A précis of the evaluation competency literature: A working document

Commissioned by the Aotearoa New Zealand Evaluation Association (**anzea**)
for the Professional Practice Development Evaluator Competency Project
February 2010

Précis prepared by Robyn Bailey
RB Evaluation Research Ltd
robyn_bailey@xtra.co.nz

Foreword

The **anzea** Board is pleased to make available this working document in preparation for the March 2010 release of the draft evaluator competency framework for consultation with **anzea's** membership.

The **anzea** 2008-2011 strategic plan identifies a number of priority projects with the development of evaluator competencies being an important foundational project. The Board recognises that evaluator competencies are a critical part of ensuring evaluation quality along with the other important 'pillars of quality'[1] - ethical principles and guidelines, and programme evaluation standards.

One of the more pressing issues in Aotearoa New Zealand is building evaluation capacity through professional development activities. A set of evaluator competencies will provide evaluators and professional development providers with a much-needed framework to assess and identify the most critical gaps and evaluation practice needs.

There have been recent initiatives in the New Zealand government sector to develop evaluator competencies to guide the recruitment and professional development of evaluators[2]. There has also been work that has focused on good evaluation practice as perceived by indigenous worldviews[3]. Internationally, Canada has developed and implemented an evaluator competency framework and designation system; and there are moves in Europe, and in international development evaluation, to develop evaluator competency frameworks.

This literature précis was commissioned by the **anzea** Board to help inform the development of a draft set of evaluator competencies relevant for Aotearoa New Zealand, for consideration by **anzea's** membership. The competencies are being developed to:

- Inform and guide sound and ethical evaluation practice in Aotearoa New Zealand, in a range of roles relevant to evaluation practice
- Provide guidance to trainers, teachers of evaluation and tertiary institutions about the minimum or graduating standards for evaluators in Aotearoa New Zealand
- Provide a basis for voluntary self-review by evaluation practitioners
- Support the development of employment criteria or standards for various evaluation positions or roles
- Increase public awareness and understanding about the dimensions that make up 'good' evaluation practice in Aotearoa New Zealand

[1] A term used by the Canadian Evaluation Society,http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/txt/three_pillars.pdf

[2] The Ministry of Social Development conducted a project to determine research and evaluation competencies for researchers and evaluators in 2004 (*Draft Core competencies for Highly Effective Research & Evaluation Analysts and Senior Analysts, Prepared for the Family, Child, Youth & Community Research & Evaluation Unit, Centre for Social Research & Evaluation, Ministry of Social Development by Chris Daly of PS... Services, July 2004).* More recently, NZQA has developed a draft set of competencies as part of their work on the new evaluative approach to quality assurance being implemented in the tertiary sector *(Professional Competencies for External Evaluation and Review Evaluators: Draft for discussion purposes, NZQA, date unknown)*.

[3] SPEaR Good Practice Guidelines Project, see http://www.spear.govt.nz/documents/good-practice/spear-bpg-maori-final-report-anzea.pdf

We hope that this document will provide **anzea** members, the evaluation sector and those with an interest in evaluation quality with a good overview of the current local, international and some of the indigenous discussions regarding evaluator competency.

Kate McKegg
Convenor **anzea**

Contents

Introduction

This précis of the evaluation competency literature was prepared to help inform the discussion at **anzea's** 9 October 2009 caucus of a number of senior and experienced members of Aotearoa New Zealand's evaluation profession. The caucus is co-chaired by Nan Wehipeihana and Jane Davidson. The purpose of the caucus' first discussion was to guide the initial development of a draft framework of evaluator competencies for consultation with **anzea's** membership.

This document is in three parts. Section one, *Synthesis,* collates information from a review of the literature according to the following six questions. Sections two and three provide summaries of the literature reviewed.

1. What are the key terms and definitions around competence, competency and practice standards for evaluators?
2. What are the range of evaluator competencies and cultural competencies (skills, knowledge and dispositions) that have been / are being written about and used locally and internationally?
    a. What does the literature say about different levels (e.g., emergent, novice, experienced, expert) of competence and practice?
3. What are the key issues in the field of evaluation that may affect the ongoing development of evaluation competencies?
4. Are there some competencies that are more essential than others?
5. What are the key issues in designating and reviewing evaluator competence?
6. What are cultural imperatives that could underpin the development of competencies in New Zealand?

This is a 'working document' rather than a formal paper. The *Synthesis* provides a series of key points to guide discussions within the caucus and the smaller working group responsible for overseeing the drafting of the framework, rather than a full analysis and set of conclusions. It draws heavily on quotes to make or illustrate the key points. This approach was adopted to maximise the available timeframe and resource.

Sections two and three contain a summary of each document reviewed presented in a table form, with the above questions noted in the left-hand column to guide the reader to the purpose of including the information. "Cut-'n'-paste" was extensively used to save time and enable as broad a coverage as possible within the available timeframe and resource.[4]

Section two *Competencies* includes literature discussing and presenting examples of evaluator competencies developed to date. It firstly notes the thinking guiding the development of competency approaches and then includes the detail (examples) of the competencies. Section three focuses on *Cultural competency*. Both sections present Aotearoa New Zealand then international literature. The literature is presented by date of publication, oldest to most recent, to enable the reader to see the progression of ideas.

[4] Quotation marks have been used to ensure no plagiarism, and page numbers have also been included in case quotes are useful for future papers.

This document does not claim to have comprehensively covered all the potential literature. The inclusion of literature was guided by the collection **anzea** had gathered for the purpose of the evaluator competency project, and the time and resource available.

Section one: Synthesis

Key terms and definitions

No agreed definition of competency or cultural competency

There is "no generally accepted definition for *competencies* (Richen, 2001), nor agreement on how to write them. The term *competencies* is derived from the term *competence*, which in the world of work signifies that a person has reached some level of expertise with the multifaceted abilities needed to be successful in any given field" (Stevahn, King, Ghere, & Minnema, 2005, p.48).

Similarly, David Thomas (2007, p.2) found that "a search of the relevant literature indicates that multiple meanings and definitions have been used to describe cultural competence. … In the United States, the department of Health and Human Services website [2007] … notes that no single definition of cultural competence has been broadly accepted, either in human services practice or in professional education".

Jane Davidson notes that Michael Scriven focuses on the definition of "evaluation" not on the definition of "competency" in his list of "fundamental evaluation-specific competencies that are absolutely essential for being able to do what evaluation actually is, i.e. to ask and answer truly evaluation questions" and get "from 'what's so' (descriptive findings) to 'so what' (evaluative conclusions)"(Davidson, 2006).

The papers included in this literature review have included skills, knowledge, experience, abilities, capacities, attributes, dispositions, and/or qualifications in their definitions and descriptions of evaluator competencies. The most common term is skills, followed by knowledge and then either attributes or dispositions.

