EVALUATION

Learning Outcomes

How helpful was the course overall?

Comment (8 people):
- Very good intro to I2S and uncertainty. (rated 5)
- Very helpful, it open (sic) a window I did not expect to explore in my research career (rated 5)
- I would love to participate in a course which teaches about fresh thinking (methods) & providing research support for decision making (rated 5)
- New insights into integration and uncertainty (rated 5)
- Esp session on uncertainty —plays major role in ‘verbalizing’ context (rated 4)
- Was hoping for more tools (rated 3)
- Possibly useful for future, not so much now (rated 3)
- Gave me a few leads to explore (rated 3)

Not at all  | Moderately | Very
--- | --- | ---
1 | 2 (1) | 3 (6) | 4 (15) | 5 (8)

Median 4, range 2-5

How helpful was the course in providing you with a better understanding of the integration tasks you confront?

Comment: (7 comments)
- I now understand that what I thought was a multidisciplinary approach to research isn’t the case anymore. More grounded (rated 5)
- I think perhaps in the field of creative practice & art, it would be greatly helpful to develop an understanding of larger numbers of specific examples (the techniques suggested appear rather science oriented) (rated 4.5)
- Great to get a structure (rated 4)
- However ‘integration’ has the negative connotation of discrete assembly (rated 4)
- Would have needed more conceptual examples (rated 3)
- I don’t have many integration tasks now (rated 3)
- Too early to tell properly (rated 3)

Not at all  | Moderately | Very
--- | --- | ---
1 | 2 (3) | 3 (9) | 4 (12) | 4.5 (1) | 5 (5)

Median 4, range 2-5

How helpful were the six questions for thinking about integration?

Comment: (8 comments)
- Validated what I had already done, and gave further insight into what needs to be done (rated 5)
- Brilliant structure and framework. Will be very helpful in designing & writing parts of thesis too I think (rated 5)
- Helped me think conceptually and set boundaries (rated 5)
- Very good (rated 5)
- I believe the ‘six questions’ are the most valuable input from the course (rated 5)
- ‘One’ of possible scaffolds (rated 4)
- Too early to tell properly (rated 4)
- Did not like boundaries. This wouldn’t work in my research. Needed more examples to get a better idea of what was meant (rated 2).

Not at all  | Moderately | Very
--- | --- | ---
1 | 2 (3) | 3 (0) | 4 (12) | 5 (15)

Median 4.5, range 2-5
### How helpful was the course in assisting you to think in new ways about what you don’t know?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>It showed paths for future thinking (rated 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Increased my confidence and ability to discriminate more comfortable and confident about what I know and equally about what I don’t know (no punctuation) (rated 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Theories led me to find new research questions (rated 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More useful in recognizing how important uncertainty is socially, not so much for research (rated 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reinforcement (rated 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think I had a reasonable awareness of some of these things already (rated 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: (6 comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median 4, range 1-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### How helpful was the course in helping you to meet like-minded peers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Part of the problem is realizing the genericity (sic) of the issues (rated 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Great lunch, and I have one possible contact! (rated 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>It was a really learning experience (sic). A creative environment (rated 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I found it really exciting to meet people in disciplines that I’m scared of – eg Physics – Steve Lade is a delightful ‘Lade-back’ ambassador for Physics (rated 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very good networking (rated 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was interesting to hear about such diverse fields, &amp; their problems &amp; achievements (rated 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not enough time to talk to others in group exercises (rated 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probably ? to do ? → only ‘social scientist’ proper in attendance (cant’ read) (rated 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: (8 comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median 4, range 2-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Content & Delivery

#### How appropriate was the depth of the content?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>I would have enjoyed more depth (rated 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About Right</td>
<td>Appropriate for length of course (rated 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Deep</td>
<td>Balanced for 1-day course (rated 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Given time available it was good (rated 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to have more info about the tools for integ (rated 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Could be more (rated 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doing course in methodologies of health that covered this (rated 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: (7 comments)

| Median 3, range 1-4 |

#### How appropriate was the breadth of the content?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>I would like to have more info about the tools for integ (rated 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About Right</td>
<td>Focused adequately on surface skim (rated 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Broad</td>
<td>Afternoon was very interesting, but unsure how relevant it is for integration! (rated 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to learn about ’managing uncertainty’ in inter/multi/trans-disciplinary research as well (rated 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wanted to know how this related to my research (rated 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Could be more (rated 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: (6 comments)

| Median 3, range 2-4 |
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### How suitable was the structure, ie mix of presentations, reflection and small and large group discussion?

