



Cornish+Grey
Helping organisations
achieve their social purpose

Mindsets + Missions Evaluation Report

**For the Association for Science and
Discovery Centres, The Liminal
Space, The Museums Association and
UK Research and Innovation**

7 November 2024

Contactus@cornishandgrey.org
www.cornishandgrey.org
[@cornishandgrey](https://www.instagram.com/cornishandgrey)

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2.1 Phase 1 - Mindsets + Missions Learning Programme	3
2.2 Phase 2 – Mindsets + Missions funded projects	4
2.3 Impacts and outcomes of the funded projects	8
2.4 Views about the Mindsets + Missions process	17
2.5 What do grantees think should happen next?	17
3. Conclusions	18
3.1 Overall view about Mindsets + Missions	18
3.2 Science Centres & Museums: Inclusive Research Hubs?	19
3.3 Mindsets + Missions: ingredients of success?	19
3.4 Grantee key learnings for inclusive research and innovation	20
Appendix A - Theory of Change and Evaluation Framework	23
Appendix B. Portfolio Summary Table	34

About Cornish and Grey

Cornish and Grey is a social consultancy providing evaluation and impact strategy support to social purpose organisations. We work with funders, grant makers, capacity builders, umbrella organisations, charities and social enterprises to help develop practical impact or measurement strategies so they can become more effective and ensure that limited funds are spent where they make the most difference.

1. Introduction

Mindsets + Missions, a new learning and grants programme funded by UK Research and Innovation (UKRI), uses the concept of “future citizens” and aims to enable people who bring diverse and plural perspectives to engage with, influence and participate in the development of the knowledge, research and innovation on which our future societies will be built.

More specifically, Mindsets + Missions aims to explore how cultural institutions can help to enable fully realised future citizens i.e.. how can they enable more people — and in particular people from underrepresented communities — to participate in a culture of enquiry, and in the acquisition and sharing of knowledge, for the betterment of themselves and society.

It aims to explore how cultural institutions can balance three objectives, namely:

- Engaging people, including young people.
- Helping people to find their place in a culture of enquiry.
- Enabling people to have real agency for themselves and for their society.

Mindsets + Missions is built on a rich foundation of research and experience, including: [The Mindsets for Museums of the Future report](#); [Science and Discovery Centre Futures: Missions and Opportunities report](#); [The Bold Futures programme](#); [The Inspiring Science Fund](#); [Museums Change Lives](#); Digital innovation and engagement grants across museums and science centres; and [Explore Your Universe](#).

Phase 1 Mindsets + Missions learning programme - in March 2023, Mindsets + Missions kicked off with a learning programme attended by a cohort of 30 museum and science and discover centre (SDC) representatives accompanied by a further 15 diverse and boundary-pushing individuals associated with these sectors. Led by the Liminal Space, the learning programme explored ways to engage underrepresented groups with research and innovation, and to champion and inspire, bold and creative research and innovation practice in the museums and science centre sectors. A further aim of the programme was to help develop partnerships and collaborations across participants.

The programme launched with an in-person 2-day event in Leeds, followed by a series of online talks by guest speakers, and responsive workshops facilitated by sector professionals. This was supported by an online collaboration space with curated content and facilitated engagement.

All the organisations and individuals who took part in the learning programme were given the opportunity to apply for funding from the Mindsets + Missions programme – the aim was to help them put ideas inspired by the learning programme into action and to help foster collaboration between participants.

Phase 2 Mindsets + Missions funded projects - In July 2023, 12 of the learning programme cohort were awarded grants ranging from £48,000 to £75,000 for research and innovation projects spanning 12 months which embodied the equitable, community-focussed, future proofing ideas and initiatives explored during the learning programme. The theory of change/ logic model for this programme is shown in Appendix A, and a list of all the projects funded including a description of each project is included in Appendix B.

This report summarises the findings from both Phase 1 and Phase 2 of this programme. It also summarises the main themes coming out of the programme and makes recommendations for future practice.

Note on the focus of this evaluation:

This Cornish and Grey evaluation report is focussed on the outcomes of the Mindsets + Missions funded activities in both phases plus any indicative findings of longer term outcomes. Legacy outcomes which are dependent on follow up activities outside of the time frame of this evaluation, or activities dependent on this report, are not covered in this report. This legacy impact will be evaluated after one and two years after the end of the first year of funding.

2. Main findings

2.1 Phase 1 - Mindsets + Missions Learning Programme

Overall, the Mindsets + Missions learning programme appears to have been successful. The feedback was very positive, particularly about the all day event in Leeds which kicked off the programme. The participants were particularly keen on the face to face interaction. While they understood the cost issues, they would have liked more face to face elements during the course of the programme as the bulk of it was run online.

The programme was seen as helping to develop the skills and knowledge of sector practitioners in engaging underrepresented groups with knowledge, research, and innovation. While the museums, SDC and research sectors already know a lot about what works and what doesn't when it comes to engagement, the learning programme was seen as an important step in inspiring them to take risks, incorporate untapped and overlooked knowledge, and to give due respect to research and innovation generated by typically unheard voices.

The learning programme also resulted in a successful collaboration between The Mixed Museum and two individual researchers/ consultants. This collaboration only existed as a result of the team meeting for the first time at the learning programme, and it went on to receive Mindsets + Missions funding.

The feedback survey of participants about the learning programme showed that:

- 97% agreed the learning programme was relevant to them
- 94% of those with colleagues said they would recommend the learning programme
- 87% agreed they learnt something new at the in-person event
- 85% agreed there was lots of opportunity for the exchange of ideas, perspectives and approaches at the in-person event
- 84% agreed they made new contacts at the in-person event
- 79% agreed the in-person event gave them space to think about new approaches
- 73% agreed the learning programme critiqued current practice in a positive way
- 57% agreed the event encouraged them to think about how to do things in a radically different way
- 53% agreed they would change their application for Mindsets + Missions funding as a result of what they had heard at the event. Only 9% disagreed with 38% uncertain whether they would change their application.

In the Mindsets + Missions Learning Programme cohort members own words:

It was inspiring

“Really valuable in terms of exploring new ideas and being open-minded to changing the way we work and who we work with.”

“It’s changed how I look at creating with, and integrating with, our visitors and communities.”

Collaboration had positive benefits

“I really enjoyed our discussions... It did seem that we perhaps held the answers to each other’s dilemmas and could tackle some very complex issues as a team.”

“It was valuable to hear how others have struggled to build strong connections with local communities, as it is easy to feel that you are failing in this area and to become discouraged.”

Full details of the insights coming out of the Mindsets + Missions Learning programme can be found at <https://readymag.website/theliminalspace/mindsetsandmissions/>

2.2 Phase 2 – Mindsets + Missions funded projects

Key findings from Phase 2

Direct beneficiaries of the funding include over 7,800 children, young people and adults from across these underrepresented communities.

Underrepresented groups involved in the projects include people with learning difficulties, people with physical disabilities, people living in areas of deprivation, Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ+) communities, neurodiverse individuals, refugees, people with mental health issues, Windrush generation, families of Black GIs (Black soldiers stationed in UK during WWII), and elderly people with early stages of dementia.

Key impacts include:

- **Mindsets + Missions has successfully fostered new ways of working with groups underrepresented in research and innovation and in the museum and science and discovery centre sector**
 - 100% of project teams agreed that the Mindsets + Missions funded research project has allowed new voices from underrepresented groups to be heard within their organisation
 - All project teams said their relationship was stronger with both communities and researchers (if applicable) as a result of doing the work.
 - 77% of project teams agreed the project has helped bring together researchers and underrepresented group(s) to work in new and innovative ways.
 - 71% agree the project has resulted in meaningful research findings – others said it is too early to say.
- **Innovative research methods used in museums and science and discovery centres have had positive benefits for the individual participants from underrepresented communities**
 - 83% of the projects achieved agency outcomes for the individual participants,
 - 100% of the projects achieved belonging, relevance and inspiring outcomes for the individual participants,
 - 83% of the projects helped individuals to develop new skills
 - 92% of the projects achieved social connection outcomes
- **Innovative research methods have created opportunities for long term legacy across museums and science and discovery centres**

- 100% are excited about the legacy of the work across their organisation and will continue to adopt the innovative practices initiated through their Mindsets and Missions project
- 93% say the research project will change the way they will work with underrepresented groups in the future
- All practitioners said their confidence in working with underrepresented groups had increased as a result of doing the work

Overall the findings show that to deliver projects successfully with groups underrepresented in research and innovation and in museums and SDCs, the following apply:

- There is necessity for flexibility, clear communication, and spending time on relationship-building.
- Institutional barriers, such as lack of agility, entrenched practices, and strict academic requirements, can hinder project delivery
- Positive outcomes can be achieved by fostering open-ended, creative approaches and sustained community engagement.
- Trust is a critical factor, especially in communities historically marginalised, and long-term commitment is seen as essential for innovative practice to imbed.
- Ensuring relevance to the underrepresented community was also seen as vital to ensure the process was not seen as extractive.