Evaluator competencies described in relation to evaluation standards and ethics

Various writers have described the relationship between evaluator competencies and evaluation standards and ethics as follows:

> "… *evaluation standards* provide guidance for making decisions when conducting program, evaluation studies, *evaluator competencies …* specify the knowledge, skills, and dispositions central to effectively accomplishing those standards have the potential to further increase the effectiveness of evaluation efforts" (Stevahn et al., 2005, p.57)
>
> "Standards define for the practitioner the acceptable characteristics of evaluation *products and services*. Competencies are the skills, knowledge and abilities required in a *person practicing* evaluation. Ethics provide an umbrella, under which the competencies are applied and products produced." (*The Three Pillars: Standards, Ethics and Competencies*, 2008, p.1)
>
> "… in order to achieve results evaluation competencies (the "who") must be complemented by quality standards (the "what") implemented in line with agreed ethical standards (the "how") within a suitable institutional environment (the "where")" (*EES Questionnaire about evaluation competencies*, , p.7)

Cultural competency

The Te Puni Kokiri Guidelines state that "evaluators with cultural, language/reo, subject and research competencies are required to undertake an evaluation involving Māori" (*Evaluation for Maori: Guidelines for Government Agencies*, 1999, p.14).

In *Pacific Cultural Competencies: A literature review,* Jemaima Tiatia notes that:

> "[a]lthough there is no universally accepted single definition of cultural competence, most definitions have a common element, which requires an adjustment or acknowledgement of one's own culture in order to understand the culture of clients, patients, working colleagues or communities. This is achieved by recognising and respecting the culture of the person, family, community and/or organisation being served" (2008, p.vii).

In the Tiatia literature review, which is focused on the health sector, cultural competency is described as:

> "… as a set of academic, experiential and interpersonal skills that allow individuals and systems to increase their understanding and appreciation of cultural differences and similarities within, among and between groups (Counties Manukau DHB 2001; Jansen and Sorrensen 2002).
>
> Therefore, becoming culturally competent requires the ability to draw on the values, traditions and customs of other cultural groups, to work with knowledgeable persons from other cultures, and shape service delivery to meet patients' social, cultural and linguistic needs by developing targeted interventions and other supports (Betancourt et al 2002; Counties Manukau DHB 2001).
>
> Cultural competency is not merely a skill set to be taught, as argued by Rhymes and Brown (2005); it also involves a fundamental shift in the way one perceives the world. It is a path on which to travel, as opposed to an end to be achieved (Rhymes and Brown 2005)." (Tiatia, 2008, p. 3-4)

Stafford Hood draws on a 1992 definition of cultural competence developed by M.A. Orlandi (Editor of US Department of Health and Human Services Publication No. (ADM) 92-1884) for evaluators working in the field of alcohol and drug abuse prevention:

> "A set of academic and interpersonal skills that allow individuals to increase their **understanding and appreciation** of cultural differences and similarities within, among, and between groups. This requires a **willingness and ability** to draw on community-based values, traditions, and customs, and to work with knowledgeable persons of and from the community in developing focused interventions, communications and other supports." (Hood, 2008, slide 14)

Saumitra SenGupta, Rodney Hopson and Melva Thompson-Robinson note that "cultural competence has been defined in the social program literature from a systemic viewpoint" (2004, p.9) and that in other fields (psychology, mental health, counseling) it covers behaviours, attitudes, policies, practice and research. They note that "the term *cultural competence* has not been commonly used to characterize evaluator competency in incorporating cultural context in evaluation" and some of the recent evaluation papers (up to 2004) were starting "to frame the issue in a culturally responsive framework"(p.11). They identify the beginnings of a definition of cultural competence in evaluation:

> "as a systematic, responsive inquiry that is actively cognizant, understanding, and appreciative of the cultural context in which the evaluation takes place; that frames and articulates the epistemology of the evaluative endeavour; that employs culturally and contextually appropriate methodology; and that uses stakeholder-generated interpretive means to arrive at the results and further use of the findings." (p.13)

Influence of power on definitions and the development of cultural competency

Jemaima Tiatia's literature review on *Pacific Cultural Competence* includes the 2001 work of M.S. Southwick (*Pacific women's stories of becoming a nurse in New Zealand: a radical hermeneutic reconstruction of marginality.* PhD thesis, Victoria University, Wellington) who argues, in relation to cultural safety – a term related to cultural competence, that:

> "… in reality that only one culture has the power to determine what [cultural] 'safety' really means. Therefore, the criteria for shaping successful knowledge and skill acquisition, and the standards and competency measures for what constitutes 'good practice', are all derived from a mainstream world view. Southwick does not suggest that the mainstream nursing profession deliberately sets out to dominate or oppress other groups, or that Pacific nurses are victims. Rather, this argument reinforces the notion that cultural safety and competence can only be achieved if the nursing profession reflects the evolving, pluralistic and diverse nature of New Zealand society and responds appropriately to the needs of Pacific peoples." (2008, p.8)

This argument suggests the development of Aotearoa New Zealand evaluator competencies and cultural competencies will need to be similarly cognisant of such power dynamics and potential influence of mainstream worldviews.

Range and levels of evaluator competencies and cultural competencies

The range of evaluator competencies and cultural competencies used locally and internationally, have been summarised in the following Tables one to three. Tables one and two provide information on the competency domains that have been or are being used, firstly in Aotearoa New Zealand and secondly, in other countries. Table three provides some examples of domains or principles informing Aotearoa New Zealand and overseas guidelines to culturally competent evaluation practice.

A difference between competencies and cultural competency

A difference between the competencies in Tables one and two and the information provided about cultural competency in the Table three, is that the former are examples of the desired skills, knowledge, dispositions etc of the evaluation practitioner, where as the later are often principles or ethics to guide evaluation practice. It is not known whether this reflects the 'evolutionary nature' of the discussion, i.e. evaluator competencies follows discussion of practice and ethical standards, or something different is occurring within the cultural competency discourse.

To illustrate this difference, three examples of local thinking regarding cultural competency have been included: a conversation which occurred between Māori evaluation practitioners (Figure one), a view on culturally responsive evaluation from a Māori evaluation practitioner (Figure two), and a view regarding Pacific cultural competency in the health sector (Figure three). For an overview of Māori guideline developments and some relevant international developments, refer to *'Good Practice' guidelines for evaluation with Māori – Talking, Reflecting and Doing!'* Kataraina Pipi, 2008.

