
These unprecedented times provide an opportunity to consider in real time what evaluation practice that holds equity as a value, embraces complexity and expands our definitions of validity might look and feel like. Given this reality and opportunity to do things differently, we offer the following topline questions and considerations that may be useful to keep in mind however might be helpful to you, and others you are bringing along. This guidance is gleaned from the Equitable Evaluation Framing Paper, Teaching Case, practice partner pilots, etc.

Broader Guiding Questions and Reflections:

- How can the Equitable Evaluation Principles – as foundational guideposts - be lifted and kept top of mind and centered throughout? What does leading with the Equitable Evaluation Principles look like? Which one of the principles might you be able to step into at this moment?
- How might evaluation “orthodoxies,” or tightly held beliefs about evaluative practice that have been shaped by the philanthropic sector over time be mitigated or eliminated?
- What does this require of us (foundations, evaluators, nonprofits) across all aspects of the evaluative process – the questions we ask, the relationship to strategy, the measures we use, the teams we assemble, and the ways we support the use of data and sense-making around findings?

The Equitable Evaluation Framework challenges and embraces new pathways for and concepts of validity, rigor, and complexity to help ensure that findings are as truthful, meaningful, and complete as possible. This entails questions and considerations across phases – at/within any point, project, or method – such as follows:

### Possibilities Across Learning/Evaluation Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design/Plan</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Share &amp; Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An intersecting, interplaying, and potentially non-sequential spectrum</td>
<td>Stakeholder/community/target population expertise, engagement, and ownership integrated</td>
<td>Opportunities within/among phases, projects, programs, people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VALIDITY, RIGOR, AND COMPLEXITY AS UNDERPINNINGS

**Questions/Considerations (Values, Voices, and Validity):**

- How can we ensure that the voice of those most impacted is not seen as separate from and different than “valid” evidence? And how can we work to ensure voice is treated as something to pay attention to always (as opposed to conditionally)?
- How can we advance consideration of when and whose voice is sought and heard as a matter of standardized professional discipline and expectation?
- How can we address the underlying issue - not that we don’t know how to increase validity in this way - but rather that we choose not to do it?

**Some questions that go unasked:**

- What kind of information and knowledge, if any, is fundamentally and inherently valuable and important? And what values does that reflect, and what intention does it advance?
- What are implications when we fail to embrace that there are multiple realities and truths influenced by power, context, systems, culture, history, and our own relationship to each of these?
- How does this limit our ability to engage in inquiry, analysis, and sense-making that are truly valid?

**What those of us who share the goal of advancing equity must do:**

- Center values and intentions. How can we put our values and intentions front and center by being transparent and honest about the decisions we make and the methods we use?
- Embrace complexity. How can we seek voices from all the traditional and nontraditional sources to help us make sense of what is learned and the ways in which those learnings might be used to advance the intention of the work and reflect the underpinning values?
- Seek multicultural validity. How can we broaden and deepen what we mean by valid, to help us understand the past and present in more nuanced ways?