

CREA Conference, April 2013
Invited Panel: 'Perspectives on Repositioning Culture
in Evaluation and Assessment I'¹

Culture in/and Evaluation: From a Transcultural Belvedere²

Jennifer C. Greene
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Welcome

Good morning to all! And welcome to this space of conversation and exchange.

My name is Jennifer Greene, and I am a professor of Educational Psychology at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. My doctorate is in Educational Psychology, although I wandered long ago far from mainstream Ed Psych, primarily into the practical field of educational program evaluation.

My name is Jennifer Greene and I am the eldest daughter of James Robert and Elizabeth Whitney Greene. My parents' parents or grandparents immigrated to the US, primarily from England, Hungary, and Sweden. I have two younger sisters and an older brother who is deceased. I also have two children and two grandchildren.

My name is Jennifer Greene, and I am an ardent lover of animals, especially dogs. In my upcoming post-retirement years, I have dreams of working in dog-assisted therapy, dog visiting programs, and modest forms of dog search and rescue – modest so as to be suited to a grandmother's physical abilities.

¹ My sincere thanks to Fiona Cram for her thoughtful and useful comments on a draft of this presentation and to Nan Wehipeihana and Kate McKegg for their critical contributions to the meanings and meaningfulness of my portraits of Maori customs and practices.

² Belvedere – a building or part of a building positioned to offer a fine view of the surrounding area.

My name is Jennifer Greene and I grew up on the East Coast of the United States, in New Jersey, close to the sea. I have experienced these past 14 years living in Illinois as a cultural adventure to the sea-less prairie.

My name is Jennifer Greene, and ... hmmm, how else should I introduce myself to you all? What else about me, about this space, and about this gathering matters in my introduction? What kind of introductory ritual is important here and now?

In Aotearoa New Zealand, the Māori have a lovely traditional ritual of engagement and relationship building. It typically occurs at the beginning of meetings, workshops, and even personal introductions. They start by identifying their tribe/s (*iwi*), and their tribal location in relation to mountains, rivers, lakes or places of significance, such sites of canoe landings or battles. When there are Māori and Pākehā together, usually one Māori person will ask for some kind of introductions of the group members to each other, and the Māori typically choose the introduction I just described. My colleagues from Aotearoa New Zealand tell me that this ritual has almost become normalized in New Zealand culture, most particularly when Māori and Pākehā come together as is seen in everyday settings and contexts such as birthdays, weddings and celebrations as well as evaluation settings.³

In Aotearoa New Zealand⁴ I experienced many government functions and professional conferences that began with a Māori ceremonial ritual of welcome (*powhiri*). The ritual includes a welcome by the hosts and a response by visitors, with songs of acknowledgment to the speakers interspersed throughout the ceremony, all followed by tea. I have also experienced at

³ For this portrait of Māori greetings, I thank Nan Wehipeihana and Kate McKegg.

⁴ Aotearoa New Zealand is generally the term for New Zealand that reflects both the Māori and Pākehā New Zealanders. The Māori label of 'Te Waipounamu' today generally refers to the South Island – although in a traditional Māori lore, it was the mainland 'o te waka a Maui' the canoe from which Maui fished up the North Island. (from Nan Wehipeihana)

conferences around the world, after a presentation from a New Zealander, their colleagues from Aotearoa New Zealand often come up to the front of the room and sing a song of appreciation for the speaker.

I experienced these welcoming and celebratory rituals as vibrant elements of gatherings intended for interaction, meaning making, and collective sense making. Relationships, as explained to me, are at the heart of these rituals. The cultural practices are about connecting, reconnecting, and positioning who each person or group is in relation to their tribe, to places of tribal significance, to their history recent and past, to their work and to their family and friends.⁵

Intermezzo

I had the wonderful good fortune last semester to take my very first ‘traveling sabbatical leave’ and to center this leave around a visit to Aotearoa New Zealand. I was eager to learn about the recent cultural and political revitalization of the Māori people, catalyzed by the government’s reaffirmation of the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi, and I was especially eager to learn how this revitalization shows up in the evaluation practices of my Māori and Pākehā colleagues.