Table one: Competency domains developed in (or had input from) Aotearoa New Zealand

AES 1995	Jakob-Hoff & Coggan 1997	AES 2002	Gomes & Daly 2004	ERO PGDE (2006)	anzea wkshp 2008	NZQA (2009?)
○ Evaluation theory ○ Research methodology ○ Management of projects and/or consultants ○ Communication skills (written, visual, oral) ○ Mediation and facilitation ○ Change management ○ Ethics and standards ○ Familiarity with tools	*Generic competencies* ○ Research skills ○ Organisational / management theory ○ Project management skills ○ Ethical behaviour ○ Communication skills ○ Change skills *Specific competencies* ○ Understanding the role and purpose of evaluation ○ Understanding of the current debates surrounding evaluation and the implications for practice	*Based on model of professional competence. Developed to inform training and professional development.* ○ Knowledge/ Cognitive competence ○ Functional competence ○ Personal/ ○ Behavioural competence ○ Values/Ethical competence	*Developed for capability development purposes for employers and evaluation training providers. Ordered by importance.* ○ Critical thinking, analysis and problem solving ○ Technical expertise ○ Communication skills ○ Socio-political awareness and sector knowledge ○ Customer focus and relationship management ○ Team-working	○ Analysis and judgment ○ Professional knowledge ○ Relationships and communication (Plus: Evaluating fairly Understanding context and content)	*Numbers reflect assigned priorities.* ○ Professional integrity, incl ethical understanding and conduct (1) ○ Cultural competencies (1) ○ Analytical/ Critical thinking (2) ○ Integration and facilitation skills (2) ○ Knowledge of evaluation theory, paradigms, models and technical skills (2) ○ Contextual knowledge (2) ○ Emotional intelligence (2) ○ Good communication	*Competencies set in form of professional practice standards and indicators, for external evaluations and reviews.* ○ Professional practice ○ Evaluation theory and practice ○ Managing and conducting evaluation ○ Working with the context of the evaluation

AES 1995	Jakob-Hoff & Coggan 1997	AES 2002	Gomes & Daly 2004	ERO PGDE (2006)	anzea wkshp 2008	NZQA (2009?)
	○ Ability to make judgements based on information collected ○ Ability to ensure maximum utilisation of evaluation findings ○ Synthesis skills to combine the other competencies ○ Intuition				skills (2) ○ Evaluation project management (3) ○ Utilisation focused (3) ○ Reflective practice (3) ○ Team player (3)	

Table two: Competency domains developed overseas

US: Stevahn et al (2005)	US: WMU IDPE (2003)	US: Stufflebeam et al (2005)	US: Michael Scriven (2006)	Canadian Evaluation Society (2008)	European Evaluation Society (2008?)	German Evaluation Society DeGEval (date unknown)
Uses behavioural language. According to CES Crosswalk, 2008, Stevahn et al omitted activities common to both research and evaluation, as well as, evaluation activities or particular types of studies. ○ Professional practice ○ Systematic inquiry ○ Situational analysis ○ Project management ○ Reflective practice ○ Interpersonal competence	○ Research design and methodology (both qualitative and quantitative) ○ Content knowledge and skills pertaining to a particular area of specialization (cognate area) ○ Evaluation competencies that includes evaluation theory; evaluation-specific methodology; understanding of social, political and cultural context; critical thinking; interpersonal and consulting skills; other evaluation know-how	*Self-assessment tool.* ○ Standards/ Metaevaluation ○ Evaluation Approaches and Models ○ Evaluation of Particular Areas ○ Designing Evaluations ○ Evaluation Methods and Techniques ○ Providing Evaluation Training ○ Professional Development ○ Developing a View of Evaluation	*Evaluation-specific competencies* ○ Conceptualizing tools ○ Investigating tools ○ Reporting tools	*CES approach is output based according to EES.* ○ Professional practice ○ Systematic inquiry ○ Situational analysis ○ Project management ○ Reflective practice ○ Interpersonal competence	○ Evaluation knowledge ○ Professional practice ○ Dispositions and attitudes	*Input based recommendations for education and training in evaluation*. ○ Theory and history of evaluation ○ Methodological competencies ○ Organizational and subject knowledge ○ Social and personal competencies ○ Evaluation practice

Table three: Principles or domains informing Aotearoa NZ and overseas guidelines to culturally competent evaluation practice

TPK Guidelines (1999)	AIATSIS Guidelines (2000)	*Reimann et al 2004 in Thomas paper*	Nelson-Barber et al (2005)	SPEaR Guidelines (2007)	Thomas (2007)	In Tiatia (2008)
Ethics: safety, respect, comfort, dignity, integrity and confidentiality for the individual, their whānau, hāpu and iwi. Evaluators and/ or interviewers who: ○ value and are able to apply tikanga and manaakitanga principles, ○ treat Māori respondents with respect and regard, and ○ appreciate and are able to apply culturally appropriate research methods / methdologies, e.g. hui, collaborative research design, kaupapa	○ Consultation, negotiation and mutual understanding ○ Respect, recognition and involvement ○ Benefits, outcomes and agreement	○ Cultural knowledge ○ Cultural awareness ○ Culturally appropriate behaviours	Ability and willingness to: ○ take into account the influences of cultural context on program goals, implementation, and outcomes (how to understand the interaction of context with the program). ○ honor community-based values, traditions, and customs and capitalize on opportunities to draw from cultural understandings (how to be responsive to the values of the community). ○ engage knowledgeable community members in developing focused interventions, communications, and other supports to help ensure that strategies make	*Based on a principles approach, and use of rich 'vignettes' to illustrate application, acknowledging that application of principles "were seen to occur within, and be subject to, the cultural context and values of the practitioner and the people/community party to the research/evaluation". (p.3)* ○ Respect ○ Integrity ○ Responsiveness ○ Competency ○ Reciprocity	*Themes of cultural competencies valued by Primary Health Organisation clients* ○ Feeling welcomed and acknowledged ○ Shared communication and understanding ○ Provider strategies which address cultural styles and ethnic status of clients	○ Sensitivity and understanding of one's own cultural identity ○ Knowledge of other cultures' beliefs, values and practices ○ Skills to co-operate effectively with diverse cultures *Three main components required to become culturally competent at individual level*

TPK Guidelines (1999)	AIATSIS Guidelines (2000)	*Reimann et al 2004 in Thomas paper*	Nelson-Barber et al (2005)	SPEaR Guidelines (2007)	Thomas (2007)	In Tiatia (2008)
Māori research methods.			sense and deliver valid results (how to engage community members). ○ create mutuality with community members (how to recognize that others have knowledge; how to distinguish between interpretation and ownership).			

Figure one: A conversation which occurred between Māori evaluation practitioners

The following is a cut'n'paste from an on-line conversation between Nan Wehipeihana, Judy Oakden, Kirimatao Paipa and Kataraina Pipi (April 2009).

Nan:

Echoing the views of Jennifer Green, being a skilled and competent evaluator is not just the application of methods and techniques to a problem or issue. It's as much about who we are, and where we position ourselves in relation to others, as it is about what we do (Greene, 2005).

What is cultural competence in a NZ context?