Comment: (2 comments)
A good mix, but maybe a touch more didactic to get the basics of I2S over (rated 4)
Good but not enough detail (rated 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (17)</td>
<td>4.5 (1)</td>
<td>5 (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median 4, range 3-5

### How suitable was the length of the course?

Comment: (11 comments)
Very good for an introduction, which is what I wanted. I wouldn’t have signed up for anything more than a day (rated 5)
A longer course (eg 2 day course) to cover a wider range of issues also would be greatly beneficial & appreciated! (rated 4.5)
It would be wonderful to delve into it more (rated 4)
More would have been wonderful (rated 4)
Great as an intro – I wanted more time to look at specific tools (rated 3)
A whole-day workshop was good but for next time it would be interesting to have weekly short meetings to have time to process information (rated 3)
Could be a two-day course and address the other 2 ‘orphans’ too (rated 3)
Longer is better (rated 3)
Too short! Another day would have been great to cover the other two aspects: intractable problems and decision making (rated 3)
Maybe more time, or one on one would enable concepts to be better explored. Forum? Small focus group (10 people) (rated 2)
Should be longer (rated 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (9)</td>
<td>4.5 (1)</td>
<td>5 (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median 4, range 2-5

### Quality & Value

#### How would you rate the quality of presentations overall?

Comment: (2 comments)
Pithy (rated 5)
Less reliance on powerpoint presentations has greater impact (rated 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (8)</td>
<td>5 (19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median 5, range 3-5

#### How would you rate the quality of discussion overall?

Comment: (2 comments)
Occasionally got bogged down in irrelevancies, mainly in small groups. Gabriele v good at keeping broader discussion focused (rated 4)
Some of the discussion drifted too much toward personal, very particular cases away from the purpose of the sessions (rated 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (10)</td>
<td>4.5 (1)</td>
<td>5 (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median 4, range 3-5

#### Did the course generally meet your expectations?

Comment: (3 comments)
For the planned course, it met my expectations very well (rated 5)
My expectations were not high but it did exceed them (rated 4)
Was looking for generic introduction [\_] (rated 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>3 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (12)</td>
<td>4.5 (1)</td>
<td>5 (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median 4, range 1-5
What was the most important thing you will take away from the course?

Comment: (26 comments)
Reinforcement.
Importance of uncertainty in my life!
More confidence about the validity and possibility of such kind of research and practice.
Being clear up front on where to draw your boundaries.
The idea of using a system diagram and the triangle as a way of setting boundaries on my research.
That it is possible to integrate AND rate it coherent! And the 6 things.
The systematic approach to integration research – the 6 questions and boundary setting.
The six questions – good company and network.
The six questions & all the things I don’t know.
The six questions for thinking about integration.
Six questions for thinking about integration.
The six questions.
I discovered holes in my [incomplete.]
The material in session 1 on what the I2S project is.
Better understanding of I2S framework.
Connections with people, with ideas, with processes.
For my current study, a realization that I need to actively engage with someone on a field which is turning out to have particular relevance. More generally, ideas for tools to open minds & break up assumptions.
That I’m not alone!
I feel lucky having a supervisor who does interdisciplinary work because I now understand how lost many others are.
That black sheep herded together provide mutual reassurance ☺
It provided structure for limiting what I draw from other disciplines, for dropping theory that may have limiting assumptions tied to its particular discipline, and confidence to fully pursue this type of work as a fully legitimate choice despite criticism and lack of understanding from more traditional scholars and practitioners.
Increased awareness and options for future directions.
Contact with broad range of subject content, with similar issues re research generally.
A conclusion to my PhD.
An understanding that academic research is incredibly insular (this person was largely negative).
That integration is being done and still has a long way to go (this person was largely negative).

What was the most disappointing thing you’ll remember from the course?

Comment: (15 responses; with another 3 people writing ‘none’ (one adding ‘it was all good’), 5 putting lines in the space and one putting ?)
That I didn’t take it earlier in the course of my study.
Looking forward to further development of the principles of I2S and ? approaches [cant read].
Nothing was really disappointing → perhaps just longer.
Discussion → too noisy? But active!
Lack of ability to distinguish between ‘I2S specialist’ and ‘manager’.
Lack of acknowledgement of disciplines of management and program/project planning and evaluation.
Almost no content dealing with intractable problems.
Group discussion often became a little rudderless – dare I say it, it was a little too interactive.
Sometimes the discussions were a bit broad. Would not say disappointing, but maybe more moderation in future?
Not much! Some discussions in my small group were more fruitful than others.
Not enough time to have unstructured semistuctured discussion (sic).
I expected more tools would be offered to deal with multi/inter/transdisciplinary research, possibly to develop approaches.
Didn’t find out about different research methodologies from other disciplines eg other than social sciences.
That cross-discipline research can be quite parallised and there is not yet ways to bridge this (sic) ((this person was largely negative)
The long table at dinner made more separation than I would like.
Wraps would be a better choice for lunch (than the sandwiches provided).
How would you describe this course to your colleagues?  
Comment: (7 comments)  
1 (1) a waste  
2 (1) so-so  
3 (5) informative  
4 (13) worth it  
5 (10) take it!  
Median 4, range 1-5