What I wish to do with my time this morning is to share some of my *initial* insights from this sabbatical leave and to begin a conversation on how such insights might be adapted to our evaluation work in the United States, on how to think well about culturally responsive and responsible evaluation in the US, drawing on the experiences and wisdom of our Aotearoa New Zealand colleagues.

⁵ For these meanings of Māori rituals, I thank Nan Wehipeihana and Kate McKegg.

The adaptation that is most directly relevant for us in the US is for *our* indigenous Native American peoples. Yet, there are evaluators – some of them present at this conference – with significantly more expertise than I have in Indian ways of knowing and being, in Indian rituals of importance, *and* in making evaluation culturally responsive and relevant for Native American peoples. So, *my* effort is to endeavor to think well about adapting the culturally responsible and culturally engaged work of evaluators in Aotearoa New Zealand to the contexts in which I work. These contexts characteristically are peopled by mainstream Americans and/or by traditional US minority groups of African Americans, Latino/as, and immigrants, as well as people from families with limited economic means, and people on other margins of our society.

Beyond the challenges of introductory rituals, my presentation will engage three main issues:⁶

1. Rituals for culturally responsive evaluation?
2. What approach to evaluation is dominant in Māori contexts and why is that perhaps so?
3. What matters in evaluation practice in Māori contexts and why is that perhaps so?
4. What political issues accompany evaluation in Māori contexts and how are they engaged?

For each, I will offer some initial thoughts about what we can learn from this for our evaluation contexts.

1. Back to Rituals

I cannot speak with any authority whatsoever about the meanings and functions of the Māori rituals of welcome and introduction, even though the words and songs were often

⁶ Among the omissions from this set of reflections is the widespread use of colorful graphics in ‘as Māori’ evaluation practice. The purpose and role of these graphics could be usefully explored.

translated for me, along with snippets of history. What I *experienced*, however, when greeted ceremoniously was a feeling of being genuinely welcomed into that space, even before anyone knew me. At times, this genuine welcoming feeling was quite profound. And I was told that the individual introductions of one's iwi, mountain, and river communicate kinship, community, and shared ideals and visions.

Perhaps more fundamentally, these introductory and welcoming rituals mark the gathering as a time of connection not just a time of work, a time for relating one to another as people not just talking formally as professionals, that is, a time of engagement with more than the professional countenance of those with whom we are meeting, for example, evaluation stakeholders. Because these rituals are face-to-face, they can engage *all* of our senses (Pipi via Cram). The introductory and welcoming rituals in Aotearoa New Zealand thereby create a space for interactions of meaning and consequence, interactions grounded in relational trust and acceptance.

Culturally responsive and engaged evaluation is also fundamentally anchored in relational trust and acceptance. Without visible and palpable connections between evaluators and stakeholders – especially the program leaders, staff, and participants – our work has little chance of being meaningfully cultural responsive and thereby meaningfully consequential in that context.

So, with what kind of rituals might we initiate our evaluation work that would signal these value commitments of respect and acceptance and would begin to establish the relational trust and openness we seek in culturally responsive, responsible and engaged evaluation? I am quite certain that my introductions to this presentation are NOT to be emulated. I am less certain

about what we might be able to do, and welcome your ideas and continuing conversation about this.

I will now turn to the second of the four issues I will address in this presentation. And that is the kind of evaluation I observed most frequently in Māori contexts in Aotearoa New Zealand.

