enough core activities to make comparisons. It seems that building openness into the framework is part of the value here. I also saw how challenging it is to be really attuned to a particular group and think about how to adapt and design activities on the fly is. The connections for researchers at CES and IBMC seemed particularly strengthened and I know for myself, I could see strong links between my own individual research interests and those of others in the CES/IBMC team.

Evaluation 7

1a) I was able to widen my thought about all sorts of subjects. The fact that you want always try to think without the pressure of the expected or desired released me to new grounds of questioning and analyzing subjects, due to the open nature of the workshop. Besides, I have found new methodologies that were close to, if not exactly, what I needed in this specific phase of my life. If I attended this workshop again, I wouldn't have the surprise factor, but I would be totally prepared to give even more

Arouca workshop evaluations 24/5/2011

of myself. My major personal obstacles how to do with the last couple of months, in which I have been really tired, working a lot and taking huge decisions about my life that have been worrying me and filling my head. If I was less anxious and more relaxed, I would have seized it more.

1b) The presence of a lot of co-workers and friends would lead you to think that you already knew everything about them. Yet, the “interaction-intensive” model allows you to search new forum of knowledge, interaction and ideas. The more you talk, the more you generate words and ideas that ease your work and personal / professional enterprise. To take the most from a workshop like this, you need to be relaxed, clear-headed, focused and concentrated, as it is quite intense, dense and fulfilling.

1c) As in the most recent activity, I have learned how to be creative, innovative and autonomous when putting up personal / professional projects. Also, personal biographies have taught me that sometimes you can be capable of developing something truly useful and pertinent. To conclude, I would say that my PhD focuses on cancer, the relationship that it establishes with these themes is fundamental for my research.

2. As said, I was quite tense and worried with other things before I came here. Yet, not long after[wards] I “found” (especially after day two) some answers and new ways of thinking started to emerge. And this is not usual in me. Generally, some anxiety takes over when I have to question things. Now I think that anxiety will not be as present as before. So my expectations were largely suppressed. It is useful for everything. As for the attitude, I guess that after day 1, I got really comfortable in the workshop, due to the way it was conducted.

I think the workshop is very good or it is the only negative part was the acoustic of the room. The positive was also to provide instruments and rituals to my professionally daily life. This was, I think, the most dense workshop I have ever been in. And the most creative and pro-active as well. I am really happy with it. And of course, creative writing and office hours are creating.

3.

- 1) perfectly attained goal, due to the diverse backgrounds from all people.
- 2) The most valuable part of the workshop for me.
- 3) Good, yet regular, as this will be the part that I will not use as often, I guess.
- 4) Inevitably necessary. I think that each time you participate in a workshop I take profit from more diverse subjects. I can definitely looking forward to participate in the next one.
- 5) All advantages, because the workshop, unlike several Portuguese workshops, is simple, direct and straightforward, which is something you don't often find in Portugal.
- 6) This part will be useful in a few months after the workshop.

Evaluation 8

1) My personal goals were, during this workshop, constantly being clarified, as I also could add new questions that were raised, and emerged from my dialogues with other participants. I could proceed differently if I did this workshop again, because this experience add so much value and new skills to think, that if I did it again, and again, it would only enrich my participation. I would be clearly more confident about myself and my capacity to share ideas and problems with other participants.

Arouca workshop evaluations 24/5/2011

1b) I learned by that focusing in earning, relating to my experience, silent reflection after, either if there are similarities or tensions in the experience there is always a product.

1c) I finally could grab the whole different notions of what collaboration might mean.

2) The workshop exceeded my expectations. And, during the 4 days, I could from day to day feel the change on how my knowledge on how to direct my thought and I would I exercise problematizing and problem-solving in my future work and continuity of what I have right now in hands. What was special to me in this workshop was the fact that I felt free to share my main difficulties as a researcher, and to find some comfort in a sort of advice, alternative strategies that I discover, and sometimes I could even feel a type of group therapy for researchers talking going on. My recommendation to future participants would be to get involved, with no [holding] back, and to feel free to share their difficulties and anxieties typical of a researcher career.

3) I think that in general the objectives of the NewSSC workshop were very well met, I couldn't think of any other insight.

Evaluation 9

Personal goals: to learn enough about each person's project that I could see how to design and facilitate activities that would be engaging. I don't know very much about the projects, but I learned that the process tools were appreciated and was able to design activities accordingly. If I were doing the workshop again, I would carve out time to communicate with each participant beforehand and not have other commitments during the workshop, but I would also assume that a full picture of what the participants want would emerge from interactions during the workshop.

1b) For the workshop to be stimulating and productive is not difficult with participants who have self-selected and are interested in collaborative processes – just use the tools and sequencing of NewSSC. My advice to prospective organizers is to have multiple assistants – facilitator of logistics, cat herder, sounding board for evaluation.

