



Historical Society
of Pennsylvania

PHILADELPHIA'S LIBRARY OF AMERICAN HISTORY



TALLER
PUERTORRIQUEÑO
El Corazón Cultural Del Barrio
The Cultural Heart of Latino Philadelphia

Audience Embedded Evaluation Report

Submitted by Monica Zimmerman, October 2019

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Table of Contents | 2 |
| Summary of Activities | 3 |
| Project Outcomes and Benchmark Goals | 4 |
| Benchmarks for PAZ Participants | |
| Benchmarks for Public Audiences | |
| Benchmarks for Staff/Institutional Impact | |
| Recommendations and Conclusions | 11 |
| Appendix A: Summaries of PAZ Meetings | 13 |
| Appendix B: PAZ Front End Survey | 31 |
| Appendix C: PAZ Front End Survey Results | 33 |
| Appendix D: PAZ Summative Survey | 34 |
| Appendix E: PAZ Summative Survey Results | 36 |
| Appendix F: Web Timeline Survey | 38 |
| Appendix G: Web Timeline Survey Results | 41 |
| Appendix H: Staff Post-Survey | 46 |

Summary of Activities

On March 3rd, 2018, the Historical Society of Pennsylvania and Taller Puertorriqueño initiated the first meeting of the PAZ (Program-Audience Zoomers) as part of *Audience Embedded*, a collaborative initiative to invite audiences from both institutions to spend time learning about archives, actively using them for research about the Latinx experience in Philadelphia, and planning events that highlight their research for public audiences. The PAZ consist of 20 participants recruited (and compensated) to participate in the project over 18 months, and represent a cross-section of traditional audiences for both institutions.

The PAZ successfully met seven times as per the project timeline, participated in individual research visits to the archives of both institutional collections, and had the option of additional field trip experiences in the summer of 2018. Following the completion of the advisory group meetings, staff continued to meet in the winter and spring of 2019 to complete work on the project results chosen by the PAZ - namely, the design of a digital timeline and two accompanying public events, one to present the idea to the public and gather feedback (March 2019) and another to present the first iteration of the timeline to a public audience and celebrate the conclusion of the project (September 2019).

By and large, the project met the proposed timeline for the grant-funded project and in some cases, exceeded the number of proposed meetings, as in the case of the PAZ. Unforeseen staff transitions at both partnering institutions, particularly at HSP in the spring of 2019, delayed production of the final deliverable - the digital timeline - due to changing resources required to complete the technically complicated process of creating a digital tool from scratch. This extended the project activities into the fall of 2019. However, project staff stayed on track to share progress widely, and with colleagues from other institutions and regions, by participating in multiple professional conferences in the summer of 2019, focusing presentations and professional engagements on the process of the project - lessons learned - rather than final outcomes.

The Evaluator attended all but one of the PAZ meetings and provided observational summaries of the events focused on identifying strengths and weaknesses in the meeting structures and participant engagement as regards the intended outcomes of the grant. The Evaluator also created surveys delivered to the PAZ (front end and summative), the staff (front end) and the public (formative and summative) to assess planning priorities, determine impact and outcomes, and provide continuous feedback to administrators on project progress.

Project Outcomes and Benchmark Goals

Benchmark goals were developed in December 2017, in advance of project implementation, for each set of stakeholders involved in the *Audience Embedded* project. Benchmarks demarcate a variety of qualitative and quantitative assessment points that intersect with the intended impact and deliverables of the project at large. The following is an assessment of how successfully the project met each of its intended benchmark goals, supported by data gathered by the Evaluator throughout the entire project schedule.

Benchmarks for PAZ Participants:

- 1. Project will retain at least twelve (n = 12) PAZ participants throughout project with representation from both organizations’ existing audience.**

Progress on this benchmark was achieved. Staff recruited 20 PAZ members from the existing audiences at both organizations and only two PAZ had to be permanently excused from participating due to regular absences. Throughout all 7 meetings, attendance met the n= 12 threshold used as the benchmark.

As well, many PAZ chose to participate in one of 3 additional field trips, with one scheduled in July 2018 and two in August 2018, both of which occurred outside of regularly scheduled meeting times.

Further, in December of 2018, the PAZ were officially released from the “planning” duties in the project, but were offered additional opportunities to stay involved with completing the final deliverables of public events and a digital timeline, even though the responsibility for completing those deliverables officially fell to staff. The PAZ indicated a high level of interest in remaining involved (see Table 1) and at least half did so until the concluding public event in September 2019.

Table 1

| | |
|--|-----|
| Interested in collaborating with the marketing team to promote the project | 64% |
| Interested in being videotaped about their experience with the project | 57% |
| Interested in helping to select the documents for use in an online format | 86% |
| Interested in helping to facilitate a workshop for the public | 57% |
| Interested in creating a response video to the oral histories included in an online format | 28% |
| Willing to speak at a culminating event in a panel discussion format | 43% |

2. PAZ members will feel a sense of ownership over the programs generated by the process.

This benchmark was successfully achieved as self-reported by the PAZ in a summative survey (Appendix E), in which 100% of respondents said they have a feeling of ownership over the programs being planned as part of the project. The only necessary caveat to this data is that the process generated an unexpected outcome - a tangible deliverable for the public rather than a series of experiential programs - so the language of the intended benchmark is misleading. The results, however, are the same - the PAZ owned their deliverables.

This final outcome was not a surprise, because as the process moved forward, mid-project summaries found indicators that progress toward the goal was already positive. One indicator was based on the amount of individual research they were doing on their own time, with 17 of the 20 completing singular or multiple research visits to both archives by August 2018. That continued independent research can still be considered a strong indicator that PAZ felt ownership over the content early in the project.

Additionally, observational summaries from the PAZ Meetings record that almost half of each meeting was spent hearing from the PAZ directly about who they were, why they were involved in the project and what progress they made individually in using one or both archival collections. While this proved challenging for staying on time with meeting agendas, it simultaneously demonstrated the high level of personal buy-in by participants eager to make the project reflect their lived experiences and personal interests. By PAZ Meeting #3, many were able to articulate how they had followed a personal or professional interest into new territory – the history of education for Puerto Ricans was popular with PAZ who are classroom teachers, for instance – and several participants noted that their research had turned up stories about people actively in the room (from the neighborhood around Taller) and the group was able to come together around the shared experience of how research turns up the personal stories of real people.

3. PAZ members will feel that they have a greater understanding of the relevance of HSP and TP archival collections to themselves and their world.

This benchmark outcome was successfully achieved as self-reported by the PAZ in a summative survey (Appendix E), in which 71% of respondents said they have learned new ways that archival collections are relevant to their life and interests. This data is supported by the sheer number of hours the PAZ spent independently researching and their willingness to stay involved with the project even after their (compensated) commitment had officially ended.

It may also be worth noting, however, that this self-reported investment came later in the project's timeline than may have been anticipated by staff. Mid-project assessments pointed out to staff that in Year 1, intentions to have the PAZ focused primarily on learning about how to access archival materials were sometimes difficult to achieve because the PAZ themselves were focused on the end deliverables - the programs or web timeline - from the very beginning. PAZ meeting summaries (Appendix A) and the PAZ pre-survey results (Appendix C) show that the group came in with a lot of experience and interest in public programming, and that those existing interests worked somewhat in counterpoint to the timeline of the project. Staff did an excellent job in refining their plans for meetings, however, and by Meeting #3, PAZ meeting notes (Appendix A) indicate that they were successfully navigating both personal archival interests and professional

archival processes and successfully debating how those two parallel avenues could be made visible to a public audience.

Ultimately, the PAZ both learned how to use the archives and advised on how to make what they found relevant accessible to a wider audience, and they did so with a great deal of passion.

Benchmarks for Public Audiences Attending Programs:

This benchmark area is challenging to assess because the process of the *Audience Embedded* project generated an unexpected public deliverable - instead of two public programs, the PAZ determined that the most impactful outcome would be a digital timeline. The process of creating the timeline did involve two public events - one in March 2019 to present the historical moments that the timeline might engage with and one in September 2019 to premier the beta version of the timeline for a public audience. However neither of those events were the sort of “public program” initially anticipated by staff managing the project. However surveys were delivered to participants at both public events (n=25 at both) and that data directly informs the assessment of progress toward all three of the following benchmarks.

#4: Attendees at two (2) programs will be more demographically diverse than those currently attending programs at either organization

This benchmark outcome was successfully achieved, although a nuanced explanation of the data may be required to illustrate why. Available demographic data includes that of the PAZ from before the program began as well as from participants at the two public events held in March 2019 and September 2019.

When the PAZ was formed, they were deliberately chosen to represent the core audiences of both institutions, with the basic premise of the grant acknowledging the centrality of a LatinX audience at Taller and a more Caucaisan-centric audience at HSP, and the desire to have more diversity at both institutions. To that end, one can extrapolate that the demographic makeup of the PAZ then represents the target for a diversified demographic *for public audiences*. Tables 2, 3 and 4 demonstrate that the ages and ethnicities of participants at both events stayed consistently in line with that of the PAZ, a particularly notable achievement in particular for the September 18th final program that took place at HSP and required many Latinx audience members to travel by bus to the event.

Table 2: Age of Participants

| | PAZ | Mar 2n d | Sept 18 |
|----------|-----------|----------------|------------|
| Under 21 | 1.00 % | 0 | 0.00 % |
| 21 - 30 | 5.00 % | 8.00 % | 1.00 % |
| 31 - 40 | 20.00 | 24.00 | 36.00 |

| | % | % | % |
|---------|------------|------------|------------|
| 41 - 50 | 10.00 % | 12.00 % | 4.00 % |
| 51 - 60 | 25.00 % | 16.00 % | 20.00 % |
| 61 - 70 | 30.00 % | 32.00 % | 16.00 % |
| 71+ | 5.00 % | 8.00 % | 4.00 % |

Table 3: Race/Ethnicities of Participants

| | PAZ | Mar 2 | Sept 18 |
|------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| African/American/Black | 5.00% | n/a | 8.00 % |
| Native American | 5.00% | n/a | 8.00 % |
| Hispanic/Latino | 55.00 % | 56.00 % | 58.00 % |
| Other | 0.00% | n/a | 0.00 % |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 0.00% | n/a | 8.00 % |
| Caucasian/White | 40.00 % | n/a | 38.00 % |

Table 4: Gender of Participants

| | PAZ | Mar 2 | Sept 18 |
|-------------|------------|----------|------------|
| Male | 25.00 % | n/a | 42.00 % |
| Female | 75.00 % | n/a | 58.00 % |
| Transgender | 0.00% | n/a | 0.00 % |

Further, at the final program in September 2019, 29% of the audience indicated they were new to participating in Taller programming and 33% of the audience new to programs hosted by HSP, and two participants had never attended a previous program at either organization. Successfully sharing roughly one third of their audiences moving forward, should the current levels of

engagement translate into future programming, would provide a significant boost in diversity over the long term for both organizations.