2. Developmental Evaluation in Maori Contexts

I spent my time in Aotearoa New Zealand absorbing all I could from a variety of evaluation contexts that I had the privilege of learning about. I did this through reading materials, talking with the evaluators over many cups of excellent New Zealand coffee, shadowing them on site visits, and listening in on hui (meetings) with project leadership and staff. I also spent whole days with both Māori and Pākehā evaluators listening in on their reflective conversations about evaluator roles and evaluator souls, about how to best engage Māori revitalization in their work, and about their values and commitments. As I said, it was a distinct privilege to be invited to listen in and observe.

One dominant observation throughout my time as an observer-learner in Aotearoa New Zealand is the use of a form of *developmental evaluation* in Māori evaluation contexts, that is, in contexts involving an evaluation of a program targeted for Māori. Developmental evaluation is the evaluative process of working closely with program staff on the development, implementation, and evaluative critique of the underlying logic, activities, and implementation of a program toward attainment of desired outcomes. Developmental evaluation aims, in part, to support program staff and to develop their evaluative thinking and capacity. Recently, Michael Patton (2010) has updated this idea to focus on developmental evaluation as supporting and guiding innovations under conditions of complexity. And perhaps not

coincidentally, Michael Patton spent some time recently in Aotearoa New Zealand, spreading the developmental evaluation gospel. But, more importantly, a developmental evaluation approach fits well with the evaluative stance, role, and contributions desired by the evaluators of these projects for Māori. All such evaluation teams were comprised wholly or mostly of Māori evaluators.

Signaling a core rationale for this widespread adoption of a form of developmental evaluation for Māori projects, many, many times I overheard a comment attesting to a fundamental shift in Māori program purpose and framework over the past decade or so. The shift was from conducting and evaluating programs ‘for Māori’ to conducting and evaluating programs ‘as Māori’, that is, doing things in the Māori way. This shift was fully evident in the character of the programs I observed being evaluated. (And, of course, I am oversimplifying this shift, from Cram.)

To illustrate, one context I observed multiple times was an evaluation of a Sport NZ program intended to encourage and support Māori youth and adults to participate in more physical activity. The director of He Oranga Poutama (HOP) observed that her program has been way ahead of Sport NZ (which was the funding and policy agency) in strategic and outcomes thinking. Sport NZ has seen HOP as a self-contained program with participation as its primary agenda and outcome. HOP people see it as a political and cultural strategy, part of a wider Māori cultural revitalization, and are working to make it so. Here practice precedes policy. As the evaluators (McKegg, Wehipeihana, & Pipi, 2013) wrote in their 2012 evaluation report:

He Oranga Poutama (HOP) is a Sport NZ initiative that supports Māori well-being through sport and recreation. In 2009, the programme evolved from a focus on increasing the participation by Māori in sport, to one of participating and leading *as Māori* in sport and traditional physical recreation at community level. [That is, this revised focus emphasized not Māori participation in Western sport and physical activity, but rather Māori participation in traditional Maori sports and games, thus also serving as a cultural revitalization of these sport traditions.]

This shift in direction, to an *as Māori* focus, signalled that Sport NZ recognised the cultural distinctiveness aspect of the new programme goal and the importance of culturally distinctive pathways for sport and recreation if Māori were to participate as Māori. Sport NZ, along with other government agencies, was coming to realise that a strong and secure cultural identity for Māori, helps facilitate their access to wider society, as well as being vital to overall wellbeing; and were willing through the HOP initiative to invest in and enable, a stronger platform for Māori to participate as Māori.

Developmental evaluation, according to my kiwi colleagues, not only supports this political '*as Māori*' agenda for the program, but also enables (gives permission to) the evaluators to partner with and actively support the program staff in the actual process of program development. This is in contrast, of course, to the common understanding of the evaluator as a neutral outsider. [Though the very wise Lee Cronbach opined decades ago that evaluators should only evaluate programs to which they are sympathetic.] Notably, in sitting in on several planning meetings for an important weekend HOP hui, I watched two of the evaluators sit side by side with the project director as they collaboratively planned the hui. All three shared common principles and commitments, and common ends, notably to elevate the *cultural value* of this kind of project as part of the reaffirmation and revitalization of Māori culture. All three were co-collaborators in this shared venture.