McKegg and Wehipeihana (2008) argue that for evaluators to become culturally responsive in New Zealand they must acknowledge and work with difference such as that between Maori and Pakeha, and understand that this difference marks a conditional and complex relationship built on different histories" (Jones & Jenkins, 2008).

I also like to think that in NZ we are attuned to cultural competence as a consequence of our histories as Maori and Pakeha New Zealanders. "Our histories matter here in New Zealand; where we are from and who our families and ancestors are matters.

So for me books like Ask That Mountain, by Dick Scott and Healing our Histories by Robert Consedine are a must read for non-Maori evaluators wanting to work in a bi-cultural space.

Further, building connections is a key foundation for the practice of evaluation with and in Maori communities. Establishing connection to others and to the land is a critical part of our cultural and evaluation practice. Our 'competence' is as much a function of our technical evaluation skills as it is our ability to connect" (McKegg & Wehipeihana, 2008). For example, in many meetings and hui both Maori and non-Maori do a brief mihi – introducing themselves, who they are, where the come from. At the heart of this cultural practice is the search for connection – typically hapū, iwi or whakapapa based, but in our contemporary context we also look for connections through upbringing, schooling, work, whānau and friendship connections etc – as a foundation for establishing relationships.

In terms of engagement, (Wehipeihana, 2008) identifies the following seven core competencies for engaging with Maori, and being able to carryout the following tasks/activities in a way that is appropriate to the context and to tikanga Maori:

- Be able to introduce yourself
- Opening prayer (or poetry, lullaby that fulfils the same purpose)
- Open a meeting
- Close a meeting
- Closing prayer (or poetry, lullaby that fulfils the same purpose)
- Bless food (or poetry, lullaby that fulfils the same purpose)
- Support / acknowledge a speaker (waiata or similar)

Ideally, this would be in te reo Maori, but a mix of Maori and English is often fine. What is important is that one understands the intent and purposes of the practice, is respectful of it and or participates and supports the process appropriately.

One useful framework originally developed by Linda Smith (1999) and subsequently refined by Fiona Cram (2001, 2008) to guide culturally competent practice in relation to Maori is outlined below.

Cultural values (Smith, 1999)	Researcher Guidelines (Cram, 2001)
Aroha ki te tangata	A respect for people
He kanohi kitea	Both face-to-face and a known face of the community

Titiro, whakarongo, korero	Look, listen and then speaking
Manaaki kit e tangata	Sharing, hosting and being generous
Kia tupato	Be cautious – politically astute, culturally safe etc
Kaua e takatakahi te mana o te tangata	Do not trample on the mana or dignity of a person
Kia mahaki	Be humble and find (humble) ways of sharing knowledge

In an indigenous context (La France & Nicols, 2007) cultural competence also means:

- Assessment of merit based on/takes account of traditional values & cultural context
- Responsive to local traditions and culture
- Shared ownership in defining evaluation meaning, practice and usefulness
- Evaluation as an opportunity to learn and go forward
- Respect for tribal sovereignty and self determination

References

Cram, F. (2008). Maintaining Indigenous Voices" In D.M. Mertens and P. E. Ginsberg (eds.),. The Handbook of Social Research Ethics". Thousand Oak, Sage.

Greene, J. (2005). Evaluators as stewards of the public good. In S. Hood, R. Hopson & H. Frierson (Eds.), The Role of Culture and Cultural Context, Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

Jones, A., & Jenkins, K. (2008). Rethinking Collaboration: Working with Indigene-Colonizer Hyphen. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith (Eds.), Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies (pp. 471-486). Thousand Oaks, CA.

Smith, L. T. (1999). Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples. Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.

McKegg K., & Wehipeihana, N. (2008, November) Where 'connectedness to others and the land' is an essential competency for evaluators – the challenges of building a system of evaluation professional development in a bi-cultural context. A paper presented at the American Evaluation Association Conference, Denver, Colarado, November 7, 2008.

Wehipeihana, N. (2009, March). Credible Evaluation in Maori Context and Settings. Presentation to the New Zealand Qualifications Association, Wellington, New Zealand, March 17, 2009.

Kirimatao:

… two core qualities that I think are essential for Pakeha to develop a culturally competent practice, one is personal responsibility, and the second is commitment to [their] own personal development and education about culture. Without these two values, the terms of engagement that Nan developed could be easily corrupted by incompetence. Maori engagement in the process begins at the same point, personal responsibility, commitment and leadership. Maori evaluators face issues of insider/outsider, tribal bias, conflicts of interest and whakapapa, we too must do our homework before crossing tribal boundaries, and work in different areas.

Kataraina:

[At the anzea 2008 workshop on evaluator competencies,] cultural competency was identified as one of the areas. The specific points highlighted under this area included:

- understanding of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and active application of those principles in evaluation

practice

- acknowledgement and understanding of cultural uniqueness and the importance of cultural sensitivity
- cultural inclusiveness
- knowledge of tikanga and how to work and behave in various Māori contexts
- ability to behave respectfully in cultural contexts that one is not yet familiar in

Preskill& Russ-Eft in their Building Evaluation Capacity – 72 Activities for Teaching and Training book have a section that includes activities that address:

- understanding the importance or recognising the cultural contexts of evaluation
- defining cultural competency within an evaluation context and
- understanding how one's culture and history potentially affect evaluation practice

The brief introduction to this section says 'it is critical that evaluators understand what it means to be culturally aware and sensitive and to have some level of cultural competence. The first step toward achieving this goal is for evaluators to know themselves – their roots, histories, biases, prejudices, and assumptions about race, culture, and ethnicity. Only then can they begin to understand, and possibly confront, long-held beliefs that may support or impede their working within multi-cultural environment.' (page 53)

I concur with the above statements and so that says that cultural competency 101 is 'know thyself'! – That's a good place to start and how do you know when you're done on that one? Is it when you can see this is who I am, where I come from, who I come from? – That is step one!

Figure two: A view on culturally responsive evaluation from a Māori evaluation practitioner

The following is by Kataraina Pipi on "Culturally Responsive Evaluation": A Maori view, Presentation for Post-Graduate Diploma in Social Sector Evaluation Research, 2008.

