



REPORT

***Change Your  
Game / Cambia tu  
juego*** Process  
Evaluation

PREPARED BY

Kera Collective

FOR

Lemelson Center for the Study of Invention and  
Innovation at the National Museum of American History

DATE

October 2024



# Change Your Game / Cambia tu juego

## Process Evaluation



### PREPARED FOR

Lemelson Center for the Study of Invention and Innovation at the National Museum of American History

<https://invention.si.edu>

Washington, DC

Main Contact: Eric S. Hintz, *Historian / Acting Director*,  
*Lemelson Center for the Study of Invention and Innovation*



### PREPARED BY

Kera Collective, [www.keracollective.com](http://www.keracollective.com)

Kera Collective team members involved in this study:

Amanda Krantz, *Director of Research and Practice*

### FUNDED BY

The process evaluation of *Change Your Game / Cambia tu juego* exhibition was funded through a grant from the [National Science Foundation](#) Advancing Informal STEM Learning (AISL) #2005404.



### IMAGE CREDITS

Images in this report are from the [exhibition's website](#) or were taken at the NMAH by Kera Collective.

### SUGGESTED CITATION

Kera Collective, 2024. *Change Your Game / Cambia tu juego Process Evaluation*. Unpublished report written for The Lemelson Center for the Study of Invention and Innovation at the National Museum of American History.

# Table of Contents

<i>Table of Contents</i> .....	3
<b>01 Summary and Key Takeaways</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<i>Summary and Key Takeaways</i> .....	5
<b>02 Study Background</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<i>About the Study</i> .....	10
<i>About the Exhibition Project</i> .....	11
<b>03 Findings: Survey of Project Participants</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<i>About the Survey Sample</i> .....	13
<i>What Worked Well About the Process</i> .....	15
<i>Challenging Aspects of the Process</i> .....	16
<i>Inventive Identity Exploration by Project Participants</i> .....	16
<i>Impact Alignment of the Process</i> .....	17
<i>Advancing the AISL Field through the Process</i> .....	19
<i>Other Feedback</i> .....	20
<b>04 Appendix</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<i>Appendix A: Survey</i> .....	22

# 01 Summary and Key Takeaways



## Summary and Key Takeaways

A process evaluation unpacks and examines work processes, management, and implementation. This process evaluation explored the development process of the *Change Your Game / Cambia tu juego* exhibition by the Lemelson Center for the Study of Invention and Innovation (Lemelson Center) at the National Museum of American History (NMAH), which was funded by a National Science Foundation (NSF) Advancing Informal STEM Learning (AISL) grant #2005404. The takeaways that follow are Kera Collective's interpretation of the response of project participants in the survey, and benefit from our having worked with the Lemelson Center from the very beginning of the project in 2018 through to the exhibition opening in 2024.

### 01

#### Project participants valued the collaborative approach to the project.

Overall, project participants were complimentary of the collaborative project plan, particularly valuing how the project was designed to include many voices into the exhibition development process. NMAH staff perceived the process as particularly collaborative and innovative for them in its focus on promoting inventive identity, which fostered a relationship with educational psychology researchers around a dynamic systems model of identity (Kaplan & Garner, 2017) as part of the grant. NMAH staff reflected on shifts in their exhibition development process from being more object- and history-driven to being more focused on visitors and identity development. They felt they identified priority audiences early and prototyped with them during exhibition design (K, but also recognized ways collaboration could have been furthered (see Key Takeaway 3).

### 02

#### Unfortunately, the project was not able to support collaboration to the extent it was desired.

Collaborative processes can be valuable but also challenging, as the project team witnessed. Early on, the project could have benefited from the establishment of clear systems for collaboration, including hosting a kick-off meeting to introduce all project members, defining roles and expectations for project participants, identifying communication processes, and determining a system to reconcile multiple perspectives. These oversights were in part due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which added a layer of uncertainty and required adaptability not previously encountered, at the project's start in 2020. These challenges were exacerbated and compounded by eventual staff turnover at the NMAH and Roto (the contracted exhibition designer).

# 03

## Project participants considered their work aligned with the desired impact on audiences, but they and Kera also recognized ways the project could have better supported audiences.