It was also noted in the Year 1 report that the pre-survey of staff at both institutions turned up the data point that no staff perceived their specific role as “primarily focusing on audience development.” This presents an overall challenge for an audience-development project, certainly, but was also compounded by a number of staff departures at both institutions during the project period, as well as a significant reduction in overall staff and resources at HSP in the Spring of 2019. These tangential facts are noted here to indicate the fact that success on this benchmark goal is quite remarkable in the face of significant challenges.

#5: Attendees will identify program content as “relevant” to themselves and their world.

This benchmark was successfully achieved, with responses again addressing the “relevancy” of the digital asset of a web-based timeline, not the program itself. Questions asked participants to define what the website seemed to achieve and the results of Table 5 show that in all categories, participants ranked the impact of the website highly, indicating that whether someone might define their world as having personal, professional or familial connections, their needs were met by the project.

Table 5

| | |
|---|---------------|
| The website offers.... | True |
| Historic information about Puerto Ricans in Philadelphia | 100.00% |
| Personal stories about Puerto Ricans in Philadelphia | 88.00% |
| Surprising information about Puerto Ricans in Philadelphia | 88.00% |
| Relevant information about Puerto Ricans in Philadelphia | 88.00% |

One important data point that requires some analysis is that 54% of respondents answered that they *did not* see their own experience represented in the website. Considering that the website focuses on speaking to the history of the Puerto Rican community, this statistic broadly makes sense, as roughly half of the attendees identified as non-Latinx, so their personal histories were not the focus of the project.

However, when cross-tabulating the data, a statistically significant subset of those who said their story wasn’t in the website identified as Hispanic/Latino, indicating that for one reason or another, they didn’t see their personal story reflected in the broader historical narrative. Also worth noting is that of respondents who said they did see their personal experiences represented in the timeline, 21 % of them self-identify as White, Asian or Native American, indicating a sort of universal “history” and relevance crosses demographic lines into other communities.

#6: Attendees will report that they were “satisfied” with the program format

This benchmark goal was successfully met, at least for the final website launch. (Attendees were not asked to evaluate the program format at the March 2nd event presenting the general idea of creating a website.) 92% of respondents answered “Yes” to whether or not they found the September 2019 launch event format satisfying.

The respondents who answered “No” indicated that that primarily they wanted to view a finished digital project, defined by short comments like “Website done” or “I would have loved to see more of the website.”

Benchmarks for Staff/Institutional Impact:

#7: Staff will have a better understanding of issues important to the audience of their partner institution

This benchmark was successfully met. While the staff and advisors completing the project’s post-survey were largely different than those who initially took the pre-survey (due to institutional shifts and changes throughout the project period), 86% of respondents still said that they felt like they have a better understanding of the audiences of both institutions. This is impactful, since it means that the project was able to effect change on staff who participated for only a short period of time, as well as project advisors, who were picked for existing expertise and interest in the target audiences.

Further inquiries into the confidence levels of staff in working with both of the individual audiences - the historical society audience versus the Latino audience - unearthed some differences. Namely, that staff still feel more confident about working with the historical society community (86% say that it is true or mostly true that they are confident working with this audience) while less are confident about working with the Latino community (71% say that it is true or mostly true that they are confident working with this audience.) These numbers are statistically on par with the results of the pre-survey, suggesting that staff remain most confident in working with the audiences they already know, which is not surprising, and does not negate their overall *understanding*.

#8: Staff will have built a new network of contacts within the partner institution’s core community

This benchmark was successfully met and corresponded to the largest jump in staff responses from before and after the project. Before the project, 45% of respondents said that it was Not True that they had a pre-existing network of professional contacts in the Latino community. After the project was completed, that number dropped to 14.29%, in spite of there being far less participants from Taller in the post-survey. Responses also included 86% of staff saying that it is True that they have a strong network of professional contacts in the historical community, up from only 27% in the pre-survey. (This number may be skewed by the lack of Taller staff able to participate in the post-survey, however.) Both of these markers indicate that staff networking was successful at introducing new relationships that participants feel they can use over the long term, even if they are relatively new.

#9: Staff will be able to articulate ways in which the process was replicable for other projects.

This benchmark was successfully achieved and the full list of responses is included as Appendix H.

The overarching theme of the responses was in the value of connecting community members with the process of telling community stories/histories through objects and wrestling with the tension between audience agency and institutional authority. In different ways, most respondents spoke to the importance of providing a model in which true audience-centered programming requires the institution to take time, surrender authority, and focus on audience priorities over institutional ones.

#10: Staff will feel that the process generated satisfying program models and content for new and existing audiences.

This benchmark was successfully achieved. In spite of the project generating a website, rather than an intended series of programs, 100% of responding staff and advisors found the output provided a satisfying model of engagement for both new and existing audiences.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Benchmarks for PAZ Participants

The impact of this project on the PAZ participants was clearly positive. Both quantitative and qualitative assessments of their experience indicate high levels of involvement and satisfaction, personal connection to and investment in the project and a sense of pride and personal growth as a result of participating. The data supports the idea that tactics used to recruit the PAZ, the integration of two audiences from culturally distinct organizations, and the decision to compensate them for their involvement were all strongly positive decisions that generated a positive impact on the project as a whole and on the PAZ participants in the specific.

When queried directly in a post-program survey, most of the PAZ responded to a question asking what they might have changed about the project in a positive vein - "Nothing! It was great!" - but the evaluator strongly recommends that before replicating the project process with other institutions, involved staff review the responses of those who offered helpful suggestions (Appendix E) and consider them practically. They correspond closely with observations staff made themselves and may be unsurprising, but since both parties came to similar conclusions, each of the three main themes are recommended as considerations for future collaborations and/or implementation by partner groups:

1. **More Time:** Several respondents and staff suggested that more time be allotted for individual meetings, for getting to know each other, and for researching. While staff plans for timing were thoughtful and well laid out, they were frequently derailed by the PAZ using extended amounts of time to query staff and debate each other about the deliverables, as noted in the next point.
2. **Clarify of Goals and Research Process:** The PAZ were eager to know from Day 1 what their final deliverable was, while the staff was working more toward getting them invested in the process. In future iterations of audience-driven programming, it may be necessary to address both concerns up front, to give the audience a clearer idea of why they are involved and what they are working toward (specific parameters like budgets or dates might come later) to manage expectations.
3. **More personal contact with the Puerto Rican community:** Responses to field trips and personal anecdotes always elicited a strong, passionate response from the group - as did turning up archival material that referenced the lived experience of a member of the PAZ group specifically.

Benchmarks for Public Audiences Attending Programs

The audience receiving the outputs of the *Audience Embedded* project represented a broadly integrated demographic of core audiences from both institutions and self-reported finding the new website personally and professionally valuable. This is a big win for the involved staff, considering that pre-program data from both administrators and the PAZ indicated that there was a common perception that archives are not inherently "relevant" to a modern public - both Latinx and Caucasian - and also that audiences from the two different communities are hard to reach

because of language and transportation barriers. And yet, the PAZ decided to create, essentially, a curated online Archive, and audiences, by and large, liked it.

The ways in which the audience found the work relevant, with over half of audiences finding it useful to them equally for “work” and for “fun” is also noteworthy, as the PAZ and staff debated for some time who the intended audience for the project was once it became digital. It’s worth noting that many of the PAZ had a target audience in mind - school children, university students, and teachers in particular - and that drove a lot of their decisions in the second half of the project. And yet, the project was well received by a much more diverse set of audience stakeholders than those they had in mind.

The fact that audiences attended an event to launch a digital asset, instead of a traditional program like a lecture, performance, concert or film, is a direct result of the PAZ process and therefore a neutral concept. But if, in the future, collaboratively designed projects with audiences *specifically want to create experiences for the public*, as opposed to being flexibly open to creating whatever deliverable the participants are most excited about, it would be prudent to consider the recommendations of the PAZ in Appendix E about introducing the limits and parameters for the final output earlier in the process, as it is clear that they take their role very seriously and tried, in this case, to reach an even broader audience than the project grant could have imagined, by making an evergreen digital asset.

Benchmarks for Staff/Institutional Impact

The benchmarks for staff were largely focused on their changed attitudes toward future work with the two target audiences, both in terms of how they felt those audiences were served by the project and how the project advanced their ability to work with these audiences again. By and large, these benchmarks proved fruitful, even for a staff that changed dramatically multiple times throughout the project.

Project staff broadly declared an ongoing and consistent comfort working with HSP staff and a growing network of contacts within the Latino community to enhance future collaborations, and while it might have been advantageous to see those two outcomes advance in parallel, it is a reasonable outcome to still see this as a success, particularly because more HSP-affiliated staff are represented in the post-survey results.

Staff remarks regarding the replicability of the project for other organizations were also broadly positive, and their advice for attempts to reproduce or introduce such a program elsewhere align with the impetus for doing the project in the first place - namely the risk to the process and the predictable outcomes that is associated with surrendering content authority to an audience.

Appendix A:

Event Summary Notes

PAZ Meeting #1

March 3rd, 2018 10:00 am – 12:00 pm

Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Part 1: Introductions and Ice Breaker

Welcome delivered by Flora Ward, who then invited the PAZ to introduce themselves and then to follow up their brief introductions with an ice breaker activity that asked them to get up and walk around and have a personal conversation with another PAZ that they did not already know.

Observations:

- Participants were eager to share fairly detailed histories, from describing the fullness of their career research to outlining the decades they had been involved with one organizational partner or another to their family's personal immigration history.
- The ice breaker activity seemed well received by PAZ, most of whom did in fact mingle with at least one (but sometimes only one) new person, and helped get them more evenly distributed around the room since they mostly sat next to the people they already knew.

Recommendation for Replication:

- The introductions were very long and threw the whole meeting schedule off track. However, they also seemed to empower the PAZ participants to feel "known" by a group of strangers and turned up helpful backgrounds about individuals that staff were not aware of, for instance how many of the group were school teachers.
- If the introduction is considered valuable enough to dominate most of a first session, a few logistical tweaks would make it even more successful – making sure everyone can hear (perhaps use a microphone) and making sure everyone can read names (perhaps name placards on tables, since name tags are too small to read in a room that large).