Summary of the types of work that took place

There was a very wide range of work across all 12 projects - a list of all the projects funded including a description of each project is included in Appendix B. Here is a flavour of all the different methods used to give the reader an idea of the breadth. Note that while examples are given for each, most projects involved more than one of these types of work.

- **Sustained community involvement:** The use of residencies, recurring workshops, and long-term projects was widespread and ensured sustained engagement and deeper participation from the underrepresented communities E.g. Winchester and Xplore! projects both ran over many months with multiple workshops, visits, engagement exercises to ensure sustained engagement and real impact on the underrepresented groups involved.
- **Collaborative learning and exploration:** Many projects encouraged collaborative learning with underrepresented communities through exploratory trips. E.g. Discovering 42 took a group of young Disabled people to a science centre to critique the exhibits from an accessibility perspective. Dynamic Earth ran multiple workshops with six different community groups to explore climate justice and also find out views about the science centre and how it could be improved for people like them.
- **Creative and artistic engagement:** There was widespread use of creative tools such as games, role-play, theatre, art making, zine-making, storytelling, and songwriting to engage participants in meaningful, representative ways. E.g. The Fitzwilliam Museum project resulted in a young person collective putting on a theatrical performance to convey their thinking in the area of racism and decolonisation.
- **Sensory and interactive engagement:** Many projects focused on sensory as well as creative tools to help engagement. E.g. The Museum of Wales piloted a framework focused on sensory engagement for people with disabilities, and exercises involving touch helped build trust between community members in the Mixed Museum project.
- **Co-creation and lived experience integration:** Many projects included co-creation workshops where underrepresented audiences made the decisions about the direction of the project. E.g.

Manchester Museum where the young artists with learning difficulties took decisions about how to use the space held for them in the Wild exhibition.

- **Digital and multimedia platforms:** Many projects leveraged digital tools such as sound diaries, video and audio recordings, e-publications, and online platforms to document and showcase participant contributions, offering a concrete legacy. E.g. Aunt Nell who worked in partnership with Queer Britain Museum are using some of the oral histories collected during the project as part of their global podcast series.
- **Transdisciplinary research:** Many projects brought together diverse groups of people, including artists, scientists, and public engagement experts alongside people with lived experience, to co-create outputs. E.g. The Kielder Observatory collaboration brought together astronomy with arts to inspire and engage underrepresented groups in the North East – the arts based approaches were particularly successful for groups with language difficulties.
- **Public engagement events:** Medium to large scale public events, workshops, and exhibitions were key for showcasing the results of these projects, often designed to engage broader audiences. E.g. Durham University worked in collaboration with multiple partners to deliver 90 events across deprived areas in the North East – participants in Street Cosmos ranged from 5 to 2,000+.
- **Building trust and emphasis on building long-term engagement prior to the research commencing:** There was emphasis by some projects on the importance of establishing trust with underrepresented communities through extensive groundwork and avoiding rushed engagement. This was seen as critical for those underrepresented groups with lived experience of being marginalised, experience of extractive research, and general mistrust of establishment. E.g. National Windrush Museum has spent nearly a year concentrating on building trust with their community, and the Mixed Museum for whom spending time on building trust was seen as critical to their projects success.

Summary of project aims

There were also a wide range of project aims including the following – again, some projects had more than one aim:

- Eight involved co-creation with the community groups to feed into exhibit design
- Two resulted in content for collections
- Five aimed to build awareness and knowledge about a research area within the community
- Four involved community building
- All aimed to impact their organisation strategy and ways of working.

Did the projects bring together new partnerships?

- Four of the 12 organisations collaborated with community groups that they had never worked with before. Five worked with a mix of old and new community groups, and the remaining three organisations worked with community groups they had worked with before, but not in this way.
- Only four of the 12 grantee organisations were working with researchers they had worked with before.

Did the projects bring about new research?

- Nine of the 12 research projects are defined as creating ‘new research’ by the grantees – the remaining three involved raising awareness of existing research with underrepresented groups.

What was innovative about the projects?

Overall, innovations emphasised the importance of trust-building, decentralisation, inclusivity, and flexibility in project planning - all of which led to better engagement and deeper connections with underrepresented communities and better outcomes. Each project was innovative in a different way, but a number of themes can be seen across all 12 including:

- **Empowering creativity and collaboration:** For several projects, giving individuals or groups the autonomy to shape the direction of their involvement and allowing them to explore creative ideas freely, and make decisions about the outcomes, was a new way of working – pushing these organisations outside of their comfort zone.
- **Inclusivity and representation:** In the same way, ensuring that underrepresented voices were involved in decision-making processes so enhancing the legitimacy and diversity of perspectives, was again new for many organisations.
- **Decentralising power structures:** Most of the projects, highlighted a shift away from their more typical hierarchical decision-making. By giving community groups 100% control over project decisions, trust was built, and deeper engagement was fostered.
- **Control of the narrative:** Some organisations gave the underrepresented communities complete control of a part of their exhibition space - changing the traditional structure where usually experts control narratives. It was felt this shift led to a more authentic representation of community voices and encouraged deeper participation.
- **Hands-on participant involvement:** In one project, underrepresented communities were involved directly in scientific research and content creation (e.g., astro-imaging, data collection) – this moved the organisation beyond their traditional outreach, empowering participants to actively contribute, fostering a deeper connection to the research and its outcomes.
- **Challenging traditional knowledge systems/ definitions of research:** Many projects sought to challenge conventional definitions of knowledge and research by incorporating oral history and collection of personal experiences into their research methodologies, thereby validating alternative forms of evidence and history.
- **Rejection of formalised approaches:** Most projects rejected the use of formal tools like surveys or questionnaires for data collection, because they recognised that previous engagement with research for their underrepresented community had been extractive. Instead, they prioritised ongoing conversations to maintain trust and adapt to the community's needs.
- **Adapting to project evolution:** Instead of working to a project plan, many projects had to work in a more agile way. This flexibility was key when working with underrepresented groups and really listening to their needs. By pivoting their plan mid-course, these projects still resulted in meaningful outcomes, including positive outcomes for individual participants, increased trust within the community for the grantee organisation and future collaboration opportunities.

Delivery challenges

Not surprisingly given that the organisations were working outside of their comfort zone and trying to deliver innovative projects, not everything went smoothly – every project had challenges that they had to resolve. The examples below point to the necessity of flexibility, clear communication, and relationship-building in delivering projects that work with underrepresented groups. They also show that institutional barriers, such as lack of agility, entrenched practices, and strict academic requirements, can hinder project delivery, while positive outcomes can be achieved by fostering open-ended, creative approaches and sustained community engagement. Overall, trust is the critical factor, especially in communities historically marginalised, and long-term commitment is seen as essential for innovative practice to imbed.

Challenges included:

- **Lack of agility** - Partner organisations were often not as agile as needed, slowing down the process – e.g. in one instance the project community partner insisted on organising all contact with the individual community participants – this additional layer of bureaucracy meant that the whole process was slowed down and less work was able to be achieved during the time frame.
- **Institutional barriers** - The entrenched systems and practices within some institutions, especially those that reproduce inequalities, limited the ability of some to implement transformative approaches.
- **Communication and decision-making issues** - There were many difficulties in maintaining clear communication and decision-making lines, both internally and with partners across complex partnership structures.
- **Hybrid working** - Hybrid working was a significant challenge, managing virtual and in-person collaboration took much longer than expected in projects spread across many locations.
- **Time constraints and external challenges** - Real-life challenges interfered with some project timelines, highlighting the importance of flexibility in timelines and contingency planning for unexpected delays.
- **Mistrust and relationship building** – all acknowledged that building trust with marginalised communities takes significant time and effort, particularly where negative experiences with established organisations has created deep mistrust. Successful engagement required them to demonstrate that the project was genuinely inclusive and beneficial to these groups – not extractive. This emphasised the need for long-term relationship-building with communities, particularly those that have experienced exclusion or mistreatment in the past.
- **Unanticipated success and the importance of flexibility** - Unexpected successes, such as the popularity of light painting among refugee participants in the Kielder project, show the value of flexibility in adapting project activities to suit participant interests and needs. This underscores the need for open-ended, creative approaches in project design to engage diverse audiences effectively.
- **Challenges with institutional practices and ethics** - Timetable restrictions (e.g. school schedules) and academic research constraints (e.g. ethics sign-off) posed significant challenges for one project, forcing the project to pivot away from a citizen science approach where the aim had been to collect new data for the researcher, towards an approach that involved raising awareness and knowledge of existing research among the community group. This highlights the tension between academic requirements and the flexibility needed to meet community needs, suggesting that more adaptable approaches to academic research may be needed.
- **Participant Engagement and Ownership** - Some participants found it difficult to engage in project planning activities (e.g. creating logic models or "how to work with me" guidelines). Instead, they preferred hands-on activities and celebration events. The project teams had to be responsive to these preferences and provide more support and guidelines to those groups who needed it.