To be culturally responsible means …

- Manaaki tangata – Look after people
- Tiaki korero – Look after the korero
- Whakawhanaungatanga – Warm up first with re-establishing relationships
- Whakamana – Acknowledge and affirm

Culturally embedded assumptions are:

- Tangata whenua – The stories are of the people and of the land
- Tino Rangatiratanga – Programmes are homegrown as is the approach
- Ngā tikanga hei ārahi – Cultural values will determine the pathway
- Whānau Oranga – Well-being is important

My cultural position:

- Whakapapa – Whānau – hapu – iwi connections
- Whanaungatanga – Long established relationships
- Kaupapa connects and reconnects us over the years
- Mana Wahine – As women we acknowledge our uniqueness

What is appreciated …

- Giving generously of your time
- Maintenance of Kaupapa Māori practices and values
- A hūmaire approach – to nestle alongside, to be 'in touch'
- The Maori heart that listens to stories that unfold – give rise and purpose to each one
- Invite to delve deeper to stories that would normally remain silent
- Respect for the preciousness of the stories
- Making evaluation a learning experience
- The sense of affirmation, rejuvenation and future development

Figure three: A view regarding Pacific cultural competency in the health sector

Cut'n'paste from Foliaki (2003) *Pacific Cultural Screening Competencies* reported in *Pacific Cultural Competencies: A literature review* (Tiatia, 2008, p.15-16):

"Foliaki provides fundamental knowledge components of Pacific cultural awareness training, which are worthy of consideration for Pacific cultural competence and effective service delivery for Pacific peoples. These are:

- knowledge of one's own beliefs and values, specifically in relation to health and ill health
- the historical, demographic, socioeconomic and cultural context of Pacific communities in New Zealand
- Pacific values, beliefs and practices specifically in relation to health and ill health
- Pacific family structure and family decision-making processes
- Pacific community structures."

"Foliaki … maintains that the key to successful interpersonal engagement between Pacific peoples and cross-cultural engagement between Pacific and non-Pacific peoples is respect. In a one-on-one interaction with a client, respect is expressed through:

- appropriate greetings, including saying the name of the person/s correctly
- introducing yourself, your function and the function of other people that are present in the meeting
- establishing a connection between yourself and the patient/family, sharing something personal of yourself (humanising yourself, taking yourself out of your professional role before tackling the business at hand)
- explaining/demonstrating what you expect to happen during your meeting
- asking the person/family what they want/expect to happen in the meeting
- reassuring them that they have your full attention by not engaging in other activities while talking with them.

When interacting with a group, Foliaki reiterates that respect should continue to be regarded with the utmost importance and demonstrated by:

- knowing the structure of the group and acknowledging the key people in the right order
- expressing appreciation for the opportunity to meet
- acknowledging past interactions

- sharing some personal information about oneself that may have some connection with the group or with the purpose of the meeting
- addressing the business at hand only after an emotional/spiritual connection has been made."

Competency levels

Most documents reviewed did not distinguish between different levels of competency. The exceptions were the Gomes and Daly's 2004 paper which provided detailed information for evaluation analyst and senior evaluation analyst levels (refer Appendix one), and WMU's Interdisciplinary PhD in Evaluation (refer Jane Davidson's summary in Section two) which used a rating approach. NZQA noted that their competencies were "intended … for lead evaluators with others expected to demonstrate most but not necessarily all" competencies (p.2). The TPK Guidelines stated they were "for the novice evaluator as well as the expert" (p.7).

Key issues in the field of evaluation that may affect the ongoing development of evaluation competencies

Cultural competency has wider implications

The literature suggests there are four inter-related levels in which to address cultural competency:

1. Evaluation as a profession / discipline / field (theory, practice models, expectations via standards, ethics, practice guidelines, etc)
2. Evaluator or evaluation practitioner (skills, attitudes, behaviours, knowledge, world views - ontological and epistemological stance, etc)
3. The evaluation project or evaluation as 'practice' (design, methodology, methods, measures, execution including by whom, interpretation / analysis of findings, etc)
4. The evaluand, that is, what are the relevant cultural competency frameworks / models / measures to enable assessment of the cultural competency of the evaluand when it is a policy, programme, service and/or provider.

Whilst this project is focused on evaluator competency, the **anzea** project sits within the much larger discussion and challenge that cultural competency presents. In the *New Directions for Evaluation* on Cultural Competence in Evaluation, SenGutpa et al identified the need for: (i) policies, (ii) practice guidelines, (iii) a critical pool of multicultural, multifaceted evaluators, (iv) more available examples of reports and literature on culturally competent theory and practice (where "the issues of cultural competence are addressed as an explicit criterion rather than an unspoken expectation"(2004, p.15)). This raises questions about whether the development of evaluator competencies occurs as part of a wider coordinated, comprehensive strategy, which in turn raises issues of strategy development, resourcing, collaboration with relevant people/organisations etc. for **anzea**.

Other issues raised by *cultural competency* include:

- Cultural competency in evaluation requires competency beyond evaluation methods and methodologies to understanding the cultural contexts and impacts on problem definition, policy formulation and discourse, theories, design, methodologies, methods etc. This has implications for evaluation as a profession and/or evaluators attempting to recognise and address the contextual factors of culture in a policy or operational setting which in turn may or may not be resistant to this.
- Cultural competency is an "active" process, an explicitly conscious act, which goes beyond treating people "equally", that is, as if everybody is the same. The later perpetuates "isms" even in the absence of "hostile … thoughts" (House in SenGupta et al., 2004, p.9) or intentions. The literature indicates that the development of evaluator competencies will need to be an ongoing, 'living', active process.

Need to develop a rationale for competencies and address concerns re credentialing

Stevahn et al pose the question "If competencies are the solution, what exactly is the problem?" Put another way, are there consequences of *not* having established competencies for program evaluators? …. [They develop] an affirmative rationale for evaluator competencies … the field would benefit from evaluator competencies in four primary ways: (a) improved training, (b) enhanced reflective practice, (c) the advancement of research on evaluation, and (d) the potential for continued professionalization of the field" (Stevahn et al., 2005, p.44-45)

Concerns regarding the use of competencies for professional designation / credentialing which is being pursued by the CES will no doubt be raised and need to be addressed.

Seeking acceptance and validation

Gomes & Daly and Stevahn et al note the importance of validation by the evaluation community and other relevant stakeholders. The CES Professional Designation Project highlighted challenges of reaching agreement on core competencies.

> "Various steps in the [validation] process include reviewing the program evaluation literature, formulating initial taxonomies that can merge into one, establishing face validity, seeking diverse input for revision, determining validation strategies, exploring validation in different geographic regions or specific sectors of practice, pursuing widespread validation across the entire field of professional practice, revisiting and refining any agreed-upon taxonomy in light of new developments within the field, and so on. … [It requires] systematically conduct[ing] a comprehensive validation study to determine the extent to which program evaluators across the entire field can reach consensus on the importance of a set of essential competencies for professional practice. Doing so will require including a broad representative sample of evaluators in the validation process who represent diverse evaluation roles, orientations, and interests …. It also will require defining terms to promote consistency in meaning and shared understanding." (Stevahn et al., 2005, p.55-56)

anzea capacity

Stevahn et al highlight the long-term nature of developing competencies, as referred to above with regard to seeking validation / acceptance. The CES Professional Designation

Project document the associated financial and volunteer resources to develop and sustain their process in terms of explicit costs (time and money), opportunity costs (loss of use of time and money on other projects), and implicit costs (volunteer burn-out member concerns, dissatisfaction).

