# ANTI-RACIST EQUITY EVALUATION TOOL FOR COMMUNITY GARDENS (WITH RACIST-INCIDENT SUPPORT)

# **EVALUATION CATEGORIES**

- Access and Inclusion
- Cultural Relevance and Sensitivity
- Leadership and Power-Sharing
- Community Engagement and Representation
- Resources and Economic Justice
- Land Acknowledgment and Reparative Practices
- Racist-Incident Support and Response
- Impact on Racial Justice and Equity

# **SCORING SYSTEM**

Each question within a category is assigned a point value (0, 1, 2, or 3) based on the level of equity achieved. Higher points indicate stronger alignment with anti-racist and equitable practices.

O points = Not achieved or no evidence of action

1 point = Partial or minimal achievement

2 points = Significant progress, but some gaps remain

3 points = Fully achieved with strong anti-racist practices in place

# 1. ACCESS AND INCLUSION (0-12 POINTS)

This category assesses how inclusive the garden is in terms of physical, financial, and structural access to marginalized communities, particularly IBPOC individuals.

# **Physical Accessibility**

Are there accommodations for people with disabilities (e.g., wheelchair-accessible pathways, raised beds)?

- [0] No
- [1] Some accommodations
- [2] Significant accommodations
- [3] Fully accessible, including adaptive tools and seating areas

# **Affordability**

Are fees for garden participation flexible, sliding-scale, or free for low-income participants?

- [0] No flexibility or free access
- [1] Sliding scale but not widely advertised
- [2] Sliding scale widely available
- [3] Free or subsidized for all, especially for low-income IBPOC members

# **Land Access and Security**

Does the garden operate on land that is accessible to historically marginalized groups, especially Indigenous and Black communities?

- [0] No land access for IBPOC communities
- [1] Some plots available for marginalized groups
- [2] Partnerships with IBPOC communities to ensure access
- [3] Secure, long-term land access for IBPOC groups with a commitment to land reparation

## **Transportation and Location**

Is the garden easily accessible by public transportation or within walking distance for IBPOC communities and low-income households?

- [0] No access to public transport or difficult to reach
- [1] Limited access to transport
- [2] Well-served by public transport
- [3] Strategically located in areas of high need (food deserts, etc.)

# 2. CULTURAL RELEVANCE AND SENSITIVITY (0-9 POINTS)

This category measures how the garden reflects and celebrates the cultural food traditions and agricultural knowledge of IBPOC communities.

## **Culturally Relevant Crops**

Does the garden grow crops that are significant to IBPOC cultures (e.g., traditional foods for Indigenous, Black, Latinx, etc.)?

- [0] No culturally relevant crops
- [1] A few culturally significant crops grown
- [2] Diverse culturally relevant crops from various IBPOC traditions
- [3] Wide array of culturally significant crops, with input from community

## **Culturally Inclusive Practices**

Does the garden integrate cultural knowledge and agricultural practices from IBPOC communities (e.g., Indigenous land stewardship practices, Black farming techniques)?

- [0] No integration of cultural practices
- [1] Some integration but limited
- [2] Strong integration of IBPOC agricultural knowledge
- [3] Fully integrated, with ongoing consultation from cultural groups

## Inclusive Language and Signage

Are there multilingual signs, materials, and resources to include non-English-speaking community members?

- [0] No multilingual materials or signage
- [1] Some materials in other languages
- [2] Signage and resources available in multiple languages
- [3] Fully inclusive with translation services, culturally appropriate materials

#### 3. LEADERSHIP AND POWER-SHARING (0-12 POINTS)

This category focuses on the degree to which IBPOC individuals are represented in leadership and decision-making roles within the garden.

#### **IBPOC** Representation in Leadership

Do IBPOC individuals hold leadership roles in the garden (e.g., board members, garden coordinators)?

- [0] No IBPOC representation in leadership
- [1] A few IBPOC leaders in minor roles
- [2] IBPOC individuals hold significant leadership roles
- [3] Majority IBPOC leadership and decision-makers

# **Community-Led Governance**

Is the garden's governance structure participatory and community-led, with IBPOC voices at the forefront?

- [0] Top-down leadership without input from IBPOC
- [1] Some IBPOC involvement, but not in leadership roles
- [2] IBPOC engaged in regular decisions on programming
- [3] Fully participatory structure where IBPOC members lead key decisions

#### **Leadership Development for IBPOC**

Does the garden offer leadership training or mentorship for IBPOC participants to take on roles in garden management?

- [0] No leadership development programs for IBPOC
- [1] Informal or limited opportunities for IBPOC leadership
- [2] Training programs available for IBPOC community members
- [3] Dedicated leadership programs that support IBPOC gardeners into key leadership roles

# 4. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND REPRESENTATION (0-9 POINTS)

This category assesses how well the garden engages with and represents the diverse voices of IBPOC communities, particularly those that have been historically marginalized.

#### **Outreach to IBPOC Communities**

Does the garden actively reach out to IBPOC communities, ensuring that their needs are addressed in the garden's goals?

- [0] No active outreach to IBPOC communities
- [1] Minimal outreach, mostly word-of-mouth
- [2] Active outreach through community partners
- [3] Robust outreach, including multilingual materials and partnerships with IBPOC-led organizations

## **Inclusive Decision-Making**

Does the garden regularly involve IBPOC community members in decision-making about garden projects and activities?

- [0] No involvement of IBPOC in decision-making
- [1] IBPOC involved in some decisions but not in leadership
- [2] IBPOC engaged in regular decisions on programming
- [3] IBPOC community leads major decisions on garden direction, programming, and policies

# **5. RESOURCES AND ECONOMIC JUSTICE (0-9 POINTS)**

This category evaluates how equitable the resource distribution is, especially for IBPOC and low-income community members.

#### Access to Garden Resources (Tools, Seeds, Land)

Are essential resources (seeds, tools, soil, space) available to all community members, with extra support for IBPOC and low-income gardeners?

- [0] Resources are limited or only available to paying members
- [1] Resources are available but limited to certain groups
- [2] Resources are widely available, with extra support for IBPOC
- [3] Free or low-cost resources are available to all, with additional support for low-income/IBPOC gardeners

#### **Funding and Grants for IBPOC Gardeners**

Are there specific funding or grant opportunities for IBPOC gardeners to start their own projects or grow within the garden?

- [0] No funding or grants for IBPOC gardeners
- [1] Some funds, but not explicitly for IBPOC gardeners
- [2] Funds set aside for IBPOC gardeners or projects
- [3] IBPOC gardeners have access to significant funding and grant opportunities\

# 6. LAND ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND REPARATIVE PRACTICES (0-6 POINTS)

This category focuses on how the garden acknowledges historical injustices related to land and works toward reparative justice.

Land Acknowledgment and Recognition of Indigenous Stewardship

Does the garden acknowledge the Indigenous history of the land it occupies and engage with local Indigenous communities?

- [0] No acknowledgment of Indigenous land
- [1] Acknowledgment, but no engagement with Indigenous groups
- [2] Acknowledgment with some engagement from local Indigenous groups
- [3] Ongoing partnership with Indigenous groups and active land stewardship practices

## **Reparative Actions for Land Dispossession**

Does the garden engage in practices of reparative justice, such as supporting land reclamation efforts or redistributing land to Indigenous communities?

- [0] No reparative actions
- [1]Financial Contributions and Partnerships: Supports Indigenous initiatives through donations or partnerships.
- [2]Co-management or Shared Stewardship: Collaborates with Indigenous communities in land management or decision-making.
- [3]Land Repatriation or Redistribution: Actively redistributes land or supports Indigenous land reclamation.