2.3 Impacts and outcomes of the funded projects

Reach of funding

- In total the projects engaged with over 7,800 children, young people and adults from across these underrepresented communities.
- Underrepresented groups involved in the projects included people with learning difficulties, people with physical disabilities, people living in areas of deprivation, LGBTQ+ communities, neurodiverse individuals, refugees, people with mental health issues, people from the Windrush generation, families of Black GIs, and elderly people with early stages of dementia.
- The number of indirect beneficiaries is not yet known but is likely to be large – indirect beneficiaries could include these and other underrepresented communities who benefit from the

exhibition of materials, new collections and new practices across organisations resulting from this work.

What were the project outputs?

There was a huge range of outputs – some of which will have a long lifetime - including:

- New sensory exhibits
- New accessible exhibits
- Public engagement events for underrepresented groups
- Creative outputs created by underrepresented groups exhibited in museums and science and discovery centres
- A theatre piece created by an underrepresented group
- A sound garden with an inspirational bench centre piece for an underrepresented group
- Online content created by underrepresented groups
- Oral histories of underrepresented groups for collections
- Podcasts based on these oral histories
- New astrophotography art created by underrepresented groups
- Best Practice Guides for museum professionals on inclusive practice for specific underrepresented groups
- Best practice guides for collecting oral histories and story telling with specific underrepresented groups
- Resources for community groups/ co-production boxes/ creative tools
- Training for community groups in how to work on topic area/ with underrepresented groups

What were the participant outcomes?

The theory of change for individual participants in Mindsets + Missions projects – see Appendix A – includes outcomes based on the inclusive outcome areas surfaced from extensive research by ASDC Centres on meaningful and more equitable participant outcomes between 2018 and 2023 – see <https://inclusion.sciencecentres.org.uk/> for more details.

Participant outcomes include:

- Agency – Participants feels they made an impact/ had choices/ made a difference to the outcome
- Belonging – Participants felt comfortable/ included
- Relevance – Connection to participants' lives - relevance to people, place and purpose
- Possible selves – Participants found out something new/ inspired curiosity
- Developing skills – Participants developed new life skills or specific skills
- Social connection – Participants made new connections/relationships/ improved existing relationships

Each of the projects used different methods to gain participant feedback. The vast majority used qualitative methods to collect reflections and anecdotes. Most felt that it was inappropriate or not possible to use formal surveys to collect data because of accessibility issues or issues around mistrust in research. Having read through all of the reports and held discussions with the grantees about the impacts on the participants, we have been able to infer the outcomes across the Bold Futures categories. We have summarised the outcomes below – where Blue is outcome met and White is outcome not met. This summary shows that all projects met more than one participant outcome, and the majority met them all. Below the table we include quotes from the participants to help bring the outcomes to life.

	Grantee	Agency	Belonging	Relevance	Inspiring	Developing skills	Social connection
--	---------	--------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-------------------	-------------------

1	Mixed Museum						
2	Fitzwilliam Museum						
3	Amgueddfa Cymru - Museum Wales						
4	Kielder Observatory						
5	Durham University						
6	Queer Britain Museum						
7	Xplore! Science and Discovery Centre						
8	National Windrush Museum						
9	Dynamic Earth						
10	Winchester Science Centre & Planetarium						
11	Discovering42						
12	Manchester Museum						
	% outcome met	83%	100%	100%	100%	83%	92%

Participants in their own words

AGENCY - *"I've never really worked in an inclusive environment before... I was super surprised when I first got hired... having a specific meeting that talked specifically and in detail about my accommodations. And as time went on, being able to find what would work for me and find those accommodations and implement them was an incredible experience. It has radically changed how I view work. It was an incredible experience."* Amgueddfa Cymru - Museum Wales participant

BELONGING - *"It was really interesting ...when I was at school I was told I really couldn't do a lot of things because of my disability"* Discovering 42 participant

POSSIBLE SELVES - *"Wow. It was amazing!! It was an incredible experience filled with fun and engagement across various age groups. From immersive VR technology to captivating activities like the pop-up planetarium and hands-on crafts, we not only had a blast but also learned new things in the process. We hope to see another Space Day at the hub!"* Street Cosmos Visitor

BELONGING - *"Oh and just wanted to add, my daughter nearly cried when we found the Open Dyslexia folders. She was so happy she was able to sit and read something more easily. She did say she wished there was a couple of illustrations inside, but she was SO happy, she felt so included. Usually when we visit museums and galleries, the words are so overwhelming for her <3 Absolutely incredible job - this is the first time we have come across this level of accessibility, and you've knocked it out of the park. So, thank you so much!"* Visitor to Manchester Museum exhibit

DEVELOPING SKILLS - *"If I was my normal shy self I would not have gotten nearly as much from this experience. Like, I would not want to do any of any of the acting, would not want to do any of the talking, I wouldn't even think of trying physical theatre, 'cos that's not my thing. Like, I think something I've learned from this is to be open, to go out of my comfort zone, and, um, even though in my future career I might not even use drama or physical theatre, the fact that it taught me to step outside of my comfort zone – that I will definitely use in later life."* Fitzwilliam Museum Participant

POSSIBLE SELVES - *"The session was amazing. And the clients loved it! Really amazing to see people seeking sanctuary have access to science and space which they wouldn't otherwise!"* Kielder Community group participant

RELEVANCE - *“I feel a sense of belonging to the region that I'd not experienced before. I feel that this is related to my interconnectedness to other people that live here.”* Queer Britain participant

SOCIAL CONNECTION/ POSSIBLE SELVES - *“I thought I never in my lifetime would meet other women and men whose lives would have and hold such a deep and strong rooted connection to my own. But most important in all of this is the closeness and most intimate loving care that grew in our relationships over those 3 days. Also how much this has grown because of all we shared and experienced during the whole period of this project. I honestly feel that the careful thinking and creative ideas you put into this project have really opened up pathways for me. I feel this is the family I never had as a child or as an adult until now.”* Mixed Museum participant

DEVELOPING SKILLS - *“The class pitched their garden to the school leadership team, who were wowed by the children's increased knowledge, confidence and skills”.* Winchester Wonderseekers community group participant

AGENCY - *“We had a group discussion we made plans on, so we had to select which one we wanted to do and then we had to decide as a group what we wanted to do”.* Xplore! participant

POSSIBLE SELVES - *“The activities inspire me to do something that I wouldn't normally do and then they're a great bunch of people. [...] [the experiments] they'll stick in my mind. All of them. Watching the experiments, learning different things.”* Xplore! participant

What were the researcher outcomes?

The aims for researchers included:

- they gained an understanding of how their research can be relevant, useful or impactful for underrepresented groups;
- they have increased confidence to engage with people from underrepresented groups;
- they will work in partnership with communities to generate knowledge and research.

Five of the 12 grantees reported in the survey that they did not work with ‘researchers’. In fact looking at each of these in turn – they did work with external individuals or organisations who gave them the skills to conduct the research themselves – but they didn’t classify them as researchers. In every case these projects did conduct new research.

For the remaining seven grantees, we can infer the following researcher outcomes based on the information given – as before Blue means the outcome has been met, whereas White means the outcome is unlikely to have been met.

	Grantee	Better understanding of how their research can be relevant/useful/impactful for underrepresented groups	Increased confidence in working with underrepresented groups	Will work with communities in the future
1	Mixed Museum			
2	Fitzwilliam Museum			

3	Amgueddfa Cymru - Museum Wales			
4	Kielder Observatory			
5	Durham University			
6	Queer Britain Museum			
7	Winchester Science Centre & Planetarium			
	% outcome met	86%	100%	100%

The Winchester researcher stands out – unfortunately the project had issues with timing which impacted on the research process including obtaining ethics sign off (i.e., approval from their university to ensure that research projects are conducted in an ethical way) which meant that the research findings could not be used by the researcher. At the same time however, the researcher really enjoyed the process and wants to work with the centre in the future (funding dependent) and has gained in confidence in working with underrepresented groups.

In terms of meaningful research outcomes - four agreed that research outcomes were meaningful for the researchers who took part, two said that it was too early to say, and one (Winchester again) said that while the researcher enjoyed the process the research outcomes were not meaningful for them.