Just do it! (rated 5)  
DEFINITELY! (rated 5)  
DEFINITELY! (rated 5)  
Though I recognize that there is a certain set of  
personalities/study types which will find it more  
useful/acceptable than others (rated 5)  
Depending on their research area (rated 4)  
Valuable to meet other people doing interdisciplinary research  
(rated 4)  
Wanted more info about how to incorporate uncertainty and  
integrate disciplines in my research. (rated 2)

Recommendations & Requests

What is the best way to improve the course?  
Comment: (21 comments)  
I cant think of anything  
Have some tasks to find out our limits of knowledge  
Maybe 1 or 2 more presenters?  
Wider room!  
Covering more issues during an extended course  
More content just together [cant really read]  
I think the introductions could have been shorter and maybe more focused.  
More time as ? (cant read)  
More help to complete Gabriele’s exercise. Perhaps some specific examples.  
Details of methods (toolkits) that relate to different disciplines especially product-based, visions and  
dialogue.  
More clearly define audience. Is it for (in the lingo I now know) multi- or trans- disciplinary only or multi- as  
well (sic)  
A little more early on on the specifics of the propose I2S discipline & discussion was good but I felt needed  
a touch more ‘scaffolding’ (hard to read)  
Have it connect to a ‘next step’  
Perhaps narrower background range (eg separate ones for scientists, economists, artists etc) so there is  
less gulfs to cross between participants (there is enough within participants!)  
Make it a two-day course; more speakers; mix of lectures & group discussion & tasks, different tasks for  
different groups  
Emphasis on the ‘fresh thinking on intractable problems’  
A better venue, as the long and thin arrangement means it is very difficult to feel involved as a whole group.  
More information about methodologies for addressing recurrent concerns in tackling complex problems.  
What methods are useful for quantitative and qualitative multidisciplinary research.  
More tasks?More specific but shorter tasks? Or maybe not. Was pretty good as it is.  
More unstructured time for free discussion amongst participants.  
Needs more of a balance in the arts. At the moment it is very focused on objectivity. Needs to also look at  
the opportunity of subjectivity & acknowledging this. (this person was largely negative)

On which topics would you attend an advanced module?  
Comment:  
Uncertainty  
Managing uncertainty  
Risk (& threat)  
Managing ignorance
**Introduction to Research Integration for Knowledge and Action**  
**8-9 September 2008**

I2S framework. Integrative research design/toolkits  
Model-based approach to integration [how]  
Integration of social sciences and creative practice  
I would love to learn more about the specific tools  
A/A (can’t read) Integrating disciplinary practice knowledge as opposed to decision making and practice change (unclear)  
Methodology for integration, perhaps  
Methodology  
Complexity scientists, practice-based research (relationship between research and practice), systems theory, ecosystemics  
Tools  
Methods and above (fresh thinking on intractable problems)  
Ways of thinking about integration  
How to integrate?  
It would be great to work in a team to try to apply the 6 steps to a problem.  
Bridging health and politics (this person was largely negative).  
Systems thinking; tools for integrating different approaches; managing uncertainty  
Dialogue methods’ ‘models’ (?) – probably better for me to learn on my own  
Integration tools; how to communicate among scientists from different disciplines

Would you be interested in taking the 6-week accredited courses? (Knowledge Integration; Managing Uncertainty; Research, Policy, Practice)

1. Knowledge Integration  
2. Managing Uncertainty  
3. Research, Policy, Practice

[marked all 3 courses] BUT I couldn’t take 6 weeks at this point unfortunately.  
[No to courses] Not at this stage. Perhaps later in PhD.  
[Three marked maybe] Need to see course outline  
[Knowledge integration marked maybe] I’d need “knowledge integration” more specifically defined to make a decision.  
[yes to all] subject to being able to cope with the workload!  
[three marked maybe] I’m very time constrained.

**Other Comments, Recommendations, Requests?**

Comment:  
PLEASE, keep up the good work! Thanx 😊  
Put me on your mailing list  
Great course for networking. Good idea to start the evening before. Thank you!  
I agree interdisciplinarity is the way of the future. I hope the future arrives soon!  
Thanks for your organization, wisdom and humour.  
Thanks so much. It was fantastic overall. Kudos on a job well done 😊  
I enjoyed it very much. It was more a touch on things than a deep engagement with the material. I would like to do more. Thanks for organizing it!  
Thoroughly enjoyed mandated dinner on Monday night!  
I appreciate the work that went into the excellent organization of this workshop. Well done and thank you. Helpful course!  
Listening to all the concluding comments, it is obvious that this course is needed. However, I do find it strange that these issues have not been talked about (this person was largely negative)  
The structure was excellent… particularly hosting an ice-breaking dinner the night before. Food is a common language.

Thank you for your feedback!