Further, evaluators of HOP and other programs commented that developmental evaluation serves not only to affirm Māori values, but also their connections to the land, as well as their connections to their marae.⁷ Developmental evaluation helps them to create a sense of space, they said. I interpret this as meaning to create a safe, protected, *and affirming* space – a cultural, historical, and relational space – from which to assert Māori values and commitments and to serve as much as program supporters as program critics. As one evaluator said, “we do this [developmental-type evaluation] to live in a better world.”

In sum, developmental evaluation is the favored approach in Aotearoa New Zealand for evaluations of Māori projects because it:

- Supports ‘as Māori’ program thinking, acting, and reflecting, and supports conducting a program that serves Māori ‘in the Māori way’
- Enables evaluators to fully partner with program staff in developing and enacting an ‘as Māori’ program
- Creates a safe and affirming space for the values and commitments that underlie these actions

So, what lessons can we draw from the Aotearoa New Zealand embracement of developmental evaluation for our own evaluation practice in under-served communities with disempowered and marginalized peoples? Again, I eagerly await your thoughts on this question.

⁷ In Māori usage, the *marae atea* (often shortened to *marae*) is the open space in front of the *wharenui* or meeting house (literally "large building"). However, the term *marae* is generally used to refer to the whole complex, including the buildings and the open space. (Wikipedia)

Three initial thoughts that I have are the following. These thoughts represent significant strands of culturally responsive and responsible evaluation or are fully consonant with the commitments and stances of this approach.

- First, just as the ‘as Māori’ evaluators in Aotearoa New Zealand adopt a developmental evaluation approach – in part because it enables, even demands, close attention to the consonance of the premises, design, and logic of the evaluand with Maori beliefs, values, and principles – we culturally responsive evaluators in the US can do the same. Many already do. But, perhaps a renewed or re-invigorated focus on the program as designed is one important strategy to recommend – especially a renewed focus on the character and magnitude of the program’s specific attention to and respect for the cultural ways of doing things in the contexts at hand, but also *as situated in the larger politics of culture in the US*. “How well does the program design *genuinely and consequentially* respect and engage cultural diversity, even when there are political tensions or costs of doing so?” might be one evaluation question that could accomplish this.
- Second, many of the evaluations I learned about during my visit to Aotearoa New Zealand were of programs exclusively for Māori participants. Some, however, were targeted for a diverse set of participants – Māori, Pākehā, Pasifika, and others. Common to most of these that I observed was a concerted emphasis on assessing the program’s success in serving those least well served, who were typically members of a cultural minority and/or a socioeconomic minority in the country. This emphasis went far beyond data disaggregation to include possibly different understandings of program

participation and different definitions of program success for different groups. Culturally responsive evaluation, by definition, attends intentionally to the quality of the program experiences and outcomes of distinct cultural subgroups. Concerted attention to those subgroups least well served in the contexts at hand – attention mindful of possible *culturally-specific understandings of and engagements with the evaluand* – could be an important evaluation strategy in some times and places.

- And third, like ‘as Māori’ evaluation in Aotearoa New Zealand, culturally responsive and responsible evaluation in the US can be *importantly and intentionally affirming* to various program and evaluation participants. The staff of the sports program HOP – also nearly all Māori – expressed deep affirmation from the engagement of the evaluation team. The staff of a health careers program, intended to attract and prepare more Māori young people for careers in health, expressed the same. This sense of affirmation and validation for one’s own hard work can be a powerful lever of mobilization and change. We could work harder and smarter to create evaluation contexts that are deeply culturally affirming.

3. Evaluation as a Social and Relational Activity

A Pākehā evaluator observed, “Another thing you might find interesting in a small market [New Zealand has a total of 4.5 million people] is our very strong focus on relationships and building strong relational trust. It is a core kiwi value. We all know that there is probably only one to two degrees of separation between us and many of those we come in contact with.”