The meaningful research outcomes include:

- The researchers at Durham University gained a great deal from the Street Cosmos process including as a consequence of this work they have been invited to host the Royal Astronomical Society's 'National Astronomy Meeting' in July 2025. Due to Street Cosmos, community engagement will play a major part of it, with meetings already taking place with the community partners as to how best to include communities in the conference and give space for them to present to the delegates.
- The Kielder project has created strong partnerships with researchers that will have lasting impact. For example, their collaboration with Dr Helen McGhie from Manchester Metropolitan University on the "Capturing the Cosmos" project not only enriched the participants' experience by blending art and science, but also opened up new avenues for cross-disciplinary research. The researchers say they gained valuable insights into how underrepresented groups engage with scientific content, which will inform their future research on public engagement and science communication.
- The Queer Britain project researchers - Aunt Nell - are using the oral histories coming out of the work in their inclusive human centred podcasts.
- The Mixed Museum said they were fortunate that their partner was very open to the project's process and outputs, also seeing it as a learning process. They did both respond to one message that was emerging from the group - the need to start mapping Black GI bases. With this new information, they worked with the academic partner to apply to a funding stream at their university to run a separate pilot study. This output (now completed) was very valuable to the academic partner.

What were the practitioner outcomes?

For practitioners the aims included:

- they would form new and stronger relationships with underrepresented groups;
- they would be more comfortable handing over decision making control to underrepresented groups;
- they would have increased confidence to engage with underrepresented groups;
- they would understand better how to ensure that the work is not extractive – that it benefits the participants;
- they would achieve better clarity about how research and public engagement can be used to form closer bonds with underrepresented groups;
- and how to achieve impact internally with the knowledge generated through this type of work.
- New underrepresented communities willing to take part in research in the future.

Did the practitioners build relationships with new community groups?

- Four of the 12 organisations collaborated with community groups that they had never worked with before. Five worked with a mix of old and new community groups, and the remaining three organisations worked with community groups they had worked with before, but not in the same way.

Has it resulted in stronger practitioner relationships with community groups and researchers?

- We wanted to see if practitioners had stronger relationships at the end of the project with the underrepresented groups/communities and researchers they worked with. The thinking was that this would indicate their propensity to take part in future research and innovation projects.
- **Every project said that their relationship was stronger with their community as a result of doing the work.**
- **Every project (where applicable) said the relationship with their researcher was stronger as a result of doing the work.**

AVERAGE SCORE WHERE 0= NOT AT ALL STRONG AND 10 = VERY STRONG	PRE	POST	CHANGE
The strength of relationship with your researcher if applicable	6.8	8.5	+1.7
The strength of relationship with your specific community group	6.5	8.2	+1.7

Have the projects been community led?

- Only one out of the 12 projects stated that they were not community led. This was not their aim but because of time constraints at the start of the project. The community partner was a school and so the project could not commence until after the end of the summer holidays. The school was a new partner – in future the grantee said they would ensure that they had a better understanding of their partner before the start of the programme, so that the trust would already be there – this would shorten the amount of time needed for set up.

Has it increased the confidence of practitioners to work with underrepresented groups?

- In order to measure whether practitioner confidence had changed across the course of the funding each of the 12 organisations filled in a pre and post funding questionnaire.
- **Every project said that their confidence had increased as a result of the project.**

AVERAGE SCORE WHERE 0= NOT AT ALL CONFIDENT AND 10 = VERY CONFIDENT	PRE	POST	CHANGE
---	-----	------	--------

Confidence in engaging with underrepresented groups/ communities in general	7.5	9.1	1.6
Confidence in engaging with your specific community group	7.6	8.8	1.2
Confidence in making research and innovation more accessible to underrepresented groups/communities	6.2	8.7	2.6
Confidence in ensuring that underrepresented groups/ communities have a meaningful engagement with research and innovation	6.1	8.3	2.2

Sample n=12/15 across 12 organisations

How did each project ensure that the work was relevant to the underrepresented community?

Ensuring relevance to the underrepresented community was seen as vital by all practitioners to ensure the process was not extractive. Examples of how they achieved this included:

- Ensuring that the project was community led in the first place
- Through a community led process of co-production – topics were picked that resonated deeply with the communities involved
- Exhibits were designed that worked for specific communities to ensure inclusivity
- Individuals with specific needs were equipped with the tools to explore and learn independently
- Underrepresented groups were inspired to take part in life long learning
- Active participation in science and two-way dialogue with researchers was encouraged - helping address misconceptions about science being inaccessible for those who might feel alienated from it.
- Focus on collecting personal stories ensuring representation of underrepresented communities in future collections

How were the projects flexed to meet the individual underrepresented groups needs?

All projects listened to the needs of the individual underrepresented group and flexed their process to ensure that it fitted with each groups needs. Examples of ways this was done include:

- **Collaborative decision-making:** All held initial meetings with project partners/ community groups/ community participants to identify shared goals and understand each other's needs.
- **Listening:** All projects tried hard to ensure that all contributors could be heard – one team split into smaller groups to ensure that everyone could contribute.
- **Adaptive communication style:** Good communication was key – some projects used WhatsApp groups or similar to enable ongoing communication between teams and community partners. Other projects used multiple communication methods, fitting around individual preferences.
- **Flexible timelines:** Most projects had to be adjusted to fit with community group schedules.
- **Guidance and support:** When communities found the 'blank paper' approach (offering total freedom) too challenging, project teams added a more structured guidance. This ensured participants still had control but were also supported in the decision-making process.
- **Flexible payments to help community involvement:** Instead of just relying on paying participants for their involvement or covering their expenses – two projects adopted a more flexible approach in response to their community asks/ needs. For example, one project reallocated its funds to pay participants to employ local coordinators to help recruit community members for workshops, ensuring more direct involvement and reducing barriers to participation. In another project the participants asked that the participation payments be re-allocated to the project fund as a whole, as they would impact their benefits payments.

- **Building trust and addressing fears:** Some groups had had negative experiences with extractive research in the past, so a key aim was to build trust and create lasting relationships. This was achieved in one project by continuously adapting the process based on the needs and feedback of the group. In the Windrush Museum project, this was achieved by shifting towards a long term public engagement exercise involving multiple interactions and interventions to build trust among the community before moving to the next phase of the project.
- **Overcoming language barriers:** For some groups language was a significant barrier. One team worked with a refugee service to adapt materials using symbols instead of words, and they adjusted their speech to be slower and clearer.

Did their work illustrate how research and public engagement can be used to form closer bonds with underrepresented groups?

There is evidence to show that the work has helped practitioners gain a better understanding of how to work with underrepresented groups in the future. For example:

- 93% say the project will change the way they will work with underrepresented groups in the future
- 77% agree the project has helped bring together researchers and underrepresented group(s) to work in new and innovative ways

Has it helped practitioners see how to achieve impact internally?

Finally the data show that the project is likely to have an impact across their whole organisation. For example:

- 100% agreed that the Mindsets + Missions funded project has allowed new voices from underrepresented groups to be heard within their organisation
- 100% are excited about the legacy of the work across their organisation

Examples of organisational impacts include:

- **Fundamental changes in research approach** – All grantees said that they hoped that the inclusion of community members in research processes has led to a fundamental shift in how their organisation approaches research. The hope is that insights and feedback from the community will now play a central role in shaping projects, leading to more research-driven initiatives that are guided by real-world community input. For example:
 - **New ways of working with lived experience** – There is a hope that many organisations will adopt new methods of exhibition design that prioritise lived experience over traditional curatorial control. This shift will allow the exhibition space to reflect diverse community voices, even if it challenges standard aesthetic norms.
 - **Lessons around the support needed for co-production** - The Mixed Museum have learned to better support co-productive research without overstressing their own resources. They have realised the importance of allowing projects to unfold at their own pace, driven by feedback and the emotional engagement of participants. This will shape how their future projects are managed and supported.
 - **In future most organisations said they will incorporate the views of underrepresented groups from the start of projects** - organisations have recognised that underrepresented groups are not only important for engagement but should be involved in the research and planning stages of projects, rather than being added later.
 - **Community representation in strategic initiatives** – There are examples already of community voices being incorporated in strategic decision making. E.g. Due to the

success of Street Cosmos, a community centre manager will be part of the steering group for Durham University's new Sustainable Space Research Centre, reflecting the high regard for their views.

- **Changes for the organisation as a whole** – there are many examples of project outcomes that could potentially lead to organisation wide changes in practice – including:
 - **Reflecting on anti-racist practices** – e.g. There is a hope that the Fitzwilliam Museum FUTURE/POWER project will become a cornerstone in the museum's journey toward becoming a more inclusive and anti-racist institution. It has already provided a framework for embedding anti-racist research methodologies which could guide future-forward thinking across the organisation.
 - **Embedding community-driven learning into outreach** – It is hoped that the success of community-driven, hands-on learning will encourage organisations to make this approach a core element of their outreach strategy. E.g. Creative, accessible pathways into science used within the Kielder astrophotography workshops will now be expanded through their digital platforms and ongoing educational resources to reach more diverse audiences.

