Big Categories (*=discussed in small groups)

- Advocacy (and Value)*
- Community Building *
- Sharing and Access*
- Common Outcomes *
- Better Measures *
- Aggregation *
- Professional Development *
- Evaluation as a Learning Process
- Focus on Science Learning
- IRBs
- Broadening Our View

Advocacy and Value
- NSF POs build evaluation capacity and are more thoughtful about evaluation (foundations too)
- Broader buy-in of new directions in evaluation (from/by funders, practitioners, etc.)
- Articulate the value of evaluation, push back on pressure to make it research
- Evaluation IS ingrained in the educational infrastructure
- Clear distinction of research and evaluation

Sharing and Access and Community Building

Sharing and access:
- Making learning visible – remove barriers to gathering and publishing images, video of learners in action
- Easily accessible evaluation and research data and JUDGEMENT (← don’t be data rich and judgment poor)
- Better coordination for collecting, consolidating and disseminating results (maybe prof. orgs. → systemic solution)
- FOIA on OPMS via Industry Orgs (VSA, ASTC, AAM, AEA)
- Infrastructure for sharing and aggregating data
- More publications about ISE valuation learning (findings) and method innovations and proposals, too! (as to PRIME)
- Access to data and findings (some reports are subscription only)
- Cyber platforms and tools for sharing, capturing, and analyzing to be generative for P & R & E.
- More collaboration, less competition among ISE evaluation community

Community Building:
- Organization/journal for the communication of evaluators, researchers and practitioners
- Sustained conversation on evaluation
  - Connect federal evaluation group to non-feds
  - Broader range of participants
• Maybe a roundtable
• More evaluation convenings, either with PIs or separate
• Research/evaluation conference (or strand)
  o Questions
  o Methods
  o Results

Common Outcomes, Better Measures, and Aggregation

Common Outcomes
• Common goals and objectives
• Set of outcomes and indicators exciting to ISE as a field
• (A super set) common set of “independent” and “dependent” variables (e.g. what do we mean by a science center experience)
• Agree upon “atlas” of ISE program types and identify best practices and challenges for each type
• Further development and use of common tools of program quality and effect
• Identify and agree upon marker assessments for engagement, identity, interest (etc.) for inclusion in ISE evaluations
• Less division between formal and informal science learning as overlap

Better Measures
• Multiple types (both internal and external) of evidence valued (study, micro-tested interactions and attractions \(\rightarrow\) understanding, aggregate
• Strengthen EVIDENCE to
  o Build knowledge
  o Understand impact
  o Improve programs
• Better “measures” for the hard-to-measure
  o For example, affective, choice, identity
• Measures that “fit” the ISE contexts
  o Theory-based
  o Evidence-based
  o Align w/ ISE outcomes
  o Address subjectively and brokerage mind-body affective-cognitive

Aggregation
• Aggregation of model outcomes and indicators
• More comparative studies within ISE types and across ISE types (e.g. exhibits, afterschool)
• More intentional relationship between project level to generalize
• Preparing the field for meta-analysis and sharing of results (e.g. conferences)

Professional Development
• Systematic PD trajectories for newer evaluators of ISE (review registry VSA, AEA, materials, etc.)
• Professional development around ISE evaluation for evaluators and non-evaluators
• Think of ourselves as applied researchers...
  o Draw on diverse theories and research areas
  o Share practices, instruments and outcomes
  o Build the “ISE evaluation” field
• Greater professionalization of the field in evaluation (for all stakeholders)
• Start system of PD
  o Across the full spectrum
  o Widely known, affordable, accessible
  o NOT certification
  o Connect with existing areas (e.g. AEA, VSA)
• Improve quality evaluation training/education/mentorship
• Improve education of practitioners, program officers in using ISE evaluation
• Cultural competency as an urgent issue (i.e. broadening participation)
  o (Part of registry, resources, PD trajectories)
  o Something concrete?
• Selection of relevant readings from other fields (e.g. sociology, cultural anthropology) (posted by evaluators in ISE based on what they found useful)

Evaluation as a Learning Process ( Evaluators, researchers, funders)
• Improve usefulness of ISE evaluations
• Accepted alternative to current summative evaluations of projects’
• Shift from summative evaluation as rating work to generating knowledge
• Evaluation as learning and accountability
• Evaluators as partners with varied skills
  o Moved to center and away from margins
  o Thought partners
• Learning more from failures, program and in evaluation

Focus on Science Learning
• Dialogue about evaluation based on understanding of learning

IRBs
• IRB reasons, guidelines, and examples (NOT an approval-system but to help PIs and evaluators [and IRBs unfamiliar with informal settings] see the need, importance and some current practice)
• Guidelines for IRB
  o The common rule and relevance to evaluation

Broadening Our View
• De-emphasize the “s” in the ISE (and make new friends)
• Intentional strategies for including more informal learning environments (settings) (e.g. don’t be focused on museums)
• Explore overlap of “evaluation” and “social impact” (expanding out so evaluation connects more)
• Incorporation of operating data in evaluation—the key difference twixt informal and formal