“Relationships are not part of the work; they *are* the work,” proclaimed one Māori evaluator.

And a Māori program staff person said, “The emphasis on relationships [in this evaluation] has been key” to its effectiveness.

Distinct from the generally close-knit character of the New Zealand populace, the Māori culture itself is strongly iwi (tribal), hapū (kinship groups), and whānau or family based. As one Maori evaluator said, “We are iwi, hapū, whānau first and then professionals second. And our identities are whakapapa connected – that is, connected to our genealogy and family histories.” Further, how many two-day evaluation meetings with program staff have you experienced where all attendees sing traditional songs together in the evening, with guitar accompaniment, and *then* all sleep on cots in the one common room of the meeting house on the marae? The singing maybe, but the slumber party? This kind comfort one with another, these kinds of close connections and relationships, I observed in many different Māori contexts throughout my visit to Aotearoa New Zealand.

These observations invoke the ideas of Tineke Abma, a health policy and evaluation expert extraordinaire from the Netherlands. Tineke Abma (2006) has said of the socio-relational dimensions of evaluation:

The social relations among program people and other stakeholders in the evaluation setting are an integral part of the program being evaluated and thus directly involved in assessments of program quality.... The relations between the evaluator and program participants and others in the setting [further] influence the possibilities and constraints of the evaluative practice in that context. (p. 185-186)

In my own recent work, the salience and importance of evaluation relationships surfaced strongly as our group worked to conceptualize, field test, and develop practical guidelines for

meaningful *values-engagement* in evaluation. In some reflections on our work (Hall, Ahn, & Greene, 2012), we offered the following:

Our experience, both conceptually and practically, highlights the need for attention to the relational and communicative aspects of evaluation, as these [are the] aspects [of evaluation that shape and] influence the character of values engagement. [Close] attention [to evaluation's socio-relational dimensions] also positions evaluation as a moral-political practice, rather than a mere methodological undertaking. Focusing on these aspects has reinforced our belief that evaluators must assume responsibility for explicating and justifying the values being advanced in their work. (p. 206)

Tineke and I both agree with our Māori colleagues that the complex and contextual relational dimensions of evaluation are constitutive of the evaluator's presence on site, the values being advanced, and thereby the character of the data collected and the interpretations made.

Back to Aotearoa, CREA's very own affiliate Fiona Cram and colleagues have generated a set of seven Kaupapa (action-oriented) Māori evaluation practices. Here is presentation of them. And here is one practice elaborated and illustrated.

1 Kaupapa Māori Evaluation Practices

Table 1: Kaupapa Māori evaluation practice examples for use in Kia Ora Hauora Programme Evaluation