Are there any indications about the wider system impact of the work?

Wider systemic changes – there were some learnings that have implications for the whole sector too:

- **Developing best practice for inclusivity/ knowledge exchange** - Many organisations have already developed best practices guidelines for use beyond their organisation. E.g. Research from Queer Britain has provided other organisations with best practice guidelines on conducting inclusive research, particularly in areas such as storytelling through oral histories. These guidelines are aimed at making GLAM (Galleries, Libraries, Archives, and Museums) organisations more inclusive for the LGBTQ+ community and the hope is that this will have a sector wide impact.
- **Building strong researcher relationships** – as a result of doing this work many organisations have recognised the need to establish stronger relationships with academic researchers early in the research process to improve the outcomes of their collaboration. Many feel as a result of their Mindsets + Missions experience, that work needs to be done on building academic understanding of the value of more creative/ collaborative research methods – to show that the insights gained this way are of equal value to those gained via more traditional approaches. Changing academic attitudes is seen as difficult – and it will need the concerted effort of the whole sector (and funders) to change. But as a starting point, many grantees say they will build on the research relationships they already have and will build new ones now they see the benefits of this way of working.
- **Understanding the importance of taking your time** – Many organisations acknowledged that as a result of conducting their Mindsets + Missions projects they now understand that co-production processes require more time than simpler more didactic projects - slowing down relationship building to allow for meaningful community engagement can be resource-intensive, and extra funding streams might be necessary at the end to ensure continuity of the relationship once the initial project is over.

Significant outcomes not mentioned elsewhere

One highly significant outcome for one grantee and the programme as a whole, is that of National Windrush Museum having announced a formal partnership with Royal Museums Greenwich and finding a physical home within Royal Maritime Museum. This is a landmark event for this small independent

museum created and run by a typically marginalised group of people. It also marks a significant step-change for the sector with the recognition of the cultural legacy and societal contributions of people of African Caribbean heritage. The National Windrush Museum believes that the Mindsets + Missions project funding put them in a position to form this partnership.

Also just at the point when we were finalising this report, the Mixed Museum reported that The Guardian had published [an article](#) reporting on their project. It has engendered lots of communication and the project team hope that it will help grow their community group in time for their forthcoming series of online DNA science events with genealogist Sophie Kay.

2.4 Views about the Mindsets + Missions process

All grantees were positive about the Mindsets + Missions process in phase 2. The Mindsets + Missions Project Officer, Craig Smith, was frequently mentioned by name as being key to its success. His wise counsel and encouragement meant that they were braver about going outside of their comfort zone in their application and many felt that his ongoing support was vital for their project's overall success. Alongside the project officer, the grantees were also supported with four online network meetings spread throughout the year which gave them the opportunity to hear about the other projects and discuss their own progress. Cornish and Grey also provided evaluation support throughout the funding period via a hotline and at each network meeting.

Grantees felt that the key to the success of the programme, was its flexibility – grantees were able to flex their project in light of their underrepresented communities' needs without having to ask permission of the funder at every step. This was seen as vital as it allowed them to act in an agile way – making changes as they saw fit as and when they were needed.

Key data from the survey shows:

- 100% agree the support provided by the Mindsets + Missions team resulted in them being successful in their application.
- 93% believe the support provided by the Mindsets + Missions team was vital for their projects overall success

On the downside, grantees had noticed a 'petering out' of the support as the programme progressed. They would have liked more input from the Liminal Space – their facilitation skills at the network meetings during the funding process were missed – it was thought that they would have added another level of learning and inspiration to the sessions.

Overall, grantees would like to see more of this kind of funding – but importantly they believe that funders need to recognise that this type of work takes a considerable amount of time to do properly. Any work which involves building trust with underrepresented communities who have experienced extractive research practices in the past, and where many have a mistrust of the establishment takes a long time – and they worry that without further funding to take on the next steps of this work, some communities will feel let down yet again and even greater barriers to their research participation will build up in the future.

2.5 What do grantees think should happen next?

Grantees think that change needs to happen. They believe that their Mindsets + Missions projects show they are able to work with underrepresented groups in accessible and engaging ways that

academic researchers would find difficult. They also find it frustrating that the co-creation work they do with the public seems not to be considered 'research' by many funders..

"I think there does need to be system change. And I think, you know, things like the ethics, you know, that's a huge barrier[to many underrepresented groups taking part in research].... I think there's ways of developing, making research more accessible and engaging ... I think we absolutely need to continue this [type of work], because if we don't keep trying to change things, it's never going to happen. And I think these projects are testament to, you know, how that change can happen."
 Grantee

Mindsets + Missions was set up as a pilot. It is testament to the success of the Mindsets + Missions programme that many of those funded are sad that something they felt was so innovative and worthwhile is not continuing to be supported by UKRI. Many believe that similar programmes are needed in the future because there are so many benefits to funding and researching in this way – not least that it allows real innovation to take place which enables organisations to reach underrepresented groups in an equitable and inclusive way.

"This was a really good project....its about the knowledge exchange, the connectivity, new ways of doing things... this is the type of funding we need to do this type of work" Grantee

While the programme delivery partners were seeking continuation of the programme, current grantees were always told their funded work was project based with an end date, and if the programme did continue they would have been welcomed to join the grantee network but could not expect follow-on funding. UKRI is using the learnings from this pilot programme to inform how it can improve its funding, including through standard research grants, to enable these collaborative research approaches.

Unfortunately there appears to have been some communication issues, with some grantees hoping that they would have been able to apply for a second round of Mindsets + Missions funding to support the continuation of the work they had started (though this was unlikely to have ever been the case). These grantees feel that it could have been better communicated to them that Mindsets + Missions would not continue beyond the pilot. and that more support to identify alternative funding sources would have been helpful.

3. Conclusions

3.1 Overall view about Mindsets + Missions

The Mindsets + Missions programme has enabled museums and science and discovery centres to conduct meaningful research and innovation projects that have successfully involved previously underrepresented communities in an inclusive and equitable way.

While it is early to look at the overall legacy of the funding programme and this is something we will return to in 2025 and 2026, these findings indicate that the projects have been transformative for all involved. Practitioners have gained new skills and confidence that will have a long term impact within their organisations. Researchers have gained meaningful insights that will impact their work. The individuals involved have all gained in terms of new skills and knowledge, as have community groups who are more open to collaborating on future research and innovation projects.

In terms of wider legacy impacts, these projects can be held up as exemplars showing what works (and what does not work) when conducting work of this kind. Many of the participant organisations are already communicating their approaches and impacts through best practice guides, conference platforms and so on.

There is an acknowledgement, however, that research and innovation projects of this kind come with time and resource costs – delivering these projects is rarely business as usual. Community groups and individual participants have to be recompensed for their time, researchers and experts need to be recompensed too, and internal teams have to be re-aligned to fit the work into their schedule. Most of these organisations will be looking for additional funding sources to ensure that they can continue to deliver research and innovation work of this kind in the future.

Grantees are positive about the Mindsets + Missions process from the learning development stage through to the flexible support provided in the funding stage. They would favour future funding programmes of this kind, ideally with a longer funding period in acknowledgement of the time it takes to build trust with underrepresented communities and/or potentially with access to a second round of funding for those that need additional resources to support the next stages of their research and innovation work.

In their own words grantees say....

“I think it will change how we will work with underrepresented groups as it has changed how I think about research and innovation.” Grantee

“Without [Mindsets + Missions], we wouldn’t have had the freedom to experiment with these innovative ideas. It’s difficult for the museum to move away from ‘traditional’ concepts of interpretation and control over project direction, but in this instance, apart from pre-defining the gallery space, every part of the project was collaborative and led by partner members.” Grantee

3.2 Science Centres & Museums: Inclusive Research Hubs?

The Mindsets + Missions programme shows that science and discovery centres and museums are good places to involve previously underrepresented communities in research projects in an inclusive and equitable way. Practitioners in these organisations understand what is needed to work together with community groups and individuals to conduct research that is not extractive but is meaningful for the participants as well as the researcher. This means listening to the community and flexing/ pivoting the project to meet the community’s needs.

As this Mindsets + Missions Learning programme cohort member puts it *“Science centres and museums are perfectly placed to be those bridging organisations between researchers and the public”*

3.3 Mindsets + Missions: ingredients of success?

Overall it gave grantees permission to innovate by providing:

- **Inspiration of examples during the Mindsets + Missions learning and development programme** - Grantees found the learning and development programme inspiring – it gave them permission to propose completely new, untested ways of working in their bids - ways of

doing things that were new for their organisation. There is a perception that most funders want to see proof/ evidence of experience in order to fund a project and so this explicit permission was critical to allow real innovation to take place.