Part 2: What is HSP and the PCAH Project?

Powerpoint presentation by Beth Twiss-Houting on the Historical Society of Pennsylvania as an organization and the goals of the Audience Embedded project.

Observations:

- Due to timing constraints, this portion of the agenda did not take place. Participants went from introductions to each other to an introduction to collections, without a great deal of conversation about what exactly they would be expected to do with the collection.

Recommendations for Replications:

- Whether or not participants understand the intended outcomes of their participation in the project by the end of the second meeting will be an indicator of whether or not skipping this section had a large impact – it's possible that spending more time building relationships between PAZ participants will turn out to be more valuable than spending time on grant logistics or organizational history.

Part 3: Introduction to HSP archives

Whitney Lopez introduced some of the areas of the HSP collection that they had been researching and invited the group into the Research Room, where many of those materials were already available on tables. Each batch of sample archives was described briefly and the PAZ were invited to self-investigate, using small notebooks and pencils to begin noting things they found interesting and might have more questions about.

Observations:

- The PAZ enthusiastically embraced this opportunity and reviewed the documents as individuals and in small groups, most of them moving from one table to another, meeting new people, and conversing about their findings. Few PAZ lingered over a single document – only three seemed immediately sure of a singular interest – rather forming small groups around an idea or piece of paper and then reforming as another interesting finding nearby drew their attention.

Recommendations for Replication:

- The PAZ's enthusiasm for primary source material was actively cultivated with this early opportunity to touch, read and investigate.

Part 4: Critical Reflection Discussion

Observations:

Due to time constraints, this conversation mostly focused on logistics and directions for the second meeting to take place at Taller.

Recommendations for Replication:

It's unclear what might have come from a "critical" conversation, but the PAZ seemed to leave content and socially activated, even without this happening in its fullness.

Event Summary Notes
PAZ Meeting #2
March 17th 2018 10:00 – 12:00 pm
Taller Puertorriqueño, 2600 N. 5th Street

Part 1: Introduction to Taller Puertorriqueño by Carmen Febo San Miguel

Greeting and brief overview provided verbally by Executive Director.

Observations:

- Participants new to Taller had substantive questions, like “What partnerships do you have with other organizations” and “Do you just celebrate Puerto Rican heritage or are you also now the representative organization for other Latino cultures and communities?” Learning about this new organization was important to them.
- Taller stakeholders in the PAZ got to have their decades of involvement validated as they answered the questions.

Recommendations for Replication:

- Equal opportunity for all partner organizations to introduce their own story in their own neighborhoods is invaluable.

Part 2: Visiting the Taller Archives

PAZ were shown the two current art exhibitions on view and the archives room. The Archivist gave a short introduction to what is in the archive, how it was catalogued, and materials they had found personally interesting.

Observations:

- Gave participants a physical understanding of where their research at Taller would take place and a light understanding of what they might uncover.

Recommendations for Replication:

- This exploration of archives felt more rushed than that at HSP during the 3/3/18 meeting. Participants barely had time to begin exploring. It’s possible this will not matter since the archive size is fairly small, but it was a missed opportunity for them to have the same “ah ha” moments they had with actual collections at HSP.
- Visiting the art exhibition on view was fun and informative; it did not, perhaps, contribute directly to the PAZ project outcomes. Considering the difficulty of gathering such a large group for a project, efficiency of exposure to each institution may need to be strictly planned so they have time to “do” and not just “see.”

Part 3: Discussion of “What is the end goal of this project?”

Beth Twiss-Houting articulated the over-arching goal of the project and the general timeline to accomplish each stage. She emphasized the desire for programs to “bubble up” from the audience, aka the PAZ, and that any model of program is worth considering. The single unifying requirement: both programs must source their ideas from *both* the HSP and Taller collections. She also handed out sample finding aids and call slips so participants could see what is required for searching the HSP archives.

Observations:

- Helped to de-mystify, somewhat, the process of getting access to both collections outside of meetings.
- More thoroughly introduced the shared resources – particularly a google drive and archival finding aids – and how they were intended to work for participants on this project. From the volume of questions, it was clear that these were new processes for many participants – many of them were so distracted by reading the physical call slips they were seeing for the first time that it's unclear if they also heard the directions on how to use them. How many PAZ begin doing independent research between meetings will be an indicator of how successful these verbal directions were.
- Participants had a lot of logistical, strategic questions about the timing of their work, the timing of the programs, program formats, etc that got answered.

Recommendations for Replication:

- The volume of questions this topic generated were of two types – “What are we supposed to do?” and “How are we going to do it?” The former was clearly a pressing issue for “outcome-oriented” PAZ members who still were unclear on what their work would be; to maximize buy-in for this subset of the group, it might be helpful to cover these basics more thoroughly in the first meeting.
- Demonstrating things visually – on a powerpoint, for instance, or a google drive demo – could be helpful in making sure all participants understand research processes.

Part 4: Discussing the theme of “The History of Puerto Rican Neighborhoods in Philadelphia”

Participants were broken into groups of three and asked to discuss three questions around this topic.

Observations:

- Counting off, so that groups were well-apportioned with various stakeholders, worked well.
- Participants were engaged in this conversation and seemed to respond enthusiastically to “generating” concrete ideas and suggestions.

Recommendations for Replication:

- Always leave plenty of time for sharing conversations if participants are asked to have them.
- Managing timing for these meetings is difficult, but essential, to the outcomes of this project being successful.

Event Summary Notes
PAZ Meeting #3
May 19th, 2018 10:00 – 12:00 pm
Taller Puertorriqueño, 2600 N. 5th Street

Part 1: Presentation by Victor Vasquez

Presenter welcomed and introduced by Flora Ward. Vazquez then gave an introduction to his own research, the history of Puerto Rican migration patterns to Philadelphia and his own research on shifting trends over two hundred years.

Strengths:

- Helped solidify a single geographic and historical narrative around the Puerto Rican community in Philadelphia that everyone in the room could build on.
- Offered a visualization of the migratory patterns of Puerto Ricans - and other ethnic communities - across the real geography of Philadelphia decade by decade.
- Allowed the PAZ to ask questions about specific moments and events in history that clarified and expanded their understanding of the Audience Embedded topic, with the answers provided by a seasoned professional researcher of community histories.

Recommendations:

- Continue to offer opportunities for professionals to interact with PAZ in the areas of their expertise, to give them concrete ideas of how to proceed in their work.
- This presentation seemed to fall at an appropriate time in the project trajectory, as the PAZ are honing their research skills, beginning to develop individual interests in particular points of contact, and trying to figure out how to make history a modern story.

Part 2: PAZ Participants Share Research to Date

PAZ participants were asked to share a short paragraph about what research they had done so far and what elements they were finding most intriguing for further investigation. Each PAZ shared their progress on research to date, the themes/documents they had found most interesting so far and encouraged to ask Vazquez for specific follow up ideas and sources.

Research themes noted by the PAZ: trends in education policies for Puerto Rican communities; the relationship between race and gentrification; the fluidity of racial identity between African American and Latinx communities; the impact of affordable housing on family migration patterns; cigar factories and production as an early pursuit of emigrating Puerto Ricans; commodities trading between the U.S. and Puerto Rico in the 19th century; census records, trends, accuracies and inaccuracies; early motivations for Puerto Rican emigration; the Spanish American war; art and community events; political activism in the 20th century.

Strengths:

- Allowed the speaker to build on the initial assumptions and investigations of individual PAZ. (For example: responding to a participant looking at red-lining maps about racial segregation and offering additional (non-archival) sources for research as well as additional trains of thought based on historic research that has already been done.

- Helped identify common threads of interest and investigation among the PAZ. In some cases, it also allowed them to cite the same documents and how they opened up different avenues of future research for them.
- Allowed participants to explain how the research they were doing connects with their personal and professional interests.
- Appeared to make it “real” for some PAZ that the project was advancing in terms of content, since they both contributed and learned facts from each other.

Recommendations:

- Since a number of participants chose not to complete the assignment, perhaps asking them to turn the paragraph in before the meeting could generate more consistent responsiveness to the assignment, as well as offer written documentation of what everyone has been working on that could be shared and compared.
- It is difficult to match the interests/facts the PAZ were individually pursuing with the shared Google document listing which dates and boxes they accessed during individual research trips. It might be helpful for them to be able to access each other’s broader thoughts and interests as the project progresses, in case small groups of participants choose to self-organize around individual programs/content streams.

Event Summary Notes
PAZ Meeting #4
June 2nd 2018 10:00 – 12:00 pm
Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1300 Locust Street.

Part 1: Seth Bruggeman, Center for Public History, Temple University

Greeting and brief agenda for the day provided by Flora Ward. Presentation by Bruggeman focused on “What is public history?”

Strengths:

- Provided a high level overview of how professionals think about this type of work and how new colleagues, like university students, are taught to think about it.
- Used current events – like the ongoing debate about confederate monuments – that participants were already familiar with to illustrate broader points about the tension between education, revision, and protest.
- Provided four concrete anecdotes of what “public history” programming can look like and the types of histories – all of which are “difficult” for someone – that are often investigated.
- Introduced ideas of “success” and “failure” in public history programming.

Recommendations:

The general principles of what makes good public history provide a solid framework for the type of work that the PAZ have been asked to do. It’s worth considering if defining the broader discipline might be more impactful for future projects if such a presentation came earlier in the project, to create a shared sense of “best practices” and “intended outcomes” for participants who have struggled to understand what the PAZ deliverables will be.

Part 2: Sean Kelley, Eastern State Penitentiary

Presentation by Kelley focused on the way one institution’s idea of “public history” evolved over time.

Strengths:

- Provided a deep dive into how institutions rethink how they talk about history as scholarship and audience needs change.
- Highlighted the ways in which other disciplines – particularly visual art – can help revision public histories in creative ways, beyond writing a book or giving a lecture.
- Introduced idea of evaluating the impact of programs on audiences and researching who the audience is (and is not) for different types of experiences and programs.
- Demonstrated why involving the community whose story is being told – not unlike why the PAZ was convened in its particular demographics – is an important part of being honest about history.

Recommendations:

Might have been helpful to follow up with PAZ about how evaluation can and will be incorporated into their own project, while the concept is fresh, and since it dovetails with some of their anxieties about who their audience is going to be.

Part 3: Ain Gordon, Artist Embedded

Presentation by Ain Gordon described the previous HSP archival project for new audiences, Artist Embedded.