As outlined in the grant, the exhibition's "ultimate intent is to foster and enhance inventive identity among diverse audiences, particularly girls and young women ages 10-17, African American youth ages 10-17, and people of all ages with disabilities." The summative evaluation findings revealed the exhibition was successful for two of the priority audiences—youth age 10-17 and Latinx visitors (who were named as a priority audience for the Smithsonian after the grant was awarded)—but was not very welcoming or accessible for another priority audience—visitors with disabilities (Kera Collective, 2024).

While NMAH staff felt the development process for this exhibition was more inclusive of multiple voices and stretched their practice to be more audience focused than in the past, three areas for improvement emerged:

- **Plan for challenges:** The project plan did not account adequately for the time and resources required for the level of collaborative efforts the project aspired to. Project participants also lamented some of the unfortunate circumstances, such as the COVID-19 pandemic and staff turnover. While the specific challenges may be unknown, the project could have better built in a safety net anticipating challenges in general.
- **Identify fewer priority audiences:** We commend the project team for identifying priority audiences early in the project. However, the audiences selected were broad and had widely different needs (youth versus people with disabilities at large). The diversity of audiences named in the grant, together with the addition of Latinx visitors, proved to be too many and too varied to sufficiently direct resources and attention.
- **Develop with audiences:** Since the inception of this project in 2018, the museum field's understandings of inclusive exhibition practices have developed greatly. This exhibition development process could have engaged audiences even earlier so they could help shape the project (i.e., nothing about us without us; and, of, by, and for us). Relatedly, the project team could have worked more authentically with community partners to build, foster, and sustain reciprocal relationships and built a more diverse team of project members that better matches the target audiences (e.g., more racially diverse and inclusive of people with disabilities).

## 04

### A number of highly engaged project participants said working on the exhibition made them think about their inventive identity.

Half of respondents said the process of working on the exhibition made them think about their inventive identity. While we cannot specifically identify the respondents, our perception—based on the comprehensive analysis of responses—is that individuals who work within the Lemelson Center are those who experienced shifts in inventive identity. This is important for two reasons. First, the Lemelson Center team is fully committed to thinking about invention and innovation, so their familiarity with the topic is high. Therefore, it is notable that their work on this specific project affected their self-reported feelings about their own inventive identity. Second, even if we consider that there might be courtesy bias among Lemelson Center’s self-reported feelings, these feelings suggest significant confidence and ability to communicate with visitors about inventive identity and inventive identity formation. For example, one described “embracing” their inventive identity more and feeling they have the language and examples to help others do the same, and another described their self-awareness of how we code switch into roles and identities including inventive identity.

## 05

### Project participants are excited about how the project may contribute to the AISL field.

The summative evaluation and research findings had not been analyzed and reported at the time that project participants completed the process evaluation survey. Yet, project participants are enthusiastic about how the project may contribute to the AISL field for many reasons:

- First, as a project led by a history museum with a sports content focus, project participants are curious to learn how these “shoulder” approaches to STEM can help broaden access to the field. Indeed, the summative evaluation revealed that the specific approach the exhibition team took to presenting sports provided entry points to explore inventive identity (Kera Collective, 2024).
- Second, project participants are interested to explore how the exhibition’s pedagogical focus on inventive identity—with concerted efforts to prompt identity awareness and formation—might create pathways for individuals who may not yet see themselves in STEM. The summative evaluation indicates to Kera that the exhibition promoted some inventive identity exploration in terms of ontological and epistemological beliefs. Together,

the summative evaluation and research findings—bringing the perspectives of evaluators with expertise in museums and informal learning in conversation with educational psychology researchers—will more holistically explore the efficacy of the project’s exhibition approach.

- Further, the evaluators have identified questions for advancing our understanding in the AISL field, which will likely be expanded or clarified through the research findings.

## References

Kaplan, A., Garner J.K., Rush, A. & Smith, M. (2023). Designing for diverse museum visitors’ identity exploration around inventiveness. *Frontiers in Education*, 8:1078001.

Kera Collective (2024). *Change Your Game/Cambia tu juego* Summative Evaluation, Unpublished report, Lemelson Center for the Study of Invention and Innovation at the National Museum of American History.