- **Encouragement from understanding that most challenges are the same for all across the sector** – bringing together peers in the learning and development programme was important as it allowed participants to see that the challenges they face around conducting inclusive work, that is meaningful for participants and results in real change are not unique to their organisation – most of their peers are in the same situation, trying to find solutions to the same problems. There was recognition that the Mindsets + Missions funding had potential to result in findings that would be of interest across the sector, not limited to just individual organisations.
- **Confidence engendered by Museums Association and Association for Science and Discovery Centres involvement** – The fact that these industry bodies were throwing their weight behind the call for innovation was an important catalyst to organisations to try to move outside their comfort zone. The programme manager's role was particularly important during the bid development stage – their encouragement gave many grantees the confidence to innovate in their proposals.
- **Flexibility of the funding programme** – the structure and process of the funding programme was also held up for praise. The perception of everyone was that if you are being truly innovative, you can't predict what is going to happen and so an emphasis on learning and development as opposed to outcomes at the start, calling the programme a pilot, paying most of the money up front instead of on the completion of milestones and generally emphasising the flexibility of the programme – all helped foster innovation.

3.4 Grantee key learnings for inclusive research and innovation

Recognise that innovation is hard

- **Innovation takes longer than you expect** - All groups were surprised about how long it took to get started with their projects – even those with existing relationships had to spend time building an understanding of what their approach would entail, and many of those who were working with a new community group from scratch had to spend a significant amount of time on this. All grantees had to shift their expectations to a greater or lesser extent about how much they would be able to achieve in their project. Alongside the time needed to build relationships, 'real life just got in the way' – participants have exams, leaders go on holiday, people go on sickness leave and so on - timetabling projects with multiple stakeholders is always challenging and projects that involve innovation are even more challenging as you are travelling into unknown territory.
- **Some research practices don't translate well in the community** – some aspects of academic research e.g. the process of gaining ethics approval from the university, and the use of time-consuming survey tools, did not translate well into the community setting. Those projects that turned the concept of research on its head and started in the community as opposed to in academia, were more likely to end up with research findings that everyone felt were meaningful.
- **Expect the unexpected** – all grantees said they had to flex their project to fit the needs of individual participants. This meant that they had to be agile, changing their plans over the course of the project. Many community groups were not as flexible and agile as the grantee organisations

– the project had to fit in with their day-to-day work – which caused timetable headaches. All of this added to the workload of grantees and needed to be factored into plans.

Don't rush, take baby steps if you can

This body of work illustrates the importance of taking baby steps – not rushing ahead without understanding what will work for the specific community and individual community you are working with. The most successful approaches involved:

- **Getting to know the community group and the needs of individuals involved** – this is critical to provide an understanding of the needs of the individuals involved and reduce perceptions of extraction. Some projects (e.g. Mixed Museum, Queer Britain) were building on a body of research that had already been conducted with their community group and so they already understood some of the needs and wants of the individuals involved. Other grantees quickly recognised that before going into co-creation mode they had to build this knowledge (e.g. Windrush Museum who recognised after the work commenced that they needed to spend a considerable amount of time on this pre-research phase). Other grantees such as Explore!, Fitzwilliam and Winchester devoted time in their initial workshops to trying to get to know the participants – these grantees reflected that they would have had better outcomes if they had spent time before the first workshop on visits and observations to build up their knowledge about what would and wouldn't work in that community.
- **Building strong relationships with partners** – as stated above this takes time, many successful grantees (e.g. Manchester Museum, Durham University) already had strong relationships with one or more of their partners. They noted that these relationships resulted in better outcomes than those relationships that had to be built from scratch during the project.
- **Iterating an approach to meet individuals' needs** – some projects were working with multiple community groups, each with different needs (e.g. Dynamic Earth, Xplore!). They learnt that they had to iterate their approach to meet each groups' needs. They could not apply a one size suits all approach so they had to learn and improve as they progressed.
- **Iterating an approach to evidence collection too** – many projects had to change their impact measurement approach as they discovered that individuals found traditional survey-based approaches confusing. Many successfully changed to more qualitative, reflection-based approaches (e.g. Kielder, Museum of Wales, Discovering 42).

Co-design with the community -

- **Community involved in all aspects of the project** - Ideally individual participants would be included in the design of a project, or community group representatives if individuals cannot take part themselves. This includes involving them in the aims of the project, the process, payment of participants, and defining what success looks like.
- **Including payment aspects** - While no individual should be excluded from the process because of financial constraints and also the process must not be extractive, participants where possible should be involved in the payments aspects of the project and help decide what is fair/ right in their circumstances – e.g. in the Mixed Museum project some of the community participants wanted their fees to be donated into a pot to be used across the whole project.
- **Guide rails can help get the project started** — while focusing on co-production of projects ensures that participants are proud of the project outcomes and gives them significant agency in

determining the direction of their activities, going to a community group and asking them to come up with an idea for a project is challenging and time consuming. The most successful approaches provided some sort of guide rails such as a topic (racism, climate change and so on). Many projects also found that having expert facilitators (including those with lived experience and/or facilitators with experience of working with the specific community and/ or experience of running co-production workshops) made this step less challenging and resulted in better ideas to take forward.

Simple delivery/ process recommendations -

- **Have alternatives prepared:** Prepare alternative activities that are engaging and relevant to the project's goals, so that external factors like weather do not hinder overall participant experience.
- **Develop inclusive materials:** Design materials that are accessible to participants with diverse language skills and educational backgrounds, emphasising visual aids and simplified language.
- **Budget for participant support:** Allocate funds to cover expenses such as travel and meals, particularly for participants from economically deprived backgrounds, removing financial barriers to participation.

Appendix A - Theory of Change and Evaluation Framework

Method

The method used for this evaluation report is summarised below.

Cornish and Grey have conducted:

- Online surveys with participants in the Phase 1 learning programme - 37 surveys were returned – there was a mix of representatives from science and discovery centres (n=11) and museums (n=11), and individuals with an interest in the sector (n=14) – one participant skipped this question.
- Baseline and post survey was completed by the 12 grantee organisations in Phase 2
- Interviews with practitioners and/or leaders in Phase 2 – one interview with each grantee organisation
- Synthesis of the 12 individual grantee Phase 2 evaluation reports

Individual grantee evaluation reports include:

- Overall summary of impact of approach and learning and development findings
- Analysis of reflections from all partners including practitioners, researchers (if applicable), communities/groups participants
- Data and summary of numbers and types of people from underrepresented communities/ groups involved in activities

The findings presented in this report are based on the individual evaluation reports provided by each of the grantees, baseline and post funding survey completed by grantees and in-depth interviews with grantees.

Reminder of overall aim of the M+M programme

- The Mindsets + Missions goal is that more people from underrepresented communities participate in a culture of enquiry and in the acquisition and sharing of knowledge for the betterment of themselves and society.

Who is going to be impacted by the programme?

- Community Partners including individuals from underrepresented communities and community leaders/activity shapers from community groups
- Practitioners within funded organisations (museums and science centres and galleries?)
- Leaders and policy makers within funded organisations (i.e. leading to organisational change)
- Individual practitioners
- Other project delivery partners e.g. researchers/innovators (either researchers in M&SC practice or researcher ["subject experts"] in an area of R&I [physics, biology, history])
- Funders (UKRI/AHRC and others as legacy)
- Programme partners (ASDC, MA, LS)

NOTE ITEMS IN RED ARE OUTSIDE OF THE REMIT OF THIS EVALUATION REPORT

M+M Logic Chain 1 – Practitioners and Organisations

WHY	WHO	WHAT		
Ultimate goal	Internal and external stakeholders	Co-creation / Engagement activities	Outcomes of engagement activities	Longer term/legacy outcomes
More people from underrepresented communities participate in a culture of enquiry and in the acquisition and sharing of knowledge for the betterment of themselves and society.	Practitioners and leaders/policy makers within funded organisations (museums and science and discovery centres)	Practitioners take part in activities with underrepresented community groups/communities and possibly also researchers	<p>Practitioner outcomes:</p> <p>Increased knowledge, confidence and skills to continue this work in the future including....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Practitioners achieve clarity about what research is and how it can be used to form closer relationships with underrepresented groups/communities Increased comfort handing over decision-making power to community groups Increased understanding of how it benefits groups to engage with R&I Increased confidence to engage with underrepresented groups/communities Practitioners will have increased understanding of what to do with the knowledge generated through R&I with communities (how to let it affect institutional knowledge, research, practices) Practitioners have formed relationships with researchers and community groups Practitioners learn about running public engagement with underrepresented groups/communities - what does and doesn't work Increased understanding of how to effectively evaluate this type of work <p>Organisations: Reach new underrepresented groups and gain evidence on effective approaches to this work</p>	<p>Practitioner long term/legacy outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Practitioners have an increased understanding of what activities are most successful in breaking down barriers between research, innovation and society Practitioners have stronger relationships with community groups which could lead to further opportunities for activities with underrepresented communities Practitioners have stronger relationships with researchers if applicable Practitioners have an increased understanding and experience of what activities will encourage engagement with underrepresented groups/communities Practitioners will have an appreciation for, and evidence of what barriers need to be removed to facilitate these participatory interactions without creating hierarchical power dynamics Practitioners will share learnings internally and externally which will lead to greater capacity of museums, galleries and science centres around the UK to engage underrepresented groups in research and innovation (this is an aim from original ITT) <p>Organisational leader/policy maker longer term/ legacy outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See value of new content/processes for reaching new groups/communities Continue to reach underrepresented groups Embed cultural change (implementation of new content and processes across organisations)