1c) Learned: People talk about it more than do it (myself included). People like to do it in the workshop setting and express “revelations” and “reengagement.” Europe is different from USA about the ways public express their voices and eventually get heard. The tension between small-scale even soft collaboration and involvement in large networks should be acknowledged and kept in play.

2. General: Expectations. The update of NewSSC processes was enthusiastic and the flexibility of the Portuguese to be structured was appreciated. In both cases, I didn't know if that could be expected. Evaluation happened as I realized the processes could be the product– we didn't have to articulate theory, cases or practices around specific cases. Improvements could come from having multiple assistants to force me to converse with more participants and to do warm-up conversations in advance so as to have a better enthusiasm of participants – my being too tired from late night and early morning work on non-workshop things. + Assistance from Felicia on context and process. + Engagement of both U.S. students in the experience. Advice to others: come and explore the “open space.”

3. Objectives. 1. Met a little. More precirculated writing could help. 2. Met well. 3. Met well. Develop more opportunities / structure for participants to practice facilitating. 4. We did reviews of each session and this evaluation. Now we need to process them and reflect back before plunging into another workshop. 5. Remains to be seen. 6. Lots of connections. Need to spend Weds. and Thurs. making this more concrete.

Evaluation 10

I didn't have any expectations about the workshop, not any specific goal so all I learned was winning something. Now that I know a little bit more about the workshop, maybe I could understand better the objectives and be more productive in the activities, more oriented to what is expected.

I have no familiar[ity with] sociology, and know nothing about social research and / or collaborative processes of knowledge construction, so everything was completely new to me. Besides, usually I have to be very quiet, clear, goal oriented, concerned with the project and here I had to put that aside and have other worries like the process.

1b) I think that the activities we did here were very interesting and I'm thinking I'll use them somehow. Also I learned that focusing on an issue and having time constraints for each task is important as well as focus participants attention on the activity. I would suggest to other people to don't be afraid of share ideas, say what they think, even if it seems stupid, to engage in sharing ideas.

1c) I learned some useful methods/ techniques to use in collaborative knowledge production, that we can always learn something with others, that sometimes people attribute very different meaning to the same thing. When we have no expectation, it is difficult to make such an evaluation. Anyway, the beginning I was quite scared because I was a total outsider, but during the four days I began to feel more comfortable and to understand better what was that of collaboration and of sociology, and of collaborative construction of knowledge. I think that maybe if we had a more specific issue to discuss it would make more easy, but this opinion is probably influenced by the fact that I'm too much goal oriented and product oriented.

Most of the workshops I have done had teachers explaining things and then the participants did activities (practical) to practice the "theoretical" classes, so this workshop was completely different.

2. I think that participants must be open to different things, to share their knowledge, their ideas.

3. The only goal that I feel that was not totally achieved was to promote social contextualization of science, because I think we obtained the tools to do this promotion in the future. We get some tools and the promotion will be done (I hope it will) in the future. I think we learned very interesting workshop processes, we trained in the skills to use this and instruments, and we established connections.

Evaluation 11

Arouca workshop evaluations 24/5/2011

1) My goals were to try and find productive ways of promoting collaborative work within and across projects. The workshop provided a lot of ideas, resources and models for collective engagement which responded to these goals. I found no particular obstacle to this, particularly owing first to the design of the workshop which encouraged active engagement in collaboration and to my previous experience with this sort of workshop. I would probably expand the PBL session to allow participants (in groups) to define their own PBL activities in further iterations of the workshop.

1b) The idea of bringing together a group of people who were clearly working together, but not making the most of the possibilities for collaborative work, was really productive. It would be interesting to adapt some of the practices used (office hours, collaborative engagement with PBL, daily writing) to introduce some ?? in daily working habits and in the organization of work of a small group or an institutional project team.

1c) I was particularly taken by the capabilities shown by participants is actually and easily move into a collaborative mode, largely owing to their sharing of research interests and approach, but also to the creation of an environment encouraging these engagements.

2) The workshop met my expectations and more. Again, being a workshop for people who had some experience of joint work offered a setting where you could compare current practices with new possibilities opened up by an experimental, friendly environment. This is one difference with the Woods Hole workshop which is usually attended by a more heterogeneous set of people. That often requires that some kind of identification of common interests of people with different backgrounds to be a significant part of the workshop. We need both kinds of workshops to address both kinds of participants.

3. Workshop objectives / goals.

1. Although we did not address explicitly the topic of social contextualization of science as a topic on its own, we ended up dealing with it as part of the activities, but particularly through the discussion of practices for addressing this as part of collaborative work. Although disciplinary backgrounds were important for the way participants framed their interventions and contributions, it did not work as an obstacle for collaborative engagement (if even provided room for the encouragement of it!)

2. We were able to come up with some innovative development of techniques and approaches and to steer them towards all concerns of the research projects (both personal and collaborative) of participants. I believe the workshop was part successful for this.