Strengths:

- Provided a deep dive into the previous iteration of a similar, archives-based project.
- Offered specific ideas on how archival materials can be incorporated into art and performance, not just educational/scholarly program formats.
- Conveyed the deep sense of buy-in that is generated for a community member who works collaboratively with an institution to develop public history projects. This was the first time that a personal narrative, by someone in a similar position to the PAZ (as opposed to a professional historian or arts and culture employee), was shared with the group.
- Gave a clear, cogent and compelling walkthrough of how the HSP archives in particular contain facts, vagaries and interpretations, and how it is both difficult and inspiring to navigate that conflicting information.

Recommendations:

Continue to provide access to individuals who have done the sort of work the PAZ is charged with accomplishing. The personal narrative provides a frisson of excitement and inspiration for the experience that the PAZ will hopefully have and creates a sense of confidence in the value of the work, as well as the fact that projects like this one do, in fact, reach completion, even if the deliverables are currently still in question for some PAZ members.

Part 4: PAZ Discussion

Flora Ward opened up the opportunity for PAZ to ask questions of the presenters as a group. Limited time allowed for four audience members to ask questions, which included queries about how you illuminate the “truth” of art as a piece of history, how you define and get an appropriate audience for a public history project, and specific follow up questions about policy and programming at Temple and Eastern State Penitentiary.

Strengths:

- Introduced a more theoretical framework for the “truth” of history and archival collections than previous sessions, which focused largely on how archives are created and used and what they contain. The PAZ conversing with speakers seemed to respond particularly well to this idea of relativity, but whether or not the whole group can agree on how much authority to give the archive in the development of their programming – particularly in a project driven specifically by archival collections – is yet to be determined.
- Q&A illuminated that even professionals and experts have trouble agreeing on the basic tenets of offering great public history programming, from defining an audience and identifying if/when it diversifies to changing internal structures to better represent the stories that institutions want to tell.

- Q&A addressed the ongoing concern of the PAZ that they don't know "who" their audience is or how to attract one, as the speakers reminded them in various ways that the story they want to tell has to come first, and then an audience for that story will likely emerge second.

Recommendations:

Timing was again an issue in terms of allowing an equal amount of time for the PAZ to process the information they were given as a group, with only four questions possible after 90 minutes of content. Many other participants took notes during the session and if timing cannot be controlled, perhaps asking them to submit their follow up questions in written format – with answers provided at the next meeting by the speakers – would allow for a greater breadth of processing by all PAZ.

Event Summary Notes

PAZ Meeting #5

September 15th, 2018 10:00 – 12:00 pm

Taller Puertorriqueño, 2600 N. 5th Street

n=15

Part 1: Field Trip Feedback

Flora Ward greeted the group and setup the major goal for the day's meeting: Identifying 2 to 3 topic areas to pursue for programming. The facilitator then began a conversation about the (optional) summer field trips PAZ had engaged with and asked participants to each reflect on the question "What did you take away from the trip that would most affect your work on this project?"

Participants noted a variety of ways that the experience inspired new ways of thinking about their own research and discussed how the trips fit into their overall project. Each of the PAZ noted specific people, places and stories they were most inspired by, with a general outline of common thematic takeaways including the following broad ideas:

- Shared experiences between groups that transcend their communities of origin
- The difference of immigration experiences versus migration experiences
- Uncovering hidden histories in a familiar location
- The power of first person experiences
- Effectiveness of collaboration and partnership in telling new stories
- Generating a sense of place for audiences
- How history can generate a shared sense of contemporary values in diverse communities
- How boundaries and barriers work to define neighborhoods
- Harnessing nostalgia and ever evolving personal identities as part of programming

Strengths:

- Gave the PAZ a chance to hear how differently they interpreted these shared public experiences and to query and clarify with each other about their personal takeaways
- PAZ participants were notably amused, anecdotal and personal in their reflections and the conversation generated a good deal of laughter and bonding between various subgroups who have shared personal backgrounds

Recommendations:

- Due to the universally positive reactions of those who did attend various trips, it is distinctly possible that non-participating PAZ would be motivated to sign up for trips as a result of this conversation; there might be an opportunity to use this reflecting process even more strategically in a replicated program by spacing it throughout the first six months of audience engagement

Part 2: Reports on Research to Date

Flora Ward asked each PAZ to report on their research to date, using prepared statements they were asked to bring. Each participant went to the front of the room to share their thoughts.

Strengths

- The PAZ again relished an opportunity to speak to their personal interests in the material and the way that it related to their lived experiences or professional curiosity.
- Made very clear that the PAZ are thinking both about content and format as they do their research, which demonstrates an extremely high level of engagement, while also presenting staff with a broad picture of their level of ambition (high).
- Encourages PAZ that are spending less time researching to get more engaged, as their peers shared extensive engagement with primary source material
- Allowed PAZ to query the group regarding questions they held from their research, some of which could be answered through lived experience (particularly that of participants from the Puerto Rican community) and some of which were answered by participants whose research interests were adjacent but included different or additional source material

Recommendations:

- In spite of requesting prepared statements, after 30 minutes, the facilitator had to chide the group for length and spending too much time discussing possible programming formats, rather than research content. Certain members of the PAZ seem regularly long-winded in their answers – out of a deep sense of personal engagement, not to be intentionally disruptive – yet each time sharing happens, they seem to be the ones that are asked to speak first. The group is small enough that the facilitator could learn this affect and deliberately work around it so that the group stays more on track.
- The PAZ are still challenged by the idea of “not thinking about format” at this stage – they perceive that as part of their role from the beginning, in spite of staff attempts to scaffold the development process of this initiative. Because of this, their suggestions for format are wide ranging in terms of required resources and feasibility (i.e. exhibitions and interactive websites versus a walking tour). Future replication might consider presenting them with a standardized set of possible program formats to keep in mind, which staff knows are achievable as part of the process, so that later meetings don’t require dampening their enthusiasm with the reality of resources.

Part 3: Breakout Sessions to Develop Themes

PAZ participants were randomly divided into four groups, with each one working directly with one of four technical advisors. Each group was asked to pick the “most important theme” from those discussed throughout the day, which was conveyed back to staff by the technical advisors in notation form after the meeting.

Strengths:

- Gave PAZ full control over which themes the project will pursue in its programming for audiences.
- Randomizing the groups broke up small cliques of PAZ that have developed over the last few months based on personal affinity and professional interest.
- This process continued to make “real” for the PAZ what the goals of their participation will be while asking them to begin focusing their interests from the broad to the specific and practicing compromising with each other about what aspects of research will make the most impact on audiences. This was an important first step in negotiating decision-making as a group, which will grow in importance over the next few months.

Recommendations

- Originally, the agenda called for groups to develop two themes, but time constraints required this plan to be revamped in order to achieve tangible outcomes. Time management could have allowed this to happen more fully. (Oppositionally, this would also have generated twice as many themes, requiring additional editing. One theme from each of four groups toward the outcome of two total programs may, in fact, be the ideal outcome at this point.)
- Technical advisors represented two types of expertise – professorial/content and program implementation. As the professors facilitated, they did the bulk of the taking, rather than the PAZ in their group. This was not the intention of staff, but it actually was helpful in providing group facilitation by content experts that were able to summarize the themes quickly and get the group to consensus. These groups finished first and from observations, were more concise and unanimous in their outcomes.
- Each facilitator used a different methodology – i.e. one used web-mapping with their group to connect the possible themes while one listed the highlights of the day and had the group vote and then simply tallied the votes. In spite of having been conversationally trained to facilitate toward the same outcome, they were not standardized in their path to get there, though both of these methods – using an infographic and using a voting system – worked well. Future versions of this initiative might consider standardizing a template for this brainstorming process, used by all groups and all facilitators, so that the outcomes and decision-making process are a shared experience for all PAZ participants.
- Some groups – notably those without a methodology of decision-making proffered by their technical advisor – continued to focus on format rather than content/theme. (One group actually titled their imaginary program and one scheduled out how scholars and community leaders would speak over the course of an afternoon of panel discussions.)
Recommendation again to consider broadly outlining what types of programs are on the table for the group to choose from, so their time is less focused on “dreaming up” program formats the technical advisors and organizational staff are already experts in.

Event Summary Notes
PAZ Meeting #6
October 13th, 10:00 - 12:00 pm
Historical Society of Pennsylvania
n=12

Part 1: Review of Popular Themes from September 15th Conversation

Flora Ward shared the three overarching threads that staff identified from notes and conversation at the previous meeting. The three themes they identified were:

Theme 1: Oral Histories and Testimonials
Theme 2: Visual Arts
Theme 3: Mapping Visual/Digital Timelines

Strengths:

Quickly and efficiently framed the conversation and put some boundaries on the program brainstorming.

Part 2: Review of Grant Resources and Audience Development Plans

Beth Twiss Houting clarified that the major thrust of the grant is actually about process - the process of the PAZ - and that the programs for the public are, while important, in some ways secondary to the importance of these discussions. She reviewed the outcomes of the process being that in Spring of 2019, the organizational staffs will produce (at least) two public programs, as well as a digital publication about the process for other institutions to learn from.

The summary of grant deliverables included the following points to guide the PAZ conversation later in the meeting. The Grant Requires that Programs Will...

- Emphasize the role of economic forces transforming neighborhoods
- Generate conversations that discuss immigration and identity formation
- Be Audience-centric: The PAZ IS the audience. But also, the grant says the project will reach a wide and diverse public audience, so programs will need to merge interests in the two groups from HSP and Taller, and ideally, one would happen at each location.
- Be resourced and implemented by HSP and Taller staff. The PAZ can volunteer to help, volunteer to speak and present, but are not obligated to actually put the program on.
- Be within a budget of \$17,200. Money available includes possibly hiring a curator, hiring/traveling speakers, renting a space if required, etc. Between now and the December meeting, staff will use notes from this meeting and attach dollars to each idea/line item, to present options to the PAZ .
- Carmen: Even if you generate an idea that doesn't make it into an actionable program format for this project, both institutions are listening and valuing your work and what you are uncovering may be included in other programs we do, like a project on memorials Taller is working on with William Penn. Don't be frustrated - everything you are doing is valuable and generative.