Evaluation framework 1 – Practitioners and Organisations

	OUTCOMES	EVALUATION TOOLS	SUGGESTED QUESTIONS FOR BASELINE SURVEY
OUTCOMES OF ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	Practitioners: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Practitioners achieve clarity about what research is and how it can be used to form closer relationships with underrepresented groups/communities - QUAL Increased comfort handing over decision-making power to underrepresented groups/ communities –QUAL Increased understanding of how it benefits groups to engage with R&I - QUAL Increased understanding of what to do with the knowledge generated through R&I with communities (how to let it affect institutional knowledge, research, practices) - QUAL Increased confidence to engage with underrepresented groups/communities QUANT & QUAL Practitioners have formed relationships with researchers and community groups REPORTS Practitioners learn about running public engagement with underrepresented groups/communities - what does and doesn't work QUAL 	Individual project reports Qualitative interviews with practitioners in grantee organisations Baseline and post survey with practitioners in grantee organisations	Thinking about your experience of working with underrepresented groups, please choose one of the following statements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is our first project working in partnership with underrepresented groups/communities We have some experience of working in partnership with underrepresented groups/communities We have lots of experience of working in partnership with underrepresented groups/communities Working with in partnership with underrepresented groups/communities is core to our work How confident are you in engaging with underrepresented groups/ communities in general? Scale from 0-10 where 10 = Very confident and 0= not at all confident And specifically in engaging with the group(s) included in your approach? Scale from 0-10 where 10 = Very confident and 0= not at all confident
	Organisations: Reach new underrepresented groups REPORTS and gain evidence on effective approaches to this work QUAL	Individual project reports Qualitative interviews with practitioners in grantee organisations	
	Practitioners:		

<p>LONGER TERM/LEGACY OUTCOMES</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Practitioners have an increased understanding of what activities are most successful in breaking down barriers between research, innovation and society Practitioners have stronger relationships with community groups which could lead to further opportunities for activities with underrepresented communities QUANT AND QUAL Practitioners have stronger relationships with researchers if applicable QUANT AND QUAL Practitioners have an increased understanding and experience of what activities will encourage engagement with underrepresented groups/communities REPORTS Practitioners will have an appreciation for, and evidence of what barriers need to be removed to facilitate these participatory interactions without creating hierarchical power dynamics REPORTS Practitioners will share learnings internally and externally which will lead to greater capacity of museums, galleries and science centres around the UK to engage underrepresented groups in research and innovation (this is an aim from original ITT) <p>Organisational leader/policy maker longer term/ legacy outcomes: QUAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See value of new content/processes for reaching new groups/communities Continue to reach underrepresented groups Embed cultural change (implementation of new content and processes across organisations) 	<p>Individual project reports</p> <p>Qualitative interviews with practitioners in grantee organisations</p> <p>Baseline and post survey with practitioners in grantee organisations</p> <p>Outcomes in red are longer term/ legacy outcomes that are dependent at least in part on the sharing of the results of the whole programme– and are therefore outside of the remit of this evaluation. Look for indicative evidence in qualitative interviews..</p>	<p>Thinking about your experience of working with underrepresented groups, please choose one of the following statements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is our first project working in partnership with underrepresented groups We have some experience of working in partnership with underrepresented groups We have lots of experience of working in partnership with underrepresented groups Working with in partnership with underrepresented groups is core to our work <p>How strong is your relationship with the underrepresented group/community you are working with? Scale from 0-10 where 10 = Very strong and 0= not at all strong</p> <p>Have you worked with the researcher in your activity before?</p> <p>Yes – more than once; Yes – once; No; N/A</p> <p>How strong is your relationship with the researcher you are working with? Scale from 0-10 where 10 = Very strong and 0= not at all strong. N/A</p>
---	--	--	--

M+M Logic Chain 2 – Other delivery partners e.g. researchers where applicable

WHY	WHO	WHAT		
Ultimate goal	Internal and external stakeholders	Co-creation / Engagement activities	Outcomes of engagement activities	Longer term/legacy outcomes
More people from underrepresented communities participate in a culture of enquiry and in the acquisition and sharing of knowledge for the betterment of themselves and society.	Project delivery partners e.g. Researchers	Researchers take part in activities with underrepresented groups/communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researchers gain understanding of how their research can be relevant, useful or impactful for certain underrepresented groups • Researchers work in partnership with communities to generate knowledge and research • Researchers have an opportunity to find out what underrepresented groups/communities think about their area of interest • Researchers have increased confidence to engage with people from underrepresented groups through activities centred around or with museums, galleries and science centres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researchers have an increased understanding of what activities are most successful in breaking down barriers between research, innovation and society • Researchers have stronger relationships with Practitioners and with the organisations • Researchers have an increased understanding and experience of what types of activities work best with underrepresented groups/communities • Researchers have increased skills/capabilities to engage with underrepresented groups/communities to develop appropriate and productive activities to explore research • Researchers share learnings internally and externally which will lead to greater capacity of researchers more widely to engage underrepresented groups in research through activities centred in museums, galleries and science centres

Evaluation framework 2 – Other delivery partners e.g. researchers where applicable

	OUTCOMES	EVALUATION TOOLS
OUTCOMES OF ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researchers gain understanding of how their research can be relevant, useful or impactful for certain underrepresented groups • Researchers work in partnership with communities to generate knowledge and research • Researchers have an opportunity to find out what underrepresented groups/communities think about their area of interest • Researchers have increased confidence to engage with people from underrepresented groups through activities centred around or with museums, galleries and science centres 	Individual project reports – suggest individual projects collect researcher reflections and ask them to take part in project feedback sessions/joint learning and development meetings
LONGER TERM/LEGACY OUTCOMES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researchers have an increased understanding of what activities are most successful in breaking down barriers between research, innovation and society • Researchers have stronger relationships with Practitioners and with the organisations • Researchers have an increased understanding and experience of what types of activities work best with underrepresented groups/communities • Researchers have increased skills/capabilities to engage with underrepresented groups/communities to develop appropriate and productive activities to explore research • Researchers share learnings internally and externally which will lead to greater capacity of researchers more widely to engage underrepresented groups in research through activities centred in museums, galleries and science centres 	<p>As above</p> <p>Outcome in red outside of remit of this evaluation</p>

M+M Logic Chain 3 – Community groups/communities (groups and members)

The theory of change for individual participants in Mindsets + Missions projects includes outcomes based on the inclusive outcome areas surfaced from extensive research by ASDC Centres on meaningful and more equitable participant outcomes between 2018 and 2023 – see <https://inclusion.sciencecentres.org.uk/> for more details.

Participant outcomes include:

- Agency – Participants feels they made an impact/ had choices/ made a difference to the outcome
- Belonging – Participants felt comfortable/ included
- Relevance – Connection to participants' lives - relevance to people, place and purpose
- Possible selves – Participants found out something new/ inspired curiosity
- Developing skills – Participants developed new life skills or specific skills
- Social connection – Participants made new connections/relationships/ improved existing relationships

WHY	WHO	WHAT
-----	-----	------

Ultimate goal	Internal and external stakeholders	Co-creation/ engagement activities	Outcomes of engagement activities	Longer term/legacy outcomes
More people from underrepresented communities participate in a culture of enquiry and in the acquisition and sharing of knowledge for the betterment of themselves and society.	Community groups from underrepresented communities	Community groups from underrepresented communities take part in activities with organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency – Participants feels they made an impact/ had choices/ made a difference to the outcome • Belonging – Participants felt comfortable/ included • Relevance – Connection to participants' lives - relevance to people, place and purpose • Possible selves – Participants found out something new/ inspired curiosity • Developing skills – Participants developed new life skills or specific skills • Social connection – Participants made new connections/relationships/ improved existing relationships <p>Community groups/communities will also have an opportunity to contribute to and engage with relevant research</p> <p>Community groups/communities will feel a sense of belonging and ownership, of research and/or in relation to issues/topics/challenges addressed e.g. how their community is presented in a museum/science centre</p>	<p>Community groups/ communities will have an increased understanding of what activities are most successful in breaking down barriers between research, innovation and society</p> <p>Community groups/communities will feel increased identity and agency within innovation and research</p> <p>Community groups/communities are more able (i.e., have more capability) and are more motivated to engage with research</p> <p>Community groups/communities will have a greater appreciation of what research is, the value of research and the role of a researcher, and their own role in research</p> <p>Community groups/communities are more likely to see research as a shared endeavour, and understand their role in it and how they can influence it</p>