## 02 Study Background



## About the Study

Kera Collective (Kera) was contracted by the Lemelson Center for the Study of Invention and Innovation (Lemelson Center) at the National Museum of American History (NMAH) to conduct a process evaluation of, *Change Your Game / Cambia tu juego*, which was funded by a National Science Foundation (NSF) Advancing Informal STEM Learning (AISL) grant #2005404. The goal of the process evaluation is to explore efficacies and challenges of the exhibition development process. Findings will contribute to the AISL field's knowledge of new approaches and understanding of the design and development of STEM learning in informal environments. The findings will also be shared within the NSF AISL community to promote accessible informal STEM experiences.

## Objectives

The overall goals of the study are to understand:

- What about the exhibition development process worked well.
- What about the exhibition development process was challenging.
- How project participants explored their inventive identity in the process.
- How project participants considered the alignment of the process to the intended impact.
- How reflections on the project contribute to learning with the AISL community.

## Methodology

We administered one standardized, open-ended survey to project participants from July to August 2024, after the exhibition had opened.

## Recruitment

Kera Collective and Lemelson Center staff compiled a list of 77 people who participated across the many phases of the exhibition development process. Kera Collective sent an initial email invite to project participants, followed by two reminder emails.

## Analysis and Reporting

The web-based survey included 9 questions: 2 closed-ended questions (checkboxes) and 7 open-ended questions (essay responses). The data were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively with attention to how responses differed based on participants' project roles and length of involvement.

## About the Exhibition Project

*Change Your Game / Cambia tu juego* opened in March 2024 and is on view in the Jerome and Dorothy Lemelson Hall of Invention and Innovation at the National Museum of American History. This 3500-square-foot bilingual English-Spanish exhibition, funded in part by the National Science Foundation (NSF) and designed in partnership with Roto, explores the central role of invention and technology in sports from an unexpected perspective: who invents for sports and why? According to the exhibition's website, the exhibition "spotlights how the motivations of diverse inventors, athletes and technologists have changed how we play historical and contemporary sports, with the additional intention of empowering visitors to identify themselves as inventive problem solvers who can become "game changers" in their daily lives."



Entrance to *Change Your Game / Cambia tu juego*

## **03 Findings: Survey of Project Participants**



Kera Collective and Lemelson Center staff identified and invited 77 people who participated across the many phases of the exhibition development to participate in the process evaluation.

## About the Survey Sample

### Invited Participants

The 77 people who were invited to participate in the process evaluation included people named in the NSF grant, plus project team members, contractors, community partners, and donors that joined the project along the way. Kera Collective and the Lemelson Center staff who identified potential survey participants considered the majority Core Team members, including staff from the Lemelson Center and/or the National Museum of American History, exhibit designers from Roto (the contracted design firm), and university researchers (included in the grant). Several participants were advisors named in the grant, and several others were donors who joined the project mid-development. A few were community partners.

Project Involvement	n	%
Core Team	43	56%
Advisors	16	21%
Donors	13	17%
Community Partners	5	6%

### Survey Participants

A total of 24 people completed the survey, for a response rate of 32 percent. Survey responses were anonymous to promote candid responses. Thus, we cannot say with certainty who of the invited participants responded, but we asked two questions to contextualize their responses: duration of project participation and their self-identified role.

### Duration of Project Participation

The exhibition development process extends over many years. For *Change Your Game*, there were approximately 6 years from the beginning of the project to the end. There were 6 survey participants who indicated participating across all years of the project. Other participants were involved in one or more phases, with the greatest percentage of respondents participating in the project between 2020-2022 during design development and prototyping.

What year or years did you work on the Change Your Game exhibition? (select all that apply).	n	%
2018 and prior: during early formation of exhibition ideas	13	54%
2019-2020: during NSF grant proposal	14	58%
2020-2021: during 35% schematic and 65% detail design phases and alpha prototyping formative evaluation	18	75%
2021-2022: during 65-100% design phases and formative evaluation and beta prototyping formative evaluation	15	63%
2022-2024: during exhibition fabrication and install	13	54%

### Project Role

Survey participants were asked to self-identify their project role based on a list of categories. These project roles are more specific, and participants sometimes identified themselves in more than one category. The greatest number indicated their role within: project advisement, programming, or exhibition design. The remaining participants served in a variety of other roles: curatorial, research, oversight, grant management, donor, and community partner. Positively, the responses include multiple perspectives into the project.