Strengths:

- Provided very clear parameters and resource values for the work of the PAZ, many of whom identify as having experience planning and implementing public programs (see PAZ pre-survey) but not necessarily managing budgets.
- Answered a lot of the questions that the PAZ had been wrestling with during their research phase, in terms of intended outcomes from their individual experiences.
- Gave time for PAZ to ask even more nuanced questions about how institutional budgeting and programming work, adding to their understanding of both organizations' processes and their expertise in audience-centric programming. This clarifying Q&A included:
 - Learning that ticket/admissions revenue does not necessarily off-set expenses in a non-profit budgeting situation
 - Learning about the challenges of the perceived "value" of free programs
 - Discussing how locations, times and marketing plans are determined to encourage audience growth
 - Noting that the PAZ are strongly interested in programs that impact youth and the challenge of making them effective without any youth represented in the PAZ
 -
 - Recommendations:
- Future iterations of this project might consider defining the parameters of possible audiences as "over 18" or some other demographic if the intended audience is supposed to be represented by the PAZ; this might help them focus earlier in the research phase on an understanding that *they* are the target audience.

Part 3: Working Through the Three Themes

Beth Twiss Houting and Flora Ward directed the group to discuss program formats and potential audiences for each of the three themes, noting particularly that this portion of the conversation would be strictly timed.

Oral Histories and Testimonials

Audiences: Most of the conversation focused in on the PAZ strong desire to impact K12 students and teachers, from instituting district-wide and even state-wide oral history curricula to doing focus groups with teachers on in-service days. Other ideas included inserting archival material into existing TP and HSP K12 curricula, including social media components, and offering performances as assemblies to schools. One PAZ participant noted at the end of the discussion that an undergraduate class might be better positioned to understand archival material and also that a "wide audience" should include some attention to being able to translate online/in person materials and talks into both Spanish and English.

Format: The conversation about format for this theme broke into two categories – the format for gathering oral histories and the format for sharing them. Specific ideas for how to source the histories included doing an NPR Story Core model of interviews with citizens on sidewalks, having high school students interview the high school students who conducted the original oral histories in Taller's collection, though the PAZ seemed to disagree on whether the stories should be sourced from "regular people" or vetted via "experts" who would have some say in which stories would be included. Proposed formats for presenting the oral histories included transcribing them into book form, including them in an exhibition as text and/or audio, presenting them at tourist locations to share Philadelphia's story with an international audience, and creating a podcast.

Technical Advisor Feedback: Technical advisors weighed in throughout the conversation with ideas and expertise, intervening particularly in the conversation about whose story to tell (“identifying key historical actors is important, but there is value in working with people who haven’t been given the power to talk about their histories, who have a sense of daily life around the stories we want to tell”) and in the focus on podcasts and other evergreen models (“the archive is the domain of the already converted, but if you want the accidental audience, online is where you find them”).

Visual Arts

Audiences: The conversation around this theme continued to prioritize K12 audiences as of the greatest interest to (at least the most vocal) PAZ, including getting teaching posters into the hands of teachers, using objects for classroom lessons, mounting exhibitions in schools, creating competition between schools who are involved in the project to generate student and teacher interest, and soliciting high school students to write and perform plays based on archival material. Some PAZ did note the challenge of creating buy in for already over-worked teachers

Format: The discussion of format was entangled with the conversation about audiences in this section, and largely focused on how K12 audiences could be impacted by a visual art program. Specific suggestions included teaching posters in classrooms, archival material in outdoor, community locations throughout the city during the summer (unclear if this was for all audiences or just youth), instagram and snapchat competitions, murals and mural tours, and exhibitions either of archival material or modeled on projects found in the archives, like Taller’s 25th anniversary exhibition which was curated by community members.

Technical Advisors: Technical advisors weighed in particularly on the scope of the formats being proposed around this theme, gently reminding the PAZ that the resources and time required to do some of the large-scale projects – like a district-wide curriculum and new cultural or government partnerships – were potentially more ambitious than the timeframe of the grant would allow.

Mapping and Visual Timelines

Audiences: The PAZ spent less time defining a potential audience for this theme, though they did occasionally reference “intergenerational audiences” when particular formats came up. It was not entirely clear if they did not perceive this theme as equally relevant to K12 audiences, their primary focus throughout the first two conversations, or if they had simply assumed/exhausted themselves around that topic.

Format: Many PAZ listed timelines or visual representations of storytelling they had found compelling, including at NMAJH, Gilder Lehrman, and Eastern State Penitentiary. What they wrestled with most was *who or what* would be illustrated through the timeline and how the content would be generated, as in, would it be archival or would the audience bring their own stories to put on a timeline or other graphic. Some specific suggestions included a timeline of events that impact (im)migration patterns, a particular neighborhood or community’s evolution over time, overlaying the Puerto Rican migration with the more widely known Great Migration of the African American community, and mapping where “work” was available to Puerto Ricans over

time to show a picture of their economic impact. The PAZ also discussed the limitations of a stationary visual and wondered if something portable would make more sense and how to make them “interesting” by themselves, outside of a programmatic event.

Technical Advisors: Advisors reminded the PAZ to look to what images are actually already in the archives as a way of letting the historical documentation they’ve spent so much time researching guide the story that a visual/timeline would be able to tell the best. Sean Kelley, from Eastern State Penitentiary, was particularly able to talk through the creation of The Big Graph, which many of the PAZ had seen, and where it was sourced from (Ellis Island) and how it’s impact is tied to the fact that it is dynamic, it changes as the information changes.

Strengths:

- Technical Advisors were helpful in framing ideas more succinctly as well as in offering advice about which ideas seemed feasible and which ones made them, as programmers, nervous. Their contributions also made it possible for them to point out concerns as outsiders, rather than having HSP or TP staff have to say “our staff can’t do that” - it gave some distance to the moments of more critical feedback
- Staff from both institutions participated actively, allowing them to calm nerves, answer questions as they came up organically, and hear the live debates; this was the most important session in terms of having staff actively go back and forth with the PAZ
- Gave staff an ability to see which themes resonated with many, versus some, of the PAZ, and indicate (on some level) where the enthusiasm was strongest.

Recommendations:

- Have the PAZ vote on the most important of the three themes before discussion, so that the order they come in doesn’t affect staff ability to read enthusiasm. By the third thematic discussion, some comments were along the lines of “we already discussed that format earlier” or a conversation about audiences was almost entirely skipped.
- Absolutely keep the Technical Advisors involved in this session. They provided key feedback, even if their particular biases – like for untold stories versus scholarly narratives – affected their advice.

Event Summary Notes

PAZ Meeting #7

December 8th, 2018 10:00 am - 12:00 pm

Historical Society of Pennsylvania

N = 11

Part 1: Progress Since Last Meeting

Beth Twiss Houting and Flora Ward introduced the plan for the day and summarized the work that had been done by staff since the last meeting. They distributed a document outlining the plan to create a digital project focusing on Puerto Rican histories with links to oral histories and documents that enrich and personalize the historical narrative, accompanied by two public programs that advance the project's development between December and June.

Beth also clarified two overarching questions. One, she noted that staff heard a clear interest in youth programming coming from the PAZ and while that was not intended to be one of the target audience for *this* project, the digital project may very well become the basis for curriculum development that HSP is committed to doing next year. Two, she clarified that the PAZ are not responsible for logistics and implementation of the programs, but since there was interest in continuing to be involved, staff had identified several opportunities for ongoing PAZ involvement that would include additional contracts and compensation for those interested.

Recommendations for Replication:

- It was a lot of information to process at once for the PAZ. Distributing the plan in advance would have given them more time to process. (This was reiterated in some of the comments on the surveys.)
- The plan for implementation successfully acknowledged most of the major themes and delivery methods identified by the PAZ as important to them, except for being directly targeted at K12 audiences. This is a reasonable accommodation within the parameters of the grant, though future versions of the initiative may benefit from identifying or excluding audience segments at the start of the project, to manage the expectations of participants.

Part 2: Presentation of Program Ideas

Flora invited the group to respond to the summary of ideas presented in the document.

Observations:

- Individual PAZ have different levels of knowledge around digital platforms and there were a lot of questions about the design, content and interface of the project.
- PAZ participants with a specific background/interest in public research were looking for more detailed information about how oral histories would be solicited, how personal stories would be ethically merged into a public infrastructure and who would "control" the narrative.
- Several PAZ continued to ask questions about the (now declared) future plan to create a curriculum for K12 audiences.
- Much of the feedback from the PAZ slyly focused on advocating for staff to continue using community audiences to finish the project, including suggesting teacher focus groups,

millennial focus groups, training Latinx community members to take the oral histories of their neighbors, and making the digital platform dynamic, rather than static, by letting regular people add their own content.

Recommendations for Replication:

- Creating a shared understanding of what type of digital platform or program model is being discussed might help the PAZ be on the same page. Staff might consider showing three models of digital platforms they are considering for different reasons, for instance, so that there is a shared vocabulary in the feedback that accommodates the disparate levels of digital expertise.
- Make sure expert staff are in the room for this conversation to field questions about best practices in design (even if it is a programmatic design), institutional resources, and ethics. There will always be some members of a group conversation who tend toward asking technical or otherwise difficult questions to measure the level of planning in a proposal.
- The focus on a digital platform superceded all conversation about the two public programs that staff propose using to develop the content, even though this conversation was followed by a survey soliciting them to participate in those programs. Perhaps stepping out the feedback about the plan to include each step up to the launch of a digital site would have helped the PAZ connect to the “process” better, rather than focusing primarily on design.

Part 3: Marketing

Flora introduces the marketing staff from both institutions to discuss the possibilities and ideas, including Monica Fonorow and Katerina Lydon. Staff suggested that they had plans to do more than “blast” existing audiences with program notices, but rather intended to create a campaign focused on storytelling, including the story of the PAZ’s participation. They reiterated a call for interested PAZ to help develop that marketing language. They also noted that early, basic fliers and a web page had been produced so that the PAZ could have quick, efficient collateral material to take to their home communities to solicit interest. One PAZ noted that the fliers were in English and that in order to be effective, would need to be translated.

Strengths:

- Underscored that bringing the PAZ together and creating the experience of having community members develop programming *is* half of the project outcome
- Caught a major, easily fixed marketing issue in the need for materials to be bilingual to reach Taller’s audience

Part 4: Post Survey

The Evaluator introduced the two parts of the survey as it was handed out and pointed out that the answers would remain anonymous, so the PAZ should feel free to speak openly about their experience and feedback. The evaluator explained that the qualitative data would be used for advising the project staff about how many of the benchmarks for progress on this project had been achieved and what feedback the PAZ had about how their experiences did, or did not, meet their initial expectations. The quantitative data would be shared with the Marketing teams to help them identify which PAZ would be involved in the final messaging and programmatic initiatives. Then the PAZ took the survey. (Note: 3 PAZ who were not in attendance also took the survey and submitted it to the evaluator via email, so the survey data, shared separately, is n=14.)