Evaluation framework 3 – Community audiences (groups and members)

	OUTCOMES	EVALUATION TOOLS	SUGGESTED SURVEY QUESTIONS FOR INDIVIDUAL PROJECT EVALUATION
OUTCOMES OF ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	<p>The 6 Bold Futures programme...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agency – participant feels they made on impact/ had choices/ made a difference to the outcome 2. Belonging – participant felt comfortable/ included 3. Relevance – connection to their lives 4. Possible selves – find out something new/ inspire curiosity 	<p>Individual project reports – data collected qualitatively and quantitatively</p> <p>suggest individual projects collect community partner reflections and ask them to take part in project</p>	<p>How much do you agree or disagree with the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I feel like I made a difference/ my presence mattered 2. I feel a sense of ownership of this programme

	<p>5. Developing skills –e.g. problem solving skills – wider than stem for this work</p> <p>6. Social connection – made new connections/relationships/ improved existing relationships</p> <p>1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community groups/communities will have an opportunity to contribute to and engage with relevant research QUAL • Community groups/communities feel a sense of belonging and ownership, of research and/or in relation to issues/topics/challenges addressed e.g. how their community is presented in a museum/science centre QUANT AND QUAL 	<p>feedback sessions/joint learning and development meetings</p> <p>and collect evidence/data where applicable/ appropriate</p>	<p>3. The XYYY programme is relevant to me / my community</p> <p>4. This programme introduced me to new ways of looking at the world</p> <p>5. This programme has given me skills I will be able to use elsewhere in the future</p> <p>6. I have made new connections/ improved relationships as a result of the XYYY programme</p> <p>2</p>
LONGER TERM/LEGACY OUTCOMES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community groups/ communities will have an increased understanding of what activities are most successful in breaking down barriers between research, innovation and society QUAL • Community groups/communities feel increased identity and agency within innovation and research QUANT AND QUAL • Community groups/communities are more able (i.e., have more capability) and are more motivated to engage with research QUANT AND QUAL • Community groups/communities have a greater appreciation of what research is, the value of research and the role of a researcher, and their own role in research • Community groups/communities are more likely to see research as a shared endeavour, and understand their role in it and how they can influence 	<p>Individual project reports</p> <p>Outcomes in red are longer term/ legacy outcomes that are dependent at least in part on the sharing of the results of the whole programme– and are therefore outside of the remit of this evaluation Expect indicative findings only.</p>	<p>How much do you agree or disagree with the following:</p> <p>as a result of taking part in this programme....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I feel like I have a stronger voice in research • I am more motivated to take part in research in the future • I am more confident about my ability to take part in research • I have a greater appreciation of the value of research • I have a greater appreciation of the role of a researcher • I have a better understanding of my role in research • I have a better understanding of how I can influence research

--	--	--	--

M+M Logic Chain 4 – Funders OUTSIDE REMIT OF THIS REPORT

WHY	WHO	WHAT		
Ultimate goal	Internal and external stakeholders	Co-creation/ engagement activities	Outcomes of engagement activities	Longer term/legacy outcomes
More people from underrepresented communities participate in a culture of enquiry and in the acquisition and sharing of knowledge for the betterment of themselves and society.	UKRI/AHRC and others as legacy	The funders will benefit from the evaluation report revealing successful methods and strategies for breaking down barriers between research, innovation and society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gain evidence of how museums and science centres facilitate engagement of underrepresented groups with research and innovation Evidence of the impact and benefit of breaking down barriers between research and society as a result of this work in museums and science centres This will support decisions about future programme funding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funders will have an increased understanding of what activities are most successful in breaking down barriers between research, innovation and society Funders will have an appreciation for, and evidence of what barriers need to be removed to facilitate these participatory interactions without creating hierarchical power dynamics Understanding of what funders need to do to better support and enable this way of working and create long term culture change.

Evaluation framework 4 – Funders OUTSIDE REMIT OF THIS REPORT

	OUTCOMES	EVALUATION TOOLS
OUTCOMES OF ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gain evidence of how museums and science centres facilitate engagement of underrepresented groups with research and innovation Evidence of the impact and benefit of breaking down barriers between research and society as a result of this work in museums and science centres This will support decisions about future programme funding. 	Suggest outcomes in red are longer term/ legacy outcomes that are dependent on the learnings from this activities and this evaluation itself– and are therefore outside of the remit of this evaluation?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funders will have an increased understanding of what activities are most successful in breaking down barriers between research, innovation and society 	

<p>LONGER TERM/LEGACY OUTCOMES</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funders will have an appreciation for, and evidence of what barriers need to be removed to facilitate these participatory interactions without creating hierarchical power dynamics • Understanding of what funders need to do to better support and enable this way of working and create long term culture change. 	<p>As above</p>
---	---	-----------------

Appendix B. Portfolio Summary Table

	Applicant	Award amount	Application summary	Org type	Location & geographic influence	Underrepresented groups	Summary of themes
1	Mixed Museum	£ 75,000	Co-production project with 'Brown Babies' cohort around DNA testing	Independent museum	England (London) – Online with national reach	People of Colour	Empowering an underrepresented group to have more autonomy with their stories and data
2	Fitzwilliam Museum	£ 74,120	A partnership between the Fitzwilliam Museum, and a rural secondary school through an in-school youth collective, exploring local history through black-history lens	University museum	England (East)	Rural, disadvantaged young people	Black history in a predominantly white region; decolonisation of local history
3	Amgueddfa Cymru - Museum Wales	£ 71,961	A community action research framework working with a learning disability community in Wales to develop a new interactive museum display	National museum	Wales – wide reach across Wales	People with learning disabilities	Learning disability communities' experiences in Welsh cultural heritage
4	Kielder Observatory	£ 74,500	The North East Astro-imaging Academy (NEAA) - democratise access to astrophotography, generate imagery and data for research enquiry, and help	Science and discovery centre	England (North East)	Socio-economically disadvantaged young people including Refugees	Democratising access to STEM, knowledge generation, and shared heritage

			progress human understanding of the universe.				
5	Durham University	£ 75,000	Connecting world-changing space science research to 'left behind' communities, using the effective 'Street Museum' model	University museum	England (North East)	General public in economically disadvantaged areas	Space science public engagement
6	Queer Britain Museum	£ 74,844	To increase recognition of oral histories as valuable and impactful research practice and resources – focussing on LGBTQ+ histories – and reduce barriers against full inclusion of queer heritage in the GLAM sector.	Independent museum	England (London) – project includes a UK-wide partnership model	LGBTQIA+ people throughout the UK	Oral history collection and cultural research with an underrepresented group
7	Xplore! Science and Discovery Centre	£ 47,903	Research how co-production with community groups can develop science centres as a place for lifelong learning	Science and discovery centre	Wales	Urban, socio-economically disadvantaged	Co-producing nomadic museum experiences
8	National Windrush Museum	£ 75,000	To create immersive experiences collecting, preserving and visually showcasing Windrush narratives, enhancing the online Windrush Museum and transcending traditional exhibitions	Independent museum	England (London) – online with national reach	People of Colour (Windrush families)	Windrush Generation

9	Dynamic Earth	£ 64,774	Research with underrepresented audiences to inform how unheard voices and plural perspectives are represented in Dynamic Earth's permanent exhibition and programming	Science and discovery centre	Scotland	People with long-term physical disabilities; People with learning disabilities; People with a long-term mental health condition; People living with dementia and care providers.	Development of cultural and STEM engagement spaces with underrepresented groups
10	Winchester Science Centre & Planetarium	£ 74,989	A one-year pathfinder project, bringing together a 'community-based learning eco-system', to develop a new approach to engaging young children with science and nature through sustainability research	Science and discovery centre	England (South East)	Young children in underserved community	<p>Improve nature connectedness and science engagement for young children from an identified, currently underserved community</p> <p>Develop and continually evaluate a new public engagement methodology and science communication tools for audiences who have not traditionally engaged</p> <p>Explore ways of working together and establish practices for long-term relationships / learning.</p>

1 1	Discovering42	£ 52,304	Enhancing interactive exhibits' exclusively for individuals with limited mobility, by empowering a research team comprising of individuals with lived experience	Independent / Science and discovery centre	England (South West)	People with disabilities	New research into accessibility and museum design
1 2	Manchester Museum	£ 67,550	To catalyse new knowledge production and a step-change in Manchester Museum's equitable working with people with lived experience of disability (d/Deaf)	University museum	England (North West)	People with disabilities	Developing multi-sensory experiences through co-production