Project Role	n	%
Project advisor/advisory board	8	33%
Programming	7	29%
Exhibition design	6	25%
Curator or curatorial assistant	4	17%
Research and evaluation	4	17%
Project oversight or management	4	17%
Grant management	3	13%
Donor	2	8%
Community Partner	1	4%

## What Worked Well About the Process

Survey respondents were asked to describe what about the development of the *Change Your Game* exhibition worked particularly well from their perspective.

- **Many voices:** The majority of respondents described the inclusive nature of the exhibition development process that invited in many voices. These respondents—who varied in project roles but were often involved in the early phases—talked about the “team approach,” “building ... a wide-ranging coalition,” “collaborative early conversations,” “open-minded ideation,” and allowing “evolution of the concept.”
- **Project structures:** Several commented on an aspect of the project structure. For example, two people (within programming and curatorial) felt the exhibition timeline allowed for deep thinking and collaboration. Additionally, one person working in grant management appreciated the regular status update meetings. Another person working in research felt the Lemelson Center team leads were excellent managers and meeting facilitators.
- **Focus on inventive identity:** Several people—mainly NMAH or Lemelson staff—said the focus on inventive identity as a driving concept for the exhibition worked well. These respondents described inventive identity as a compelling idea (e.g., that anyone can be inventive) and one with multiple jumping-off points (e.g., beyond sports).
- **Exhibition approaches:** A few people described the approach to exhibition development and design as innovative. For example, one NMAH staff described a “move away from a traditional content-centered approach to a more educationally impactful visitor-centered one,” and another said they went beyond “just telling the history of sports invention.”
- **Audiences:** Two mentioned the target audiences. For instance, one person working with curatorial described the early identification and clarification of audiences as valuable.

---

“ The team **worked well together** even though there were some areas that became contentious at times. There was **an exchange of ideas that was heard and considered** by curatorial and designers.

”

---

## Challenging Aspects of the Process

Survey respondents were asked to describe what was challenging about the exhibition development process. Almost all named more than one challenge, which are interrelated.

- **Project staff turnover:** The majority of respondents indicated challenges presented by the turnover in project staff. Between NMAH staff, including two project PIs, and Roto the contracted exhibition designer, at least half a dozen people named in the grant left their roles and thus the project. One NMAH staff member noted, “We felt this acutely in late 2023 and early 2024, just as we were trying to open the gallery and launch CYG-related programming.” Respondents described the turnover as “unfortunate” and “stressful.”
- **Communication:** Partly due to the project staff turnover, several respondents described communication issues around the project that emerged from project participants in many roles. For example, a few NMAH staff felt that decisions were constantly being revisited and/or not fully communicated out, thus belaboring the development process. Two donors felt communication was unclear and one was disappointed that certain aspects they expected to be in the exhibition did not manifest. Additionally, two others felt project partners did not have shared expectations for and perceptions of their roles and others’ roles on the project team, which set up skewed expectations for time and effort.
- **Reconciling multiple perspectives:** While the inclusion of many voices emerged as a successful aspect, several respondents also noted the challenges that came with reconciling multiple perspectives. One person described it as challenging and “rewarding” to do something ambitious together: “The Lemelson Center was interested in content/story, the academic team was focused on theory and research, and the exhibit team was focused on experience and design.” However, another person described how “the consonance and dissonance of opinions” contributed to more work and frustration.
- **COVID pandemic:** Several respondents noted that the project was funded by NSF in 2020 amid the COVID pandemic. A few noted how this resulted in project delays and increased costs beyond those anticipated due to materials shortages and inflation, which in turn required more fundraising. Additionally, one noted the challenge of not being able to meet in person and prototype exhibits on the floor of the museum in the real-world context of the museum setting for Smithsonian visitors.
- **Fundraising and costs:** Several noted the challenge of fundraising and costs. As mentioned above, the rising costs of materials necessitated more fundraising. One NMAH staff described the challenges of connecting the exhibition to established funding bases. Another NMAH staff felt the museum did not support the project team’s fundraising efforts as much as they would have hoped. Still, another project partner described the work scoped to NSF as requiring more funding than requested. And, another project member described having to make decisions to cut costs and keep exhibits “cost effective.”