Appendix B

PAZ Participant Pre-Survey
March 3rd, 10:00 am
Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Thank you for participating in the Audience Embedded program co-produced by Taller Puertorriqueño (Taller) and the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Your answers will help staff better understand the expertise and expectations of this newly organized group of advisors.

Your Name:

Please tell us a little about your background:

1. Have you ever attended a program offered by Taller before today? Yes No
 2. Have you ever attended a program offered by HSP before today? Yes No
 3. In your personal time, what types of programs do you prefer to attend regularly, defined as at least twice in a calendar year (please circle all that apply):
 - a. Music/Concerts
 - b. Theater/Dance/Performances
 - c. Films
 - d. Hands-on Workshops
 - e. Museum Exhibitions/Archive-based Events
 - f. Community Meetings/Town Halls
 - g. Poetry Readings/Book Clubs/Literary Talks
 - h. Lectures and Panel Discussions
 4. I have spent time working directly with archival collections in the past. Yes No
 5. I have spent time developing public/educational programs in the past. Yes No
 6. I have spent time developing new audiences for organizations in the past. Yes No
-

Please tell us a little about your expectations for this program:

7. I was most interested in participating in this project because.....

8. As a participant in this new collaboration, I am most excited about...(Please choose only one)
- a. Learning new information about history from the archives and collections at both institutions
 - b. Building personal relationships with staff and other PAZ members as we plan programs together
 - c. Helping Latino and non-Latino audiences come together
 - d. Creating programs that are replicable at other institutions and in other cities
 - e. Other _____
9. In your opinion, what is likely to be the greatest challenge in developing archives-based programs that bring HSP and Taller audiences together?
-

Please tell us a little about yourself:

10. What is your age?
- a. 21-30
 - b. 31 – 40
 - c. 41-50
 - d. 51-60
 - e. 61-70
 - d. 70+
11. What is your gender?
- a. Male
 - b. Female
 - c. Transgender
 - d. Prefer not to answer
12. What ethnicity do you identify with?
- a. African/ Afr. American/Black
 - b. Native American
 - c. Hispanic/Latino
 - d. Other _____
 - e. Asian/Pacific Islander
 - f. Caucasian/White
 - g. Middle Eastern/Arab
 - h. Prefer not to answer

THANK YOU!

Appendix C

PAZ Front End Survey Summary

April 10th, 2018

Summarized findings from PAZ pre-surveys delivered at PAZ Meeting #1 on March 3rd, 2018 at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.*

Demographics:

- The PAZ group was successfully composed of 20 members, all of whom completed the pre-survey. Moving forward, success will be measured by retaining an n of 12 at all meetings and events, acknowledging there will be some attrition over two years.
- The PAZ is 50% over the age of 50, and 50% younger
- The PAZ is 75% female
- 55% of the PAZ identify as Hispanic/Latino, 40% Caucasian/White, and a handful of others identified as several ethnicities or wrote in one, like Jewish. Important note: Many of the PAZ identified “Puerto Rican” as separate from Hispanic/Latino and wrote it into the “other”. For the purposes of these statistics, those respondents have been coded as Hispanic/Latino, but it’s important for staff to understand that the audience makes that distinction.

Pre-Program Participation Trends:

- 30% of the PAZ had been to Taller previously and 60% of the PAZ had been to HSP. Only one participant had familiarity with both organizations.
- 75-80% of the PAZ regularly attend Music/Concerts, Films or Museum Exhibitions/Archive-based Events. Other program models lagged much further behind in terms of their familiarity to the group, with the least popular being “Hands-On Workshops.” This may provide some clues for what the group will be most inclined to put together (or what they might need the most help in shaping, should they pick a model they are less familiar with).
- 60% of the PAZ have experience with audience development or archival collections, while almost all of them, 90%, have experience developing educational programming in some capacity
- The PAZ were fairly evenly distributed in what most excited them about participating, with one exception – zero of them indicated they were compelled by the idea of replicable programs that could be useful to other institutions or held in other cities.
- 80% of the PAZ predicted that the greatest challenges to their success would be, essentially, the same critical issues that staff identified in writing the grant – making archives relevant to a contemporary audience and managing the diverse needs and backgrounds of any intended program audience. Two participants focused more on logistics and accessibility - breadth of digitization, cost, and language barriers.

Appendix D

PAZ Participant Post-Survey
December 8th, 10:00 am
Historical Society of Pennsylvania

Thank you for participating in the Audience Embedded program co-produced by Taller Puertorriqueño (Taller) and the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Your answers will help staff better understand the experience you had during this past year.

Your Name:

Please tell us about your experience to date as a Program Audience Zoomer (PAZ).

1. As a participant, I have gotten the most enjoyment out of...(Please circle only one)
 - a. Learning new information about history from the archives and collections at both institutions
 - b. Building personal relationships with staff and other PAZ members as we plan programs together
 - c. Helping Latino and non-Latino audiences come together
 - d. Creating programs that might be replicable at other institutions and in other cities
 - e. Other _____

2. Participating in the Audience Embedded program gave me a feeling of ownership over the programs that are being planned by Taller Puertorriqueño (Taller) and the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Yes No

3. Participating in the Audience Embedded program has taught me new ways that archival collections are relevant to my life and interests. Yes No

4. Since the Audience Embedded program began in March 2018, I have attended a program at Taller Puertorriqueño on my own time. Yes No

5. Since the Audience Embedded program began in March 2018, I have attended a program at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania on my own time. No Yes

6. How important was the honorarium in making it possible and pleasurable for you to participate in the Audience Embedded project?
 - a. Not Important b. Somewhat Important c. Very Important

7. What is the most important thing you've learned from your experience with the Audience Embedded project? (All thoughts welcome!)

Please let us know how involved you would like to be in the next phase of the Audience Embedded Project.

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| 8. Would you be interested in collaborating with our marketing team to develop content to promote the project? | Yes | No |
| 9. Would you be interested in being interviewed in video format about how the Audience Embedded project has affected your personal relationship to and understanding of Puerto Rican history? | Yes | No |
| 10. Would you be interested in helping to select a series of proposed documents for use in the online history project? | Yes | No |
| 11. Would you be interested in helping to facilitate a workshop to select documents for the online history project? | Yes | No |
| 12. Would you be interested in creating a video response to the oral histories captured for the online history project? | Yes | No |
| 13. Would you be willing to speak at a culminating event as a panelist about your experience with the Audience Embedded project? | Yes | No |
| 14. If there is one thing I wish had happened differently during the Audience Embedded project, it would be that..... | | |

Appendix E

PAZ Post-Survey Findings
December 8th, 2018

Benchmark-Related Feedback:

- 100% of the PAZ have a feeling of ownership over the programs that are being planned
- 71% of the PAZ have learned new ways that archival collections are relevant to their life and interests
- 2 PAZ who had previously never been to Taller have participated in a program there since getting involved in this project
- 3 PAZ who had previously never been to HSP have participated in a program there since getting involved with this project
- 36% of the PAZ said that the honorarium was “Somewhat Important” and 43% said that the honorarium was “Very Important” in making it possible and pleasurable for them to participate in this project

Continuing Involvement:

A series of questions probing the interest levels of the PAZ to stay involved for the last six months of the project concluded the survey. The questions focused on which aspects of the project still requiring development they would be interested in participating in.

- 64% are interested in collaborating with the marketing team to promote the project
- 57% are interested in being videotaped about their experience with the project
- 86% are interested in helping to select the documents for use in an online format
- 57% are interested in helping to facilitate a workshop for the public
- 28% are interested in creating a response video to the oral histories included in an online format
- 43% are willing to speak at a culminating event in a panel discussion format
- Note: For these questions, between 1 and 3 PAZ wrote in “Maybe” or “Possibly” as their answer, indicating an unanticipated ambivalence, and is data that is not included in these statistics. Those names will, however, be included in a separate report to the marketing team and if those PAZ participate in future programs, that data will be noted in the final report.

Qualitative Responses:

In response to “What is the most important thing you’ve learned from your experience with the Audience Embedded Project?” the open-ended responses were coded into the following common categories:

- 43% of respondents identified factual content about the history of Puerto Ricans in Philadelphia as their most valuable learning experience
- 29% of respondents identified a new understanding of how archives work, what is in the specific archival collections, and how archives can be turned into programs, as the most valuable learning experience

- Additional themes noted by 2 or fewer PAZ referenced personal growth, understanding one's own family and city better and meeting people outside normal social circles through the project

In response to "If there is one thing I wish had happened differently during the Audience Embedded project, it would be that..." many PAZ said they would not change anything or did not answer. (Note: It is very common for participants to be unable to identify hypothetical change in a program they did not conceive of. Non-answers are not statistically important in a question like this.)

Those that did answer did so thoroughly, and the running themes were "More time," "Clarity of goals and research process," and a desire for "more personal contact with the Puerto Rican community" (particularly youth). The specificity of their answers, however, is important for future replication, so they are included in their fullness here:

- I wish...more time [had been] allotted to the discussions and sessions on Saturday. Time definitely restrained some of the process. On the other hand, a lot was accomplished and we will have a couple projects to share with the Puerto Rican and other communities. Also, lack of Puerto Rican youth involvement during the process was limited and almost absent. Am speaking particularly about students that have had programmatic experience with Taller; or live in the immediate vicinity.
- More time for discussions with the team is all I would have wished for.
- I wish...we were given more concrete tasks for archival visits. I wasn't really sure about what was expected of me. It seems odd to me to put so many resources into coming up with a project idea, whereas there are so many worthwhile projects in search of funding
- From the beginning, I would have involved more members from community and students.
- First thank you! Really didn't understand the project and didn't know why I was asked. Great group of folks and I really hope we have helped you in future events. Would have liked to get the Audience Embedded final project paper we got today through email prior to today. Maybe announce the field trips more in advance. Those were great and I would have paid to go. Shocked I was compensated for the fantastic event with Michelle.
- To meet Puerto Ricans to talk about their daily lives
- I would have loved at least one 8 hour working session with the group. It would have really given us time to workshop particular topics, target our research and all work towards the same goals. I wish I had learned more about what exists in the PHS archives with a more targeted approach. I think we would have all benefited from narrow guidelines as to what we are researching. I found it a bit difficult to focus on the overwhelming amount of information and things I'm interested in. While I know this was part of the goal of our program, I think we would have benefited from all starting on one topic and then breaking out on our own from there. I think it would have given us all a shared language to talk about our archive findings.
- I would have appreciated knowing how much of the work of creating the final project we were going to be responsible for at the beginning.