Essential competencies

Cultural competency core

The 'nature of evaluation' places cultural competency at the core of evaluator competency. SenGupta et al argue that the "common thread between culture and evaluation is the concept of *values*. Culture shapes values, beliefs, and worldviews. Evaluation is fundamentally an endeavour of determining values, merit, and worth (p.6). … Stufflebeam (2003) describes values as the core of an evaluative endeavour"(2004, p.10).

Cultural competency highlights need for particular skills, knowledge, and attributes

With regard to the following point from the previous section, this highlights the need for particular skills, knowledge, attributes and abilities:

> Cultural competency in evaluation requires competency beyond evaluation methods and methodologies to understanding the cultural contexts and impacts on problem definition, policy formulation and discourse, theories, design, methodologies, methods etc. This has implications for … evaluators attempting to recognise and address the contextual factors of culture in a policy or operational setting which in turn may or may not be resistant to this.

Further review of the papers in Section three *Cultural competency* and information contained in Figures one to three is needed to identify the potential range of relevant competencies.

There is also discussion yet to be had about the competency and role of evaluators' outside-of-the-culture of the participants in an evaluation. Review of papers by and/or input from Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Fiona Cram, Peter Mataira, SPEaR Best Practice Māori Guidelines Hui vignettes and Māori evaluators will be important to inform this discussion.

In terms of Pacific cultural competency in the health sector, the review of the literature noted that an evaluation:

> "found that non-Pacific general practitioners were not expected to have in-depth knowledge of cultural knowledge, customs and traditions of their Pacific clients. It was argued that while such knowledge would have been beneficial to improving communication, it is only one aspect of a Pacific culturally competent service. Study participants (patients, doctors) believed that cultural sensitivity was of the utmost importance. For instance, participants agreed that the ability to build rapport and express empathy and respect should take precedence …" (Tiatia, 2008, p.30)

Another study:

> "indicated that the most effective [alcohol and drug] assessments were those conducted by skilled Pacific staff with sound knowledge, not only in their field of expertise, but in Pacific cultures and processes, and in the ability to combine mainstream and Pacific knowledge to benefit the client. … The findings also reinforced the notion that when working with Pacific clients, it is not enough to simply be 'Pacific'; it is equally, if not more, crucial to have formal training and skills development." (Tiatia, 2008, p.27)

The co-editors of *The Role of Culture and Cultural Context: A Mandate for Inclusion, the Discovery of Truth, and Understanding in Evaluative Theory and Practice* strongly stated:

> "We have zero tolerance for continuing the current practice of assigning evaluators unaware of the cultural landscape to projects that serve the least-served children of our society (i.e., children of color and those in poverty). This is *not* a matter of race, of one ethnic group having exclusive rights or insights because of their family of origin. It *is* a matter of acknowledging who is aware of what and how we can maximise our collective talent, skills and insight to make education evaluation as effective as possible. (p.3)
>
> "The coeditors of this volume are throwing down their collective gauntlet … : If you don't know our territory, either work in your own territory or open your mind or heart to matters that heretofore have escaped you. We welcome all sentient human beings in our quest to enhance the power of educational evaluators to become more culturally competent in their practice …" (Hood, Hopson, & Frierson, 2005, p.5)

However, it is important to recognise that both the findings from the Pacific health sector and the above writers from the United States may not necessarily reflect the views of Māori as tangata whenua - the indigenous peoples of Aotearoa, and as partners of the Treaty of Waitangi (Aotearoa New Zealand's founding document). Hence the need for further discussion and review as noted earlier.

Evaluation-specific competencies more important

Most of the competency frameworks focused on evaluation-specific as opposed to those competencies shared with social science research. Stevahn et al "crosswalk omitted activities common to both research and evaluation, as well as, evaluation activities or particular types of studies (premised on the approach that evaluations should be designed to address questions and issues)" (CES Crosswalk, 2008, p.1). Jakob-Hoff and Coggan (2003) distinguish between competencies specific to and not-specific to evaluation. Scriven is the strongest advocate, stating that "most of the evaluator competency lists are incomplete, [that is] they lack the fundamental evaluation-specific competencies that are absolutely essential" to evaluation (Davidson, 2006) (refer to Section 1.2 in the *Summary Tables* for his list).

No agreed order of importance

The two Aotearoa New Zealand papers by Gomes & Daly and from the anzea competency workshop in 2008 list competencies in order of importance according to those who took part in their development (refer Table one). The two lists are different. In the development of the Education Review Office list, the competencies identified as most important were in the domain of analysis and judgment.

Key issues in designating and reviewing evaluator competence

Deciding on an approach

Stevahn et al note that there is no "agreement on how to write" competencies (2005, p.48).

> "Different frames of reference … influence how competencies are conceived and operationalized (Weinert, 2001). In education, for example, some consider competencies to include specialized skills and knowledge, whereas others also include attitudes or dispositions (Blanton, 1992; Gettinger, Stoiber, Goetz, & Caspe, 1999). Despite a lack of agreement, most competency taxonomies focus on "complex action systems that encompass not only knowledge and skills, but also strategies and routines for appropriately applying these knowledge and skills, as well as appropriate emotions and attitudes and the effective self-regulation of these competencies" (Rychen, 2001, p. 8). Accordingly, we chose to use a competency framework that includes the knowledge, skills, and dispositions program evaluators need to be effective as professionals. We also chose to write the competencies in behavioral language (to the extent possible), describing "the things you can see or hear being done" (Green, 1999, p. 7). As such, the competencies predominantly describe various activities that evaluators carry out to achieve standards that constitute sound evaluations (e.g., *The Program Evaluation Standards*; Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1994). It is important to note, however, that using *behavioral language* is not the same as taking a *behavioral approach* to developing competencies, the latter of which tends to task analyze competencies into discrete behaviors rather than considering whole, functional outcomes (McAllister, 1998)." (Stevahn et al., 2005, p.48)

In relation to culturally competent health care, the literature review of *Pacific Cultural Competencies* notes the following, which may also have implications for the development of cultural competency in evaluation.

> "Cultural competence is … generally … considered a behavioural approach and functions on the principle that behavioural changes can only be achieved first and foremost by changes in attitude. The capacity to affect attitudes and behaviours is influenced by many factors, including leadership in the field, access to information, goodwill, informed decision-making, a learning environment, best-quality practices, and organisational processes and procedures." (Tiatia, 2008, p.vii)

> "There is substantial evidence to suggest that cultural competence is imperative. However, there is little evidence on which approaches and techniques are effective and how and when to implement them appropriately [in relation to culturally competent care]. … An important issue for Pacific peoples is that cultural competencies lack rigorous evaluation. As a result, it is uncertain what actually works to improve outcomes." (Tiatia, 2008, p.viii)

Gomes & Daly (2004) adopt a behavioural approach (or language?) in the development of their competencies. They provide a definition for each competency domain, statements of behaviours, examples of behaviours, indicators of competency, types of activities / training or other means of developing competency (refer Appendix one, *Summary Tables*).