Applying Kaupapa Māori Principles in Evaluation		
Kaupapa Māori Practice	Explanation	Some examples in relation to the evaluation of Kia Ora Hauora
Aroha ki te tangata: a respect for people	Allows people to define their own space and to meet on their own terms and includes: appropriate engagement processes; correct observance of protocols; being informed about previous activities in whānau/communities; and leaving preconceived ideas at home.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide different times, opportunities and methods to facilitate student and other stakeholder involvement in the evaluation Value, acknowledge and encourage the specific participation of key Māori community stakeholders (e.g. kaumatua/kuia) Be mindful of whānau and community dynamics (e.g. between whānau and school) and issues of confidentiality and privacy
He kanohi kitea: the seen face	'A voice may be heard but a face needs to be seen'. This is about building personal relationships and becoming known to the whānau/ community i.e. face to face approaches; and investing the time it takes to become known, that is to build relationships.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of evaluators who are local, of the community, possibly of the iwi and have good community networks. As a consequence, they and or their whānau will be known to some of the evaluation participants and stakeholders. Use of qualitative and face to face methods of engagement (interviews, whānau hui etc).
Titiro, whakarongo ... korero: look, listen ... speak	The fine art of watching, listening and then, sometime later, talking. Allowing whānau time to reflect on information provided, questions asked and responses given; practitioners taking time to carefully reflect on what has been said/shared; and engagement conducted within timeframes that works for whānau/community.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing as much notice as possible so participants can plan their involvement in the evaluation and think carefully about their responses and involvement (should they want to) During and post the interview at the note taking and analysis stage, take time to reflect carefully on what is being said and check back with participants for meaning
Manaaki ki te tangata: look after people	This is about hospitality and reciprocity. This can be done through kai, koha, training, capacity building and the sharing of information. It also means being mindful of whānau obligations and resources in this regard and not taking anything for granted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan within the evaluation opportunities for participants through their engagement to be able to learn from and share with one another Within the evaluation develop (fun) participant engagement activities (e.g. visioning, future projection) that allow participants explore possibilities, inspire participants to see bright futures. Consider how best to take care of participants with special needs Consider meaningful contributions that can be made to reciprocate hospitality (koha).
Kia tupato: be careful	This is about practitioners and whānau being culturally safe through the following of whānau protocols and customs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan for accuracy and quality Facilitate processes for participants to find logical solutions and make sense of their situations Observe and be guided by whānau, community and marae protocols Prepare in advance and seek support where necessary to practice appropriately and safely with/in Māori communities and contexts. Be mindful of student, whānau, and school/tertiary education institution dynamics, relationships and history
Kaua e takahia te mana o te tangata: don't trample on people's mana	Act in ways that are respectful and mana enhancing. A particular focus is on ensuring whānau participation at every stage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respect and seek to understand the dynamics, loyalties and perspectives of participants. Seek the input of whānau, community and school leaders into the evaluation activities Consider what respectful and mana enhancing means for each participant in their respective contexts Consider who should participate in what, why and when

Applying Kaupapa Māori Principles in Evaluation		
Kaupapa Māori Practice	Explanation	Some examples in relation to the evaluation of Kia Ora Hauora
Kia māhaki: be humble	Act with humility, share knowledge. Be humble; share knowledge and provide opportunities for whānau/community empowerment /learning through engagement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be guided by whānau, community and school leaders. They know their people/communities. • Provide feedback to whānau leaders, whānau and communities • Facilitate opportunities for whānau to share their stories, uniqueness and knowledge • Consider who should share what, why and when

Source: This table has been adapted from Cram (2009), and (Pipi, Cram, Hawke et al. (2004).

So, what are the lessons herein for culturally responsive, responsible, and engaged evaluators in the US? Here are three preliminary thoughts.

First, I believe that clear statements of the values that are guiding a given evaluation study, along with the rationale for these values, is an important step toward meaningful communication and authentic relationships. A clear values statement should become one of evaluation’s commonplaces or standard parts of our evaluative thinking, evident in our evaluation design, implementation, and reporting. In culturally responsive evaluation, clear statements of evaluator values offer articulated and public declarations of cultural respect and understanding, available for evaluation stakeholders to critique, support, or otherwise engage.

Second, I believe we need to take the social strands of our work more seriously and engage in them with greater intentionality. We are indeed already attuned to the importance of relationships, interactions, and communications in our work as culturally responsive evaluators. We are indeed mindful of traditions and customs in varied contexts, or at least alert to the possible need to learn about these prior to entering and working in a given context. But, inspired by Fiona and our other Māori colleagues, I think many of us could use a set of articulated principles and guidelines for this relational work, and a set of concrete practices to accompany these principles. Multiple sets may be needed for different cultural groups and

different settings. And we will always need an insider's specific assistance in guiding our evaluative pathway. But we ourselves can and need to get better at being *relationally* culturally responsive in our work, so that our work can be of greater consequence.