Appendix F

Web Timeline Survey March 2nd, 2018

| | How important is this fact in shaping your understanding of life in Philadelphia’s Puerto Rican neighborhoods? |
|--|---|
| In 1815, trade begins between Puerto Rico and the U.S. through treaties with Spain. | Very Important Somewhat Important Not Important |
| In 1865 Puerto Rican intellectuals and cigar makers begin immigrating to Philadelphia in significant numbers. | Very Important Somewhat Important Not Important |
| In 1898, the U.S. invades Puerto Rico, and the island is officially ceded to the U.S. by Spain during the treaty that ended the Spanish American War. | Very Important Somewhat Important Not Important |
| Early Puerto Ricans settled in Philadelphia’s Southwark neighborhood, creating a diverse Latino community including many Cubans and Mexicans. | Very Important Somewhat Important Not Important |
| In 1903, La Milagrosa moves to Spring Garden street, paving the way for a migration from Southwark into North Philadelphia. | Very Important Somewhat Important Not Important |
| During WWI, the Jones Act of 1917 established a bill of rights and system of governance for the island and makes all Puerto Ricans U.S. Citizens. | Very Important Somewhat Important Not Important |
| In the 1920s, new immigration laws expand opportunities for migration, and by 1930 there are 5,000 Spanish speakers living in Philadelphia. | Very Important Somewhat Important Not Important |
| In 1929, the first Pan Am flights fly from Philadelphia to San Juan, creating an important travel connection between the two communities. | Very Important Somewhat Important Not Important |
| In 1929, the First Spanish Baptist Church begins providing social services for migrant workers in factories and in farm labor camps. | Very Important Somewhat Important Not Important |
| During World War II, 72,000 Puerto Ricans serve in the U.S. Armed Forces. | Very Important Somewhat Important Not Important |
| In 1944, the government’s “Operation Bootstrap” encourages migration to the mainland, where state and federal agencies found Puerto Ricans work in factories and on farms. | Very Important Somewhat Important Not Important |
| In 1948, the first bodega and Puerto Rican travel agencies open in Philadelphia . | Very Important Somewhat Important Not Important |
| In 1953, cultural and racial tensions in the Spring Garden neighborhood erupt, leading to violence between the Puerto Rican community and their neighbors. | Very Important Somewhat Important Not Important |
| In 1954, Casa del Carmen is established by the Archdiocese to meet the social services needs of the growing Latino community. | Very Important Somewhat Important Not Important |

| | | | |
|---|----------------|--------------------|---------------|
| In the 1960s and 1970s, Puerto Ricans make public declarations of cultural pride through Festivals and the Fiera del Barrio. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In 1962, CONCILIO (the Council of Spanish Speaking Organizations) is established in Philadelphia, a loose federation of small Latin organizations, social clubs and fraternal groups. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In 1968, German Quiles becomes the 1st Puerto Rican/Latino elected as a State Representative from Philadelphia | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In 1969, the Spanish Merchants Association is founded and helps build El Bloque de Oro, the important Latino business and cultural corridor at 5th and Lehigh. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In 1970, the Puerto Rican <i>Panorama</i> television show begins in Philadelphia and becomes the longest continuous running Latino TV show of its kind in the U.S. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| By the 1970 census, one quarter of the population of Eastern North Philadelphia and West Kensington is Puerto Rican and Latino. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In the 1970s, The Young Lords Philadelphia Chapter and the Norris Square Senior Citizens Center (now Carmen Aponte Senior Center on Howard Street) are founded. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In 1974, Taller Puertorriqueno is established in Philadelphia. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In 1974, the Pennsylvania State Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights finds that Puerto Ricans are not receiving equal education. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In 1975, the home of the Santiago family is firebombed by white neighbors, ushering in a decade of violent eruptions along neighborhood borders and with the police. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In 1977, WRTI 90.1 FM "El Viaje" Latino music radio show begins in Philadelphia, to serve the growing population. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In 1979, the Puerto Rican Alliance is established in Philadelphia to advocate for the rights of the community. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In 1981, Community Focus/Enfoque Comunal newspaper begins publication in Philadelphia. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| During the 1980s, Puerto Ricans Nelson Diaz and Angel Ortiz are the 1st Latinos elected to political and judicial positions. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In 1987, Nueva Esperanza, one of the largest Latino faith-based organizations in the United States, is founded in Philadelphia. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In 1990, Puerto Ricans are 76% of the total Hispanic population in Philadelphia. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In 1991, Raices Culturales Latinoamerican is established. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In 1994, Centro Nueva Creacion Church is established. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In 1996, Al Dia Newspaper begins publication in Philadelphia region. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In 2000, Philadelphia has the 3rd largest Puerto Rican population in the US outside Puerto Rico. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In 2000, 50% of Latino children in Philadelphia at or below age 17 were living below the poverty level. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In 2001, the Philadelphia School District reports that 37.7% of Latino students drop out before their anticipated graduation date. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |

| | | | |
|--|----------------|--------------------|---------------|
| In 2003, Grupo Fuego y Caliente (STEP Program) is founded in Philadelphia. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| By 2006, there are more Puerto Ricans living on the U.S. mainland than in the Puerto Rico. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| In 2017, after Hurricane Maria, 2000 families moved from the island to PA, the second-highest number of evacuees from Maria in any state other than Florida. | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Not Important |

Two More Things!

1. I identify as Puerto Rican. Yes No

2. What is your age? 10-21 21-30 31 – 40 41-50 51-60 61-70 70+

Appendix G

Survey Data from Saturday, March 2nd, 2019 Taller Puertorriqueño, 2600 N. 5 th Street

Demographics

25 people took the survey, 8 in Spanish and 17 in English. Respondents were quite evenly split between Puerto Ricans (56%) and non-Puerto Ricans (44%). Respondents also came from a wide variety of age groups, illustrated in **Table 1**.¹

| Table 1: Age Ranges | % of Respondents |
|---------------------|------------------|
| 21-30 | 4% |
| 31-40 | 24% |
| 41-50 | 12% |
| 51-60 | 16% |
| 61-70 | 32% |
| 71+ | 8% |

“Not Important”

Few respondents marked many historical facts as “not important,” regardless of age or ethnicity. This is important to note because for many survey takers, the lowest ranking they gave anything is actually “Somewhat Important.” If looking for a quick list of facts to eliminate completely, **Table 2** provides a quick look at which facts *more than one* participant marked “not important” as well as which ethnic group contributed those opinions:

| Table 2: Facts considered “Not Important” by overall participants | % | Ethnicity of Respondents |
|---|------|--------------------------|
| In 1815, trade begins between Puerto Rico and the U.S. through treaties with Spain. | 8% | All non-Puerto Rican |
| In 1948, the first bodega and Puerto Rican travel agencies open in Philadelphia . | 12 % | Both |
| In 1954, Casa del Carmen is established by the Archdiocese to meet the social services needs of the growing Latino community. | 8% | Both |

¹ Note: Due to the small sample size and wide age range, there was not enough concentrated data to cross-tabulate by age and draw any statistically relevant conclusions. All age groups included both Puerto Ricans and non-Puerto Ricans.

| | | |
|---|------|----------------------|
| In the 1970s, The Young Lords Philadelphia Chapter and the Norris Square Senior Citizens Center (now Carmen Aponte Senior Center on Howard Street) are founded. | 8% | All non-Puerto Rican |
| In 1987, Nueva Esperanza, one of the largest Latino faith-based organizations in the United States, is founded in Philadelphia. | 12 % | Both |
| In 1991, Raices Culturales Latinoamerican is established. | 12 % | Both |
| In 1994, Centro Nueva Creacion Church is established. | 8% | Both |
| In 2003, Grupo Fuego y Caliente (STEP Program) is founded in Philadelphia. | 24 % | Both |

Very Important:

All participants identified over half of the data as “Very Important,” regardless of age or ethnicity. Of those answers, the historical facts that at least 75% of participants agreed were “very important” are identified in **Table 3**.

| Table 3: Facts considered “Very Important” by overall participants | % |
|--|-----|
| In 1898, the U.S. invades Puerto Rico, and the island is officially ceded to the U.S. by Spain during the treaty that ended the Spanish American War. | 84% |
| During WWI, the Jones Act of 1917 established a bill of rights and system of governance for the island and makes all Puerto Ricans U.S. Citizens. | 88% |
| In 1953, cultural and racial tensions in the Spring Garden neighborhood erupt, leading to violence between the Puerto Rican community and their neighbors. | 80% |
| In the 1960s and 1970s, Puerto Ricans make public declarations of cultural pride through Festivals and the Fiera del Barrio. | 80% |
| In 1974, Taller Puertorriqueno is established in Philadelphia. | 88% |
| During the 1980s, Puerto Ricans Nelson Diaz and Angel Ortiz are the 1st Latinos elected to political and judicial positions. | 84% |
| In 2017, after Hurricane Maria, 2000 families moved from the island to PA, the second-highest number of evacuees from Maria in any state other than Florida. | 88% |

Cross-tabulations across ethnic identifications revealed that there are several places in which Puerto Rican and non-Puerto Rican audiences differed in regards to which facts are “very important.” In some cases, the fact is still relatively important to both groups and therefore a likely candidate for inclusion in the timeline already. (These will all have overall high percentages of “Very Important” in the full table at the end of this report.) In some cases, however, a particular fact may have an

overall lower ranking of importance but indicate that one of the target audiences finds it particularly valuable, a consideration that could impact timeline development for two very different audiences. **Table 4** illustrates the historical facts in which there was a significant difference of opinion about importance.

| | Very Important to Puerto Ricans | Very Important to non-Puerto Ricans |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Table 4: Cross Tabulation of facts considered “Very Important” by Puerto Ricans versus Non-Puerto Ricans (percentages out of population of each group, as in, 93% of Puerto Ricans found the invasion of Puerto Rico to be “Very Important”) | | |
| In 1898, the U.S. invades Puerto Rico, and the island is officially ceded to the U.S. by Spain during the treaty that ended the Spanish American War. | 93% | 73% |
| Early Puerto Ricans settled in Philadelphia’s Southwark neighborhood, creating a diverse Latino community including many Cubans and Mexicans. | 43% | 82% |
| During WWI, the Jones Act of 1917 established a bill of rights and system of governance for the island and makes all Puerto Ricans U.S. Citizens. | 100% | 73% |
| In 1929, the First Spanish Baptist Church begins providing social services for migrant workers in factories and in farm labor camps. | 57% | 27% |
| In 1969, the Spanish Merchants Association is founded and helps build El Bloque de Oro, the important Latino business and cultural corridor at 5th and Lehigh. | 86% | 45% |
| In 1970, the Puerto Rican Panorama television show begins in Philadelphia and becomes the longest continuous running Latino TV show of its kind in the U.S. | 71% | 36% |
| In 1977, WRTI 90.1 FM “El Viaje” Latino music radio show begins in Philadelphia, to serve the growing population. | 43% | 64% |
| In 1979, the Puerto Rican Alliance is established in Philadelphia to advocate for the rights of the community. | 86% | 64% |
| In 1991, Raices Culturales Latinoamerican is established. | 14% | 36% |
| In 1994, Centro Nueva Creacion Church is established. | 7% | 36% |
| In 2003, Grupo Fuego y Caliente (STEP Program) is founded in Philadelphia. | 7% | 55% |

