



I-WISE Evaluation Strand

Strand leader: Joe E. Heimlich

Strand synthesizers: Tania Wolfgramm, Salvador Acevedo

Strand support: Jill Stein

Engaging in an evaluation process can often challenge an organization, a project, or a program. When the evaluation requires multiple cultural perspectives, the honoring of different worldviews can sometimes seem overwhelming. Further, those who choose to undertake such work are often straddling multiple worldviews and end up serving in the very complex role of a 'bridge person,' which can be a difficult and sometimes frustrating position. The discussions that underlay this document were full of individual stories, a great deal of honest sharing, and challenges. The evaluation strand of the IWISE conference was designed as a journey of collaborators. The core group was relatively small, but had many others join segments of the journey.

Our group: The group used many different tools for facilitating dialogue, including small and full group discussions, poster-board brainstorming, and a couple of facilitated activities. We were guided by the four directional goals for the strand, which were inspired by the four directional goals for the IWISE conference. These included the following, with a focus on evaluation practice: 1) **Identify, integrate, and synthesize** existing efforts to embed Indigenous worldviews in ISE; 2) **Advance and strengthen** the interchange between Indigenous worldviews and Informal Science Education (ISE); 3) **Formulate a research agenda** in the area of Indigenous worldviews in ISE; 4) **Establish next steps** to improve communication, access, and leadership in this area.

Our discussion: As evaluation is not 'value-free', value is central to its design and exercise. Values are prioritized and accorded relative measures of importance and influence by different stakeholders. They are seeded from the outset of the evaluation in terms of the prioritization of (1) what counts as values or valuable outcomes, (2) the framing of the evaluation questions, and (3) the methods chosen to answer those questions. Thus the values of the designers and developers of evaluation systems and tools are indelibly stamped onto them, making evaluation inextricably linked with power and control. Therefore, considering competing value systems both explicit and implicit in evaluation processes, it is important to continue to ask challenging questions. Whose values and voices are privileged? Whose perspectives are valued as more *or* less important than others?

Using a model inspired by the Dine' Cosmic Model (Maryboy and Begay), the conversation for the strand started in the East with an opportunity for all voices to be heard with stories

of how people arrived both in the strand, and in the work of evaluation across worldviews.¹ We entered this discussion knowing the East would be the area where we spent the most time in order to come together, build a shared pathway, and discover where we as a group wanted the discussions to take us. Guided by a holistic indigenous-based process, the group considered the work of evaluation across all contexts and settings, not necessarily specific only to informal science learning. Particularly from a community-based or learner-based perspective, we must consider the whole learning landscape in evaluation, including self, family, culture, community, informal, and formal learning environments. The following table provides a roadmap of the overall strand dialogue:

INDIGENOUS CULTURALLY INTELLIGENT EVALUATION			KEY AREAS OF FOCUS	KEY OUTCOMES
EAST INITIATE	Ha'a'aah <i>Initiation</i>	Vision, values, dream, ethics, conceptualise	1. INDIGENOUS VISION & VALUES 2. INDIGENOUS CULTURE & LANGUAGE 3. INDIGENOUS EVALUATION SYSTEMS	Improved depth of understanding of Indigenous values, culture, worldviews and their integrity; Indigenous languages are honoured; Indigenous Evaluation Models and Systems are designed and developed
		Gather, understand community, own / others identities	4. COMMUNITY NEEDS 5. CULTURAL IDENTITIES; ROLES; RESPONSIBILITIES 6. EVALUATION DESIGN	Deeper understanding of community values and protocols ; Genuine community engagement and participation; Improved knowledge of cultural identities; Strengthened relationships through shared values; Improved approaches and processes for Indigenous and Culturally Intelligent Evaluation
SOUTH GENERATE	Shadi'aah <i>Organization & Growth</i>	Connect, collaborate, co-design cross-cultural evaluation	7. POWER AND POLITICS 8. FUNDERS & FUNDING 9. CROSS-CULTURAL EVALUATION	Increased knowledge of power and politics; Increased equalisation of power; A greater degree of harmony and balance in evaluation; Funders will have increased knowledge, skills, and processes for supporting Indigenous evaluation; Explore the possibility of co-creating a 'universal design' for cross-cultural evaluation.
WEST ACTIVATE	I'i'aah <i>Activation - Living It</i>	Activate, implement, operationalise	10. EXPERIENCE OF EVALUATION 11. CULTURALLY APPROPRIATE APPROACH 12. URGENCY AND NECESSITY	Improved experiences of evaluation for Indigenous communities; Co-design, develop, draft culturally appropriate approaches; Demonstrating effective engagement and participation in developing and implementing Indigenous and Culturally Intelligent Evaluation
NORTH FLOURISH	Nahookos <i>Transformation, Learning, Sustainability</i>	Achieve, learn, measure, realise outcomes	13. EVALUATION LEADERSHIP 14. BUILDING THIS EVALUATION COMMUNITY 15. CO-CREATING THE EVALUATION SYSTEM	Indigenous Evaluation Leadership; Bicultural, multicultural, 'bridge-building' Evaluation Leadership; Indigenous and Culturally Intelligent Evaluation Community developed and established; Indigenous & Culturally Intelligent Evaluation System

¹ Note that unlike with the other strands, there was not a pre-conference webinar held for the Evaluation Strand. The conference in Albuquerque was the first time this group gathered, although there were some prior relationships among a couple of participants.