## Inventive Identity Exploration by Project Participants

Survey respondents were asked to describe how, if at all, their work on the exhibition development process made them think reflexively about their own inventive identity.



- **Thought about their inventive identity:** Half of respondents said the process of working on the exhibition made them think about their inventive identity. Those who worked in project oversight, exhibit design, programming, and research described their reflections at great length. For example, one described “embracing” their inventive identity more and feeling they have the language and examples to help others do the same, and another considered the “dynamic was we code switch among our various roles and identities.” A few described how they now thought about their creative work and problem-solving as inventive.
- **Did not respond:** One-quarter did not respond to the question, possibly suggesting they did not think about their inventive identity or did not understand the question.
- **Talked about audiences experiencing inventive identity:** A few talked about how they imagined the exhibition helping visitors experience their inventive identity. For example, a community partner described their youth’s participation in the exhibition research, saying they “appreciated the opportunity to expand their identity to include inventor.” A donor described appreciation for building that identity in others: “I think it opens the mind to how there are all sorts of inventions and ways to be creative.”
- **Did not think about their inventive identity:** A few said they didn’t think about their inventive identity or their work on the project did not affect their inventive identity. The question prompted one person to express concern about how the exhibition development process did not recognize “other aspects” of the project that are required to host a successful exhibition, such as taking a project from exhibition design to actually implementing the design in installation and with forethought to long-term maintenance of the exhibition (i.e., the exhibition development process supported inventive traits and habits of mind such as creativity and risk-taking but not resourcefulness).

---

“ Even though I'd been steeped in invention and innovation content and approaches before this project, I felt I embraced my inventive identity more strongly. I now think of myself as an inventive problem solver in a way I didn't before. **I feel like I can be more proactive about encouraging others to see themselves as inventive because I have better language and examples to share.** ”

---

## Impact Alignment of the Process

As outlined in the grant, the exhibition's “ultimate intent is to foster and enhance inventive identity among diverse audiences, particularly girls and young women ages 10-17, African American youth ages 10-17, and people of all ages with disabilities.” Survey respondents were asked to think about what aspects of the process were successful in supporting the intended impact and areas where the process could better support the intended impact.

## Successes

Respondents identified three primary and interrelated ways they felt the exhibition development process supported the intended impact:

- **Audience-focused approach to the development process:** Almost half of respondents described the early identification and constant reflection upon the exhibition audiences. Staff at NMAH described the shift: “It was instrumental for the team to move beyond telling this history of the subject, which is what we tend to do in NMAH exhibits—and to explore how to help visitors consider their own identity. This was an enormous and impressive shift!” A few NMAH staff described their close collaboration with the researchers as helping them stay focused on how visitors will experience exhibition elements as related to their inventive identity.
- **Many voices in the development process:** Almost half of respondents described the importance of including multiple voices in the process. Some described the inclusion of the audiences in prototyping, to test language and artifact choices and collect more general feedback about the exhibition based on their interests and experiences. A few also described the diversity of voices as advisors and project contributors.
- **Intentional efforts to represent many people in the exhibition:** A few respondents described the intentional efforts to select objects, stories, and photographs representing a wide range of people, and specifically the target audiences. For example, one staff member said, “As we selected stories and images for the gallery, we tried to highlight athletes and inventors of every stripe: men-women-nonbinary, elite athletes and amateur weekend warriors, old-young, every race and ethnicity, people with disabilities, etc.”
- **Did not respond:** A few respondents did not answer the question.

---

“ Defining specific audiences toward the outset of the project began the curators’ shift away from the traditional exhibition development model. With the help of evaluators and psychologists, the curators increasingly thought more of how individuals, especially those from the targeted audiences, might experience the exhibition. ”

---

## Areas for Improvement

Respondents were asked what about the exhibition development process they thought could have better supported the project’s ultimate intent on audiences.