The European Evaluation Society offers a different tack to the understanding and development of competencies:

> Most competency initiatives seek to capture the knowledge content, analytical rigor and presentational quality of products and the interpersonal behavior and leadership characteristics needed for effective evaluation delivery.
>
> Whereas input based approaches focus on evaluators' qualifications, the outcome based approach assesses competencies in terms of the results of evaluators' activities. The main advantage of the input based approach is its accessibility and simplicity. The main advantage of the output or outcome based approach is that it aims to make competencies "evaluable".
>
> On the other hand, threats to the validity of competencies as performance indicators arise when, as is frequently the case, evaluation outcomes are affected by the behaviors of other actors (commissioners; other stakeholders, etc.) and the characteristics of the enabling environment.
>
> Both the input based and outcome based competency frameworks interrogate capabilities in terms of disciplinary content as well as delivery, social interaction and/or management skills. Equally, both models consider theory as well as practice; knowledge as well as experience.
>
> Finally, both provide for competency assessments at different competency levels ranging from basic entry level requirements to higher order and/or specialized knowledge and skills. …
>
> The output based approach is illustrated by the Canadian Evaluation Society initiative. It is geared to a proposed certification scheme for Canadian evaluators and linked to a core body of knowledge qualifications for individuals tasked with the design and delivery of program evaluation products.
>
> Canada's approach to evaluation competencies focuses on quality assessments of practice in five categories: (i) reflective; (ii) technical; (iii) situational; (iv) managerial; and (v) interpersonal. Similarly, essential competencies for program evaluators have been codified in the United States to complement the guiding principles for evaluators endorsed by the American Evaluation Association.
>
> By contrast, in Europe, the German Evaluation Society (DeGEval) has designed generic, input based recommendations for education and training in evaluation. They outline five competency fields that evaluation education and training programs should cover: (i) theory and history of evaluation; (ii) methodological competencies; (iii) organizational and subject knowledge; (iv) social and personal competencies; and (v) evaluation practice. This approach is more input based than output based: it focuses on the content of education and training programs capable of generating the skills, knowledge and mastery needed to contribute to high quality work." (*EES Questionnaire about evaluation competencies*, , p.11-12)

Risk of standardisation

The following quote from the European Evaluation Society highlights a number of the risks of developing competencies:

> "If [competencies are] rigidly defined, they may inhibit adaptation to diverse contexts. They may also raise unrealistic expectations regarding the feasibility of achieving results

from evaluation activities by diverting the spotlight away from inadequacies in commissioning or management.

Too demanding a framework may create unreasonable barriers to entry in the profession. Too loose a framework may offer misleading comfort to commissioners, employers, evaluators and other stakeholders. Too static a framework may hinder timely adaptation to new evaluation challenges." (p.9)

The literature review of *Pacific Cultural Competencies* highlights similar concerns re standardisation:

> "There is the view that establishing cultural competency standards may run the risk of reducing complex cultural processes into simplistic formulas, which may underestimate and ritualise culture (Southwick 2001). In other words, standards imply normative behaviours within a defined group, but it must be understood that individual behaviours vary widely from these norms." (Tiatia, 2008, p.20)
>
> "Cultural competence does not suggest treating all members of a cultural group in the same way. Rather, it presumes that difference and diversity between and within groups are valued, and acknowledges a positive integration of diversity, difference and multiculturalism within a system of care. Universals and normative standards that reference 'the average person' are avoided." (Tiatia, 2008, p.13)
>
> "It is evident that cultural competence involves a dynamic interplay among socioeconomic status, ethnicity and language – an interplay that definitions and interpretations of the term do not always acknowledge (Zambrana et al 2004)." (Tiatia, 2008, p.22)

Other issues

Stevahn et al also identify a range of issues, partly touched on in earlier sections:

- validation and acceptance by the evaluation community and other stakeholders
- development of a crosswalk comparison with standards, principles, ethics and guidelines valued in Aotearoa NZ

  The CES Three Pillars exercise (refer Section 1.2 of the *Summary Tables*) notes developing a crosswalk is an important "part of the validation process and providing confidence that the competencies are comprehensive and address the requirements of the other key pillars – standards, ethics" etc.
- use of single descriptors for each competency (unless inseparable concepts)
- development of shared understanding of terms and consistency in meaning
- construction of descriptive rubrics for assessing competency

Cultural imperatives potentially underpinning the development of evaluator competencies in Aotearoa New Zealand

Treaty of Waitangi, demographics, marginalisation, evaluation's role in improving policy outcomes, small size of Aotearoa New Zealand

The Te Puni Kokiri Guidelines state that "Māori are an important priority to examine in any evaluation because of the Treaty of Waitangi, the Government's strategic priorities for Māori, and their status as a 'target group'" (*Evaluation for Maori: Guidelines for Government Agencies*, 1999, p.10).

Both the literature review of *Pacific Cultural Competencies* in the health sector and Stafford Hood et al speak of the changing demographics and the position of marginalised groups:

> "Rapidly changing demographics in the United States and the world make our efforts at once daunting and inescapable. We must not continue to dodge the issue of cultural competence …" (Hood et al., 2005, p.2)
>
> "Culturally competent attitudes and aptitudes are critical for all marginalised sub-groups, whether gender groups (male, female, trans-gender, fa'afafine); age groups (elderly, adolescent, children); sexual-preference groups (gay, heterosexual, lesbian, bisexual); place of birth (island-born or raised, New Zealand-born or raised, and multi-ethnic); people with disabilities; or religious groups." (Tiatia, 2008, p.vii)

Evaluation in the government and community sectors is often about informing policy and programmes that aim to achieve better outcomes for people, particularly those who are not achieving good social, educational, health, and economic outcomes. As such, it is then imperative that evaluation has the competency and cultural competency to assess whether these policies and programmes are actually achieving better outcomes for those who are marginalised and/or achieving poorer outcomes than the rest of the Aotearoa NZ population.

And:

> "Kiwi evaluators work in a small market where there's a practical limit to how specialised a niche you can carve out for yourself. This is true in all aspects of life, not just evaluation. We have to be able to turn our hand to a wider range of projects, work in a more diverse range of content areas and contexts, and take a decent-sized kete [flax woven basket or kit] full of tools with us to make all that work. The smaller your kete, the tougher things will be in the current economic climate because your repertoire is smaller." (Personal communication from Jane Davidson, October 2009)

References

The following references are those that were specifically drawn on for quotes in *Section one: Synthesis*. A full list of those references informing this work is provided at the end of the document.

Davidson, J. (2009). Personnel communication with author.

Davidson, J. (2006). Personnel communication with Michael Scriven on 'The real evaluation competencies'.