3. The workshop provides, if not a model, at least a set of very important resources for training, but it could well be used for further training activities. We are taking with us a set of tools for engaging with issues related to collaborative research and engagement which are already being discussed as to how they could be utilized in other work settings beyond the workshop.

4. I believe that this workshop should be taken as the first in a continuing series, will ?? which could be adapted to evolving ideas associated with collaborative work in the fields covered (life sciences, health, environment and society). It would be desirable to make it a yearly event, complementary to

NewSSC in Woods Hole, if possible. Getting the resources to do it would be a major goal, and we should explore possibilities of formal cooperation between UMass and our institutions/centers for this purpose.

5. In Portugal, this type of workshop is still unusual, and it interferes [?] strongly with current academic practices and culture. To have successfully organized this first edition is itself an achievement, which we should work on to continue and to expand.

6. The building of fruitful students connections has yet to be worked though, but these are already some conditions in place (for instance, graduate students from Coimbra or Porto who want to spend some time of their PhD work in Boston...) which will make it possible to make this a robust compact of the institutions, through new kinds of formal agreement between institutions in the 2 countries.

Evaluation 12

1. In this four days I've discussed a lot of my personal PhD project and the project were I'm working, currently, and this was my main goal with this training course. Perhaps, if I would participate in the same workshop in the future, I would go more prepared theoretically, in order to the discussion of my projects could be more fruitful. Thinking about my major problem, or my personal obstacle, I would say that it was the fact that I'm still on the first stage of my PhD project, and because of that, I didn't explore as much as I could the tools that I could developed in this particular context.

1b) What have I learned about making an "interaction-intensive" . . . many things. First that we can build critical thinking in short time and express it to a group of people. And that "premise" was very productive and stimulated a lot the exchange of ideas among participants. This interaction was, indeed, very intensive but also helped a lot to the group dynamic.

1c) I've learned that is not very easy (actually, I've already known that) to establish collaborative research, but I've seen that most of my concern are shared by other participants. I've also learned that collaborative work demands some particular goals, and makes the process more complicated, but the final product is way much better. Even though I continue to say that is complex.

2. I had some expectations, especially related to share ideas among other researchers. And on this matter, my expectations were fulfilled completely. My attitudes were changing through the four days in what concerns the adaptation to this format. I didn't know what to expect from the workshop structure / format and I think that after the first day was tha I needed to understand the structure. I've stayed more confident, or more comfortable thinking. "So, this is how it goes!" Another issue that was improved through the four days was the adaptation to the group. Most of the group already knew each other, and I needed to know them better. But with this kind of workshop format, for instance the "office hours," I felt that coming very naturally. The group dynamic was very well created. I'm [sure] it should work very well when all participants are strangers for each other.

Perhaps an idea to improve this workshop is to give the participants more "material" to prepare previously. This workshop had one thing very positive, that was the daily writing connected to the critical thinking developed the day before. The negative aspect, I would instead say, the aspect that worked worst, would probably the food (which has nothing to do with the workshop itself).

Connecting again with positive aspects, this was totally different from any other workshop I've done especially in the "interaction-intensive" structure. And that was very interesting.

Evaluation 13

1. My goals, as I stated in the beginning of the workshop, was to learn more about how to engage (myself and others) in collaborative research processes, mainly related to health and environment. So, this workshop was spot-on. I think that not having paid much attention to the program and other materials (due to lack of time) was not a problem – on the contrary, I found myself surprised with myself several times during the workshop. The only personal problem I can identify right now was the need – and my difficulty with – sitting for long periods

1b) The autobiographical introduction and engaging the participants in a process of discussing their ideas as a part of a group of ideas, and not just having each one's ideas discussed by each of the other participants.

1c) Listening, relating other's experiences to your own, everyone's ideas and [insights] can be relevant, even if they don't appear to be at first, getting to know the trajectory and expectations of the people you're working with.

2) The workshop mostly exceeded my expectations. I had never attended / participated in anything like this. All the other initiatives (comparable initiatives) I participated in were too "teaching – oriented," in the sense that someone teaches the participants something, almost like a mini-lecture, and then the participants are asked to perform one or two tasks that are suppose to more or less conforming to the "lecture" part. I believe this "minimal" structure of guided exercises in which we had to be aware of our own ideas and related theme with the rest of the participants ideas and experiences is much more useful. My only advise to prospective participants is to go as free of pre-conceptions (and even specific expectations), to be available, willing to share. As for improvement and suggestions, I just think that a more "loose" use of the space where the workshop's main activities take place would be beneficial.

3) Like I said before, in the previous questions, I think the goals of the workshop were entirely met. I believe that for me the main benefit was to evolve in the way I perform my daily tasks and plan my longer-term research objectives, which are all, although in different ways, collaborative.