- **Unsure or did not respond:** The majority of respondents either said they were unsure or did not have enough information/involvement to answer the question. A few other respondents did not answer the question.
- **Greater involvement of audiences:** Several respondents suggested greater involvement of the target audiences would have been beneficial. Some said that the target audiences could have been involved even earlier than in the prototyping phases of work. For example, one project advisor said, “Allowing the target audience a seat at the table in the conceptual development

might have opened minds to hidden opportunities.” Some others said the target audiences could have been engaged more frequently throughout the project. For example, two respondents suggested doing more testing of the physical accessibility of interactives for people with a broad range of disabilities (particularly low vision). A few described how relationships with the community partners named in the grant ended up not being sustained with staff turnover, so there were gaps in audience representation in prototyping, research, and evaluation.

- **Better project planning and administration:** Several respondents suggested project planning in different capacities could have been better. A few said the budgeting and fundraising for the project were not adequate based on the planned approach. These respondents wished the project team had requested additional funding from NSF and/or that NMAH had been better prepared to fundraise for additional support to execute the project as desired. Potentially related to budgeting and fundraising, one respondent suggested NMAH needed to communicate better with potential donors about audience involvement in exhibition projects, and another suggested identifying major sponsors or partners early in the process. Still, another felt there was “too much fluidity in the possibilities of the exhibition late in the process,” and another felt some additional resources on intellectual property and patenting could have been important.
- **Greater diversity on the project team:** One respondent suggested working more diligently to diversify the project team; this respondent recalled efforts being made, “but that in the end, the core project team was largely composed of able-bodied, white people.”

---

“ To better support our goals, it would have been nice to have a more diverse project team. Our advisory group certainly included people of color and people with disabilities... but in the end the core project team was largely composed of able-bodied, white people. ”

---

## Advancing the AISL Field through the Process

The NSF AISL grant that funded the project “seeks to advance new approaches to, and evidence-based understanding of, the design and development of STEM learning in informal environments.” This includes providing multiple pathways for broadening access to and engagement in STEM learning experiences, advancing innovative research on and assessment of STEM learning in informal environments, and developing understandings of deeper learning by participants.” Respondents were asked in what ways they think Change Your Game (CYG) advances approaches to and understanding of STEM learning in informal environments.

- **Broadening access to STEM through history and sports:** The majority of respondents described how the exhibition broadened access to STEM by being an exhibition hosted in a museum of history (not science or technology). For example, one said, “Allowing people to encounter these concepts in an informal learning environment, like a museum, especially one that isn't specifically STEM-coded allows them to step away from some of their preconceived ideas and be open to how truly applicable it is.” Several also described sports as a hook into STEM

exploration. One said, “It invites in young people to consider STEM by starting with sports. In this way it can attract the interest and engagement of youths who are beginning to say ‘science isn’t for me’.”

- **Broadening access to STEM through identity exploration:** Several described the focus on identity exploration as broadening access to STEM, as well as advancing research in STEM identity. As one person noted, “I think people often have a very narrow view of STEM—who uses it and where it’s applied; CYG helps the public see that these concepts underlie much of what we all do in our everyday lives.”
- **Exploring efficacy of the exhibition strategies:** Several described their deliberate approach to the exhibition design strategies and how this project will explore the efficacy of these strategies through evaluation and research. For example, an NMAH staff observed, “Visitors have the opportunity to experience what could normally be complex subjects in simple and fun ways. There is a human factor to the STEM content in the exhibit... feelings/motivations behind the STEM content makes the STEM content more personalized and relatable.” And, one donor said, “I think it meets people where they are and activates curiosity, so there is storytelling, good questions, and then a problem. I think it advances approaches to and understanding of STEM learning by making it fun, relatable and doable...”
- **Broadening access to STEM by connecting it to inventive traits and habits of mind:** A few described the power of invention and inventive traits and habits of mind as a bridge between STEM and those who may feel uninterested or unwelcome in STEM fields. For example, one participant said, “By using the lenses of invention—rather than science—and sports, the exhibition opens the door wider for more people to be able to understand, connect with, and be impacted by the exhibition.”
- **Did not respond:** A few did not answer the question.