European Evaluation Society Questionnaire about evaluation competencies.

Evaluation for Maori: Guidelines for Government Agencies. (1999). Te Puni Kokiri.

Gomes, A., & Daly, C. (2004). *What do you need to do to be a highly effective social science evaluator?* Paper presented at the Australasian Evaluation Society International Conference, Adelaide, South Australia.

Hood, S. (2008). The Role of Culture and Cultural Context in Evaluation: Continuing thoughts on Culturally Responsive Evaluation. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education Seminar.

Hood, S., Hopson, R., & Frierson, H. (2005). Introduction: This is Where We Stand. In S. Hood, R. Hopson & H. Frierson (Eds.), *The Role of Culture and Cultural Context: A Mandate for Inclusion, the Discovery of Truth, and Understanding in Evaluative Theory and Practice* (pp. 1-5). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

Jakob-Hoff, M., & Coggan, C. (2003). Core competencies for evaluators. In N. Lunt, C. Davidson & K. McKegg (Eds.), *Evaluating Policy and Practice: A New Zealand Reader* (pp. 132-137). Auckland: Pearson Education New Zealand Limited.

SenGupta, S., Hopson, R., & Thompson-Robinson, M. (2004). Cultural Competence in Evaluation: An Overview. *New Directions for Evaluation*(102), 5-19.

Stevahn, L., King, J. A., Ghere, G., & Minnema, J. (2005). Establishing Essential Competencies for Program Evaluators. *American Journal of Evaluation, 26*, 43-59.

Thomas, D. R. (2007). *Client views about cultural competence in primary health care encounters*. Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland.

The Three Pillars: Standards, Ethics and Competencies. (2008). Canadian Evaluation Society.

Tiatia, J. (2008). *Pacific Cultural Competencies: A literature review*: Ministry of Health.

Section two: Competencies

Thinking informing the development of competency approaches

Aotearoa New Zealand

Jakob-Hoff, M., & Coggan, C. (2003). **Core competencies for evaluators**. In N. Lunt, C. Davidson & K. McKegg (Eds.), *Evaluating Policy and Practice: A New Zealand Reader* (pp. 132-137). Auckland: Pearson Education New Zealand Limited.	
What is this document about?	Maggie and Carolyn build on the competency work developed by AES's Training and Professional Development sub-committee in consultation with regional groups in 1995, and present a competency model outlining generic (i.e. not unique to evaluation) and evaluation-specific competencies (refer section 2.3 for detail of both models).
What are the key terms and definitions around competence, competency and practice standards for evaluators?	"The term competencies has been used to reflect the range of skills, experience and attributes necessary for evaluators. Competencies cover both the 'what' and 'how' of evaluation. … Skills cover the things that evaluators need to be able to do whereas knowledge covers what the evaluators need to know." (p.132)
What are the key issues in designating and reviewing evaluator competence?	They identify five assumptions informing their model: ▪ Evaluation is "a unique discipline that has borrowed many skills and much knowledge from a range of other disciplines. ▪ … a core set of competencies (skills and knowledge) does exist for evaluators. ▪ … generic evaluation skills are more important than in-depth knowledge about the area to be evaluated as arrangements can be made to acquire the in-depth knowledge. ▪ … evaluators must be capable of being responsive to the needs of their clients. ▪ … evaluators must bring a sensitivity to their work on issues such as ethnicity, race, gender, age, social class and disability." (p.132-133)

Gomes, A., & Daly, C. (2004). ***What do you need to do to be a highly effective social science evaluator?*** Paper presented at the Australasian Evaluation Society International Conference, Adelaide, South Australia.	
What is this document about?	"The … paper reports on an approach … shifting the focus of the debate from the question of 'what skills, knowledge and abilities do evaluators need?' to 'what are the characteristics of evaluators who are regarded as highly effective?'. …

	The questions underpinning the inquiry reported in this paper were developed from the perspective of a New Zealand government agency, acting both as a practitioner and sponsor of social science evaluation. … The goal of the exercise was to identify and define a set of competencies and indicators that could be used for capability development purposes, by employers as well as evaluation training providers to improve capability in the field." (p.3)
Process as described in the following paper (page refs refer to following paper unless stated otherwise): *Draft Core competencies for Highly Effective Research & Evaluation Analysts and Senior Analysts, Prepared for the Family, Child, Youth & Community Research & Evaluation Unit, Centre for Social Research & Evaluation, Ministry of Social Development by Chris Daly of PS… Services, July 2004.)* Example in Appendix one is copied from the above paper.	The competencies were developed from interviews with "ten key informants with long-serving experience in evaluation, both as practitioners and sponsors of evaluation" (p.4 of Gomes and Daly paper), and other sources of information. They are presented as (copied from p.2): • A definition of the stated competency, and the types of behaviours the competency includes *(refer section 2.3)* • For each type of behaviour, examples of the behaviours that might be expected of a *highly effective* analyst or senior analyst • Examples of indicators of competency, that would assist someone to recognise the competency in the behaviours and conduct of the analyst, and • Examples of the types of activities, training or other means of developing competency in the particular area. The author noted that (copied from p.2): • These competencies and their definitions will not be comprehensive, nor have they been robustly validated • It is possible that they encompass more than one "competency" within one definition (although competencies for these roles are often interdependent) • They establish a high standard, as they have been framed as those competencies required to be *highly effective* or *exceptionally successful* analysts or senior analysts. • They are to be considered as indicative, rather than conclusive.
Areas of competency	" … the following six generic competencies (in ranked order of averaged importance to interviewees) applying to highly effective evaluators, regardless of their technical orientation or field of practice, emerged [as follows – more detail in section 2.3, and Appendix one] (p. 4-5 of Gomes and Daly paper):

	1. Critical thinking, analysis and problem-solving *The ability and desire to assimilate, synthesise and evaluate complex information, form appropriate judgements about its quality, and apply the knowledge gained to the problem in focus.* 2. Technical expertise *The ability to demonstrate depth and breadth of knowledge and skill in applying research and evaluation methodologies.* 3. Communication skills *The ability to express and convey information effectively to other people.* 4. Socio-political awareness and sector knowledge *The ability and desire to understand issues arising in the wider socio-political environment and social sector, and the implications of these for one's work.* 5. Customer focus and relationship management *The ability and desire to remain focused on what the customers and stakeholders need from research and evaluation outputs, and develop collaborative relationships with them* 6. Team-working *The ability and desire to and work collaboratively and co-operatively to enhance achievements and attain goals.*

Davidson, E. J. (2006). **Needs assessment excerpt from an evaluation completed for ERO of the PGDE**.	
What is this document about?	As part of the groundwork for evaluating Massey's PGDE for ERO, this NA draws on various sources including: 1. ERO's list of Review Officer Performance Competencies 2. Key stakeholder interviