



Condensed Responses to the Evaluation of the 1st Annual Meeting

This document is a review of the feedback on the first meeting of the Collaborative for Community Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions held in Nashville, TN February 16-18, 2005. Thirty-four completed evaluations, and a number of emailed comments on the meeting were received. The results of the questions are reported here as an overview statement capturing the main issues and selected comments for the open-ended questions, and as frequencies of responses for the closed ended questions. If you participated in the meeting and have not completed an evaluation, or have additional comments to share, please email Christine Rutherford-Stuart at cers@u.washington.edu.

	Exceeded Expectations	Met All Expectations	Met Most Expectations	Expectations Not Met
1. To create a shared understanding of the project's goals and objectives	8 (24%)	20 (59%)	6 (18%)	0 (0%)
2. To build knowledge about community engaged scholarship and institutional change	5 (15%)	17 (50%)	11 (32%)	1 (3%)
3. To create a culture of shared learning	8 (24%)	17 (50%)	7 (21%)	2 (6%)
4. To develop team-based action plans	4 (12%)	20 (59%)	6 (18%)	4 (12%)
5. To develop Collaborative-wide action plans	5 (15%)	10 (29%)	16 (47%)	3 (9%)
6. To achieve consensus on project documentation, learning and assessment strategies	3 (9%)	11 (34%)	10 (31%)	8 (25%)

	Extremely Useful	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful
7. Usefulness of pre-meeting binder/instructions	9 (26%)	21 (62%)	4 (12%)	0 (0%)
8. Usefulness of poster/exhibit session	2 (6%)	15 (44%)	14 (41%)	3 (9%)
10. Usefulness of information presented	15 (44%)	15 (44%)	4 (12%)	0 (0%)
11. Usefulness of small/large group discussions	18 (53%)	12 (35%)	4 (12%)	0 (0%)

	Excellent	Very Good	Average	Poor
9. Knowledge/skill of presenters/facilitators	19 (56%)	15 (44%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
12. Meeting facilities	30 (88%)	4 (12%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

13. Please comment on the value of completing the team/provost representative self-assessment prior to the meeting.

Overview: Most respondents found this to be a useful exercise for team building or coming to a better understanding of the issues at their school or university, many found it an important first step in preparing for the meeting. Some critique of the self-assessment was that it was too long and/or too detailed.

Selected Responses:

- This was very useful. It provided an opportunity for the team to meet prior to the meeting and have extended discussions and clarify positions and perceptions.
- Helped to understand campus-wide priorities, constraints and degree of alignment with school interests/activities
- Very valuable- important for baseline information and also enlightening to see the similarities or disconnect between team and provost assessment
- I don't necessarily object to the length but the questions were so specific I didn't feel I could accurately answer them.
- Found it very time consuming and unclear in places (categories are often "double barreled" and not naturally exclusive), helpful to work with others on team and get their perspectives
- Time consuming, not especially meaningful considering these were opinions of a few and not highly based on data

14. Please comment on the value of completing the team planning document prior to the meeting.

Overview: Comments were very similar to question 13, and many surveys showed exact duplication of comments for these two questions. Most found the tool to be useful in bringing the team together and clarifying issues, overall response was that this was a more useful exercise than the self-assessment. Many comments suggested a desire to revise plans after meeting at the conference. Some comments revealed that at least one team did not meet together to complete this document, and that other teams found this again to be time consuming.

Selected Responses:

- Good sharing process. Interesting discussion with varying perspectives on our own work in CES. Remarkable convergence of opinion, yet a few significant differences.
- Somewhat valuable as it was an opportunity to begin to think about our current situation and needed resources to begin implementing change strategies
- Again, time consuming- and somewhat repetitive (especially difficult to do SWOT analysis as it felt it desired more time but with length of instrument couldn't do so)
- Its major value was that it generated discussion and set an expectation of immediate action. Planning during the meeting of the collaborative was more useful because we had better defined goals and a clearer context to guide the planning. Our pre-meeting planning was modified based on the collaborative meeting activities.

15. What do you consider the most valuable aspect of the meeting?

Overview: The aspect of the meeting listed as most valuable for most respondents dealt with opportunities for networking and discussion with colleagues from other institutions and disciplines to share ideas and practices. Other common responses included clarification of the issues related to CE and CES and in-depth time with individual teams to move forward as well as meetings with workgroups and with other schools in the profession around association issues.

Selected Responses:

- Having dedicated, uninterrupted time to think about these issues with similarly focused people from other schools/disciplines
- 1) synthesis of issues surrounding CES, 2) gaining perspectives and insights about CES and associated strategies for RPT
- Opportunity to work with own team and discipline after hearing general information and working with others

16. What do you consider the least valuable aspect of the meeting?

Overview: A range of issues were raised for improvement, with several indicating that more time with individual teams was desired. Other areas focused on the length and potential redundancy in the large group discussions. Three respondents found everything in the meeting to be “useful”/“valuable”.

Selected Responses:

- The least valuable piece related to the lack of time within teams to directly apply what had been discussed at the meeting.
- Maybe too much talk/discussion of P&T- as opposed to talk of designing model for 21st century.
- Time spent the first morning on reviewing the self-assessments of member institutions. Besides the fact that we weren’t told that our information would be made public with the group, it just wasn’t helpful.
- The large amount of information/meeting time jammed in to one and a half days- but I don’t see any way around this given the schedules we’re working with
- The poster session at the beginning—I did not find it to address faculty CES as much as community-based learning activities at the various institutions (ours included) and would have liked to see more examples of the former.

17. What questions or topics were not answered during the meeting that can be addressed in subsequent conference calls, meetings or on-line?

Overview: A range of questions/topics for further discussion were raised. Several asked for more clarification on CES through a clear definition of the term, its distinctness from service and community-engagement, and examples of products of CES.

Selected Responses:

- Further discussion on transforming service learning to community engaged scholarship
- How will each team periodically report progress/accomplishments on action plans to the project leadership? What sort of feedback will all the teams get regarding progress by other teams?
- Specific strategies for conversations with naysayers

18. What changes would you like to see in the meeting format/process for the Collaborative’s next annual meeting?

Overview: Feedback on the format of the meeting was generally positive, with a desire for fewer presentations and more time for small group work. Several respondents pointed out a need to better clarify the nature of scholarship in CES, and to provide examples throughout the meeting, and requests for more time with individual teams were reiterated here. Comments on increasing participation of community representatives were also included here. In terms of meeting logistics, respondents were very pleased with the meeting facility, and felt the length of the meeting should not be longer than one and a half days.

Selected Responses:

- Overall, I thought the format was stimulating, and had a good mix of presentations and discussions. There was a lot of sitting, so if it is possible for us to get up and move more often during the day that would be grand.
- Meeting in total is very well organized, flow very good, group discussions and small table discussions provide great insights into what specific universities are doing in this area
- Limited time for small group discussions made it difficult to accomplish all tasks with much depth of discussion. Would have liked to hear more from other groups, but I understand that this information will be shared later.
- Would have liked more time to work as a team to re-assess and re-define pre-determined goals and then to have problem solving discussions with the entire group about areas which we see as constraints/barriers to implementation
- Increase community partner participation, if we are to be true collaborators we must involve partners as part of initial planning process to define problems, implementation and solutions

Additional Comments:

"I had some moments of enlightenment, realizing more fully what the concept of community engaged scholarship really encompasses. It's easy to look at service-learning as an end product, but it is more apparent to me, now, that there's a big world around that corner, and it needs to be an integral component of all of the community engaged work."

"Thanks again for a terrific meeting in Nashville. I'm excited about the work and am pleased to be a part of this impressive group of people!"