Full Listing:

Here is the full listing of how each historical fact was ranked by participants.

| <i>Table 5: Percentages of overall responses to How important is this fact in shaping your understanding of life in Philadelphia's Puerto Rican neighborhoods?</i> | Very | Some- what | Not |
|---|------|---------------|-----|
| In 1815, trade begins between Puerto Rico and the U.S. through treaties with Spain. | 44% | 48% | 8% |
| In 1865 Puerto Rican intellectuals and cigar makers begin immigrating to Philadelphia in significant numbers. | 76% | 24% | 0% |
| In 1898, the U.S. invades Puerto Rico, and the island is officially ceded to the U.S. by Spain during the treaty that ended the Spanish American War. | 84% | 16% | 0% |
| Early Puerto Ricans settled in Philadelphia's Southwark neighborhood, creating a diverse Latino community including many Cubans and Mexicans. | 60% | 36% | 0% |
| In 1903, La Milagrosa moves to Spring Garden street, paving the way for a migration from Southwark into North Philadelphia. | 52% | 44% | 4% |
| During WWI, the Jones Act of 1917 established a bill of rights and system of governance for the island and makes all Puerto Ricans U.S. Citizens. | 88% | 12% | 0% |
| In the 1920s, new immigration laws expand opportunities for migration, and by 1930 there are 5,000 Spanish speakers living in Philadelphia. | 68% | 32% | 0% |
| In 1929, the first Pan Am flights fly from Philadelphia to San Juan, creating an important travel connection between the two communities. | 48% | 48% | 4% |
| In 1929, the First Spanish Baptist Church begins providing social services for migrant workers in factories and farm labor camps. | 44% | 52% | 4% |
| During World War II, 72,000 Puerto Ricans serve in the U.S. Armed Forces. | 72% | 28% | 0% |
| In 1944, the government's "Operation Bootstrap" encourages migration to the mainland, where state and federal agencies found Puerto Ricans work in factories and on farms. | 72% | 28% | 0% |
| In 1948, the first bodega and Puerto Rican travel agencies open in Philadelphia . | 36% | 52% | 12% |
| In 1953, cultural and racial tensions in the Spring Garden neighborhood erupt, leading to violence between the Puerto Rican community and their neighbors. | 80% | 20% | 0% |
| In 1954, Casa del Carmen is established by the Archdiocese to meet the social services needs of the growing Latino community. | 40% | 52% | 8% |
| In the 1960s and 1970s, Puerto Ricans make public declarations of cultural pride through Festivals and the Fiesta del Barrio. | 80% | 16% | 4% |
| In 1962, CONCILIO (the Council of Spanish Speaking Organizations) is established in Philadelphia, a loose federation of small Latin organizations, social clubs and fraternal groups. | 72% | 24% | 4% |
| In 1968, German Quiles becomes the 1st Puerto Rican/Latino elected as a State Representative from Philadelphia | 64% | 32% | 4% |
| In 1969, the Spanish Merchants Association is founded and helps build El Bloque de Oro, the important Latino business and cultural corridor at 5th and Lehigh. | 68% | 32% | 0% |
| In 1970, the Puerto Rican Panorama television show begins in Philadelphia and becomes the longest continuous running Latino TV show of its kind in the U.S. | 56% | 44% | 0% |
| By the 1970 census, one quarter of the population of Eastern North Philadelphia and West Kensington is Puerto Rican and Latino. | 72% | 24% | 4% |
| In the 1970s, The Young Lords Philadelphia Chapter and the Norris Square Senior Citizens Center (now Carme Aponte Senior Center on Howard Street) are founded. | 56% | 36% | 8% |
| In 1974, Taller Puertorriqueno is established in Philadelphia. | 88% | 8% | 4% |
| In 1974, the Pennsylvania State Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights finds that Puerto Ricans are not receiving equal education. | 76% | 24% | 0% |
| In 1975, the home of the Santiago family is firebombed by white neighbors, ushering in a decade of violent eruptions along neighborhood borders and with the police. | 76% | 24% | 0% |

| | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|
| In 1977, WRTI 90.1 FM “El Viaje” Latino music radio show begins in Philadelphia, to serve the growing population. | 52% | 48% | 0% |
| In 1979, the Puerto Rican Alliance is established in Philadelphia to advocate for the rights of the community. | 76% | 20% | 4% |
| In 1981, Community Focus/Enfoque Comunal newspaper begins publication in Philadelphia. | 40% | 56% | 4% |
| During the 1980s, Puerto Ricans Nelson Diaz and Angel Ortiz are the 1st Latinos elected to political and judicial positions. | 84% | 12% | 4% |
| In 1987, Nueva Esperanza, one of the largest Latino faith-based organizations in the United States, is founded in Philadelphia. | 36% | 52% | 12% |
| In 1990, Puerto Ricans are 76% of the total Hispanic population in Philadelphia. | 68% | 32% | 0% |
| In 1991, Raices Culturales Latinoamerican is established. | 24% | 64% | 12% |
| In 1994, Centro Nueva Creacion Church is established. | 20% | 72% | 8% |
| In 1996, Al Dia Newspaper begins publication in Philadelphia region. | 36% | 64% | 0% |
| In 2000, Philadelphia has the 3rd largest Puerto Rican population in the US outside Puerto Rico. | 68% | 32% | 0% |
| In 2000, 50% of Latino children in Philadelphia at or below age 17 were living below the poverty level. | 68% | 32% | 0% |
| In 2001, the Philadelphia School District reports that 37.7% of Latino students drop out before their anticipated graduation date. | 64% | 36% | 0% |
| In 2003, Grupo Fuego y Caliente (STEP Program) is founded in Philadelphia. | 28% | 48% | 24% |
| By 2006, there are more Puerto Ricans living on the U.S. mainland than in the Puerto Rico. | 76% | 24% | 0% |
| In 2017, after Hurricane Maria, 2000 families moved from the island to PA, the second-highest number of evacuees from Maria in any state other than Florida. | 88% | 12% | 0% |

Appendix H

Institutional Staff Post-Survey Results

October 26, 2019

(*Note: Only two staff remain between both institutions from the pre-survey results. So participants completing this survey may have joined mid-project or participated as a Project Advisor, not a staff member of either institution.)

Question 1: Which institution do you work for?

| | |
|------------------------------------|--------|
| Taller Puertorriqueño | 14.29% |
| Historical Society of Pennsylvania | 28.57% |
| Project Advisor | 57.14% |

Question 2: I feel like I have a better understanding of the audiences of both partner institutions.

| | |
|-------|--------|
| True | 85.71% |
| False | 14.29% |

Question 3: My role in the Audience Embedded project primarily focused on...

| | |
|----------------------|--------|
| Research and content | 28.57% |
| Audience Development | 14.29% |

| | |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Educational Programming | 14.29% |
| Grant/Resources Management | 14.29% |
| General Administration | 28.57% |
| Marketing | 0% |

Question 4: I feel confident about working with audiences from the historical society community.

| | |
|---------------|--------|
| Not True | 0% |
| Somewhat True | 14.29% |
| Mostly True | 14.29% |
| True | 71.43% |

Question 5: I feel confident about working with audiences from the Latino community.

| | |
|---------------|--------|
| Not True | 0% |
| Somewhat True | 28.57% |
| Mostly True | 28.57% |
| True | 42.86% |

Question 6: I feel like I have a strong network of professional contacts in the historical society community.

| | |
|---------------|--------|
| Not True | 0% |
| Somewhat True | 14.29% |
| Mostly True | 0% |
| True | 85.71% |

Question 7: I feel like I have a strong network of contacts in the Latino community.

| | |
|---------------|--------|
| Not True | 14.29% |
| Somewhat True | 57.14% |
| Mostly True | 14.29% |
| True | 14.29% |

Question 8: I think the programs and grant outputs – specifically the website – provided a satisfying model of engagement for both new and existing audiences.

| | |
|-------|------|
| True | 100% |
| False | 0% |

Question 9: Please list one way you think other institutions can learn from this project.

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Others can learn about the value in interrogating the concept of "community history" BEFORE trying to do community history.</p> | <p>Project Advisor</p> |
| <p>I think the most important lesson of this project was the important of granting full and complete agency to audience participants. A real strength of this process was that we as staff didn't go in there with a predetermined idea of what kind of programs we wanted the participants to create. There was a push and pull between institutional authority and audience agency, and there were times when it was more challenging for the PAZ to maintain ownership of the process -- but I think overall as a model for engagement with audiences, this project has a lot to offer other institutions looking to develop their audiences.</p> | <p>Project Advisor</p> |
| <p>It was fascinating to see the overlap in the audiences, and how they worked together for the programming.</p> | <p>Project Advisor</p> |
| <p>I don't think the project was perfect, but direct interaction between community members and primary resources/collections is a great way to inspire programming and can lead a project/program in surprising directions. Also, its a great way to learn about audience priorities. I think the way this audience wanted to ensure there were K-12 resources created is very telling.</p> | <p>Historical Society of Pennsylvania</p> |
| <p>Doable model that could be easily adaptable to other settings. Great way to bring communities together.</p> | <p>Taller Puertorrique no</p> |
| <p>sorry, but need to state again that a number of these questions don't really apply to my role in this project. re my "confidence" in working with audiences in either org or professional contacts in either org, my role was distinct from a process that would have led me to either feeling. I only noted more confidence with HSP because I have worked with them prior to this project. I don't think my answers should be used for this survey. I do believe this project can serve as a model for collaboration between institutions, communities, and for interrogating the omniscience of the traditional historical lens.</p> | <p>Project Advisor</p> |

That they should invite the community in, but only IF they are willing to give the process time to build relationships and to follow-up on suggestions.

Historical
Society of
Pennsylvania