## Other Feedback

A few respondents provided additional feedback:

- **Pride and commitment to learning:** A few NMAH staff noted their pride in and commitment to learning from the project. Respondents described the process as a “benchmark project” that can further our understanding of inventive identities and STEM.
- **Reiterated a specific former comment:** A few reiterated something they had noted previously, including: noting the importance of identifying target audiences early, desiring the need for greater incorporation of research and evaluation, and observing the need to balance tensions between including multiple voices and efficiency.
- **Curiosities and recommendations:** A few described curiosities, such as whether the exhibition would perform best as a traveling exhibition to local museums versus at NMAH. One suggested the exhibition continue to be supplemented with special events to keep the exhibition relevant.

## 04 Appendix



## Appendix A: Survey

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey reflecting on the process of developing the [Change Your Game / Cambia Tu Juego](#) exhibition (formerly called Game Changers). This survey is part of the process evaluation being conducted for the [National Science Foundation \(NSF\) Advancing Informal STEM Learning \(AISL\) Grant #2005404](#) by [Kera Collective](#).

### Participation and Confidentiality

Your answers are anonymous; they are not linked to your name, IP address, or other identifiable information. However, given the limited number of people who worked on the project over the course of the grant (approximately 75 people at the Smithsonian and other organizations) there is potential that the evaluator can identify individual responses. The evaluator will aggregate the responses in reporting and will aim to mask identities as much as possible without losing context for individual feedback. Your participation is voluntary, and you can stop at any time or decline to answer any questions.

### Definition

Throughout the survey, we ask about the **process of developing / development of the exhibition**. By development, we mean all the aspects that led up to creating the exhibition, including coming up with the exhibition ideas, collecting or identifying stories and objects, testing content and design, and designing and fabricating the exhibition. You have been identified by Lemelson staff as having a role in the development of the exhibition. Whether you consider your role large or small, we want to hear from you!

### You and the Exhibition Development Process

1. **What year or years did you work on the Change Your Game exhibition ?** (select all that apply).
  - **2018 and prior:** during early formation of exhibition ideas
  - **2019-2020:** during NSF grant proposal
  - **2020-2021:** during 35% schematic and 65% detail design phases and alpha prototyping formative evaluation
  - **2021-2022:** during 65-100% design phases and formative evaluation and beta prototyping formative evaluation
  - **2022-2024:** during exhibition fabrication and install
  - Other, please describe in general terms: \_\_\_\_\_
2. **What was your role on the project?** (select all that apply)
  - Project advisor/advisory board
  - Community partner
  - Project manager
  - Exhibition design
  - Curator or curatorial assistant
  - Research and evaluation
  - Project oversight
  - Programming
  - Grant management
  - Other, please describe in general terms: \_\_\_\_\_

3. From your perspective, what about the development of the Change Your Game exhibition worked particularly well? Please describe.

---

---

4. What was challenging about the exhibition development process? Keep in mind that the results are used to inform future NSF AISL projects.

---

---

5. How, if at all, has the exhibition development process made you think about your inventive identity?

---

---

#### Audiences, Intentions, and the Exhibition Development Process

6. As outlined in the grant, Game Changers “ultimate intent is to foster and enhance inventive identity among diverse audiences, particularly girls and young women ages 10-17, African American youth ages 10-17, and people of all ages with disabilities.” [See award abstract for additional information.](#)

What about the exhibition development process do you think was instrumental in supporting this intent?

---

---

7. What about the exhibition development process do you think could have better supported the project’s ultimate intent (see Q6 above [and award abstract for additional information](#))?

---

---

8. The NSF AISL grant that funded the project “seeks to advance new approaches to, and evidence-based understanding of, the design and development of STEM learning in informal environments. This includes providing multiple pathways for broadening access to and engagement in STEM learning experiences, advancing innovative research on and assessment of STEM learning in informal environments, and developing understandings of deeper learning by participants.”

In what ways do you think Change Your Game advances approaches to and understanding of STEM learning in informal environments?

---

---

9. Is there anything else you would like to share about the exhibition development process to help further knowledge in the field?

---

---

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!

*With gratitude, Kera Collective thanks the Lemelson Center for the Study of Invention and Innovation for the opportunity to evaluate the Change Your Game / Cambia tu juego exhibition development process.*

*Our doors are always open—don't hesitate to reach out with anything that's on your mind!*



Kera Collective explores, measures, and furthers the meaning-making that occurs between museums and people.

WWW.KERACOLLECTIVE.COM  
HELLO@KERACOLLECTIVE.COM