And third, directly from Fiona Cram (with thanks), placing relationships as the foundation of a culturally responsive evaluation does *not* imply a relaxation of methodological rigor, strong warrants for evidence, or professional responsibilities. As Fiona's colleague Papaarangi Reid has said, "Māori deserve good science." So, relational trust comes with accountability to the people in that context for work that is of consequence to them.

4. Evaluation and Politics

And finally, following on the aspiration to be of consequence in our evaluation work, I wish to end with my modest observations and reflections on the politics of 'as Māori' evaluation in contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand.

Evaluation is intrinsically political as it serves some people's interests but not others, as it advances some people's values but not others, as it embraces some definitions of program quality but not others, and so forth. Culturally responsive evaluators already know this.

What did I observe about the political dimensions of 'as Māori' evaluation during my study leave?

I observed that the larger political context is centered on the core issue of Māori self-determination, accompanied by the complex issues of land and rights restitution for Maori iwis. I believe that these macro, cultural survival issues of political rights and of sovereignty are manifest in 'as Māori' evaluation in both overt and more subtle ways.

Notably, overheard from Māori evaluators:

- It is NOT ok for non-Māori to do evaluation in Māori spaces on their own/without Māori guidance, no matter how much they know about Māori culture.
- It is important to always start from a position of Māori strengths.
- I do not do any multi-ethnic work or writing anymore because the Māori voice gets lost or watered down.
- There is a difference between culturally responsive and Māori/indigenous evaluation, a difference worth articulating more clearly.

And again, what lessons can we US evaluators, working with diverse cultural groups in our society, draw from the contemporary Māori politics in Aotearoa New Zealand? And again, my initial thoughts.

- One, our work as culturally responsive evaluators should not duck the complex and often-controversial political issues in the contexts in which we work, but rather engage respectfully and thoughtfully with them in our evaluation, as they are already there.
- Two, maintain vigilance and regard for cultural self-determination at least in our language. Learning from Veronica Thomas:
 - There are no “at-risk children, youth or families” in the US. But there are many, too many people who are *placed at risk* by continuing structural inequities in our society.
 - Similarly, children in our schools do not achieve at a particular level according to standardized tests. Rather, children in our schools demonstrate some level of mastery of the material *that they have had the genuine opportunity to learn*.

- And finally, I suggest that culturally responsive evaluation more explicitly and officially include the concept of *culturally responsible* evaluation, a term I have used throughout my remarks this morning. To me the concept of cultural responsibility captures many of the assertive and proactive stances of 'as Māori' evaluation I witnessed during my study leave. To me, the concept of cultural responsibility unmasks the muted hegemony of evaluation in especially government and public contexts and insists that evaluation serve, if not self-determination goals of cultural minority groups, then the more modest goals of democratizing voice, access, and judgment.

Closure

Finally, may I show off my budding fluency in Aotearoa New Zealand's contemporary version of our own language, English.

I am truly Gob-smacked to be here and hope that my stropky comments have been bolshi, flash, and skite, and neither curdled nor shonky. May your day be filled with lollyscrambles and jaffas.

Thank you.

References

Abma, T.A. (2006). The social relations of evaluation. In I.F. Shaw, J.C. Greene, and M.M. Mark (eds.), *The Sage handbook of evaluation* (pp.184-199). London: Sage.

Cram, F. (2009).

Hall, J.N., Ahn, J., & Greene, J.C. (2012). Values engagement in evaluation: Ideas, illustrations, and implications. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 33(2), 195-207.

King, J., Pipi, K., & Wehipeihana, N. (2012). *Evaluation of Kia Ora Hauora National Māori Health Workforce Development Programme*. Wellington: Kinnect Group.

McKegg, K., Wehipeihana, N., & Pipi, K. (2013). *He Oranga Poutama: what have we learned. A report on the Developmental Evaluation of He Oranga Poutama*. Wellington: Sport New Zealand

Patton, M.Q. (2010). *Developmental evaluation: Applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use*. NY: Guilford Press.

Pipi, K., Cram, F., & Hawke et al. (2004).