NOTES: Summary of Breakout Group Findings from September 15 webinar: 
*Equity & Evaluation Practice in Cultural Organizations*

**Exploratorium report**
- Hyper-local nature of the project allowed for community partners to come together and share assets.
- Positioned the project within pressures toward gentrification and displacement in local neighborhoods.
- Took stock of diversity within communities of color throughout evaluation.
- Considered different organizational styles, timelines and expectations of project partners.
- Accessible language in exhibits a key to community participation.
- Participants appreciated Spanish language versions of labels appearing first.
- Question posed: How was the report shared with community members?
- Lots of information on methodologies--the report can function as a very useful guide to evaluation practice.
- The evaluation also demonstrated how to conduct an evaluation of a trans-disciplinary project.
- This report was funded by the National Science Foundation--How do we bring funding resources to smaller projects pursuing equity in evaluation?

**Room to Rise**
- Equity agenda was not forefronted in this project, nor did its evaluation start with a racial equity lens.
- Influenced most deeply by youth development literature on how programs can help students to find their voices.
- Started initiative with focus on underserved students of color, but found stronger impacts within diversified spectrum of participating students.
- Intentionally allowed for critical feedback from outliers
- Opted for approach in which evaluator, artists, and project facilitators worked closely together--rather than at a distance--to broaden perspectives
- Groundbreaking, visionary methodology - investigated commonalities across multiple sites, and aggregated findings
• Journey maps and visualizations provided a richness that you don't find in
traditional methods—they were key to understanding students' lives.
• The project successfully investigated short-term, mid-term, and long-term
outcome of project, on students, teachers, museums, and communities.
• Investigated a type of impact new to museums—public value.
• Question posed: How was Room to Rise shared with community members?
• Art museums having difficulty with teen audiences would find the report very
useful.

Practices from Both Reports
• Interrogate whether evaluation and program partners are committed to equity.
• Do initial assessment to see if the project treats equity as an afterthought,
source of tension, or a source of value only for some.
• As evaluator, be a thought partner and provide a safe space for negotiation
among partners.
• Account for history, structures, and inequitable systems that shape the
institution(s) whose program(s) are being evaluated.
• Be aware of power dynamics among partners and within the community.
• Build community ownership of evaluation—from project design to defining
success to sharing stories.
• Human component/lived experience: talk “with” vs. “at” stakeholder.
• Minimize pre-determined categories of impact—have patience and wait for the
emergence of outcomes.
• Question: How do we find out about participants’ experience before they
became involved with the program?
• Beware oversampling of white community members and underrepresentation of
people of color.
• Question: What are the equity implications of integrating qualitative methods
with quantitative methods?
• How are timelines of complex, equity-focused evaluations established?
• In reporting, communicate with those participants who were involved in the
project.
• Engaging audiences with evaluation reports can take many new forms these
days with the explosion of social media capabilities.
• Engage people where they are, and where they are gathered.
• With participant observation methods, how are you thinking about what you are seeing?
• Utilize mixed methods to bolster understanding of the perspectives of program participants and multiple stakeholders.
• Webinar participants are very interested in critical friends groups and an evaluation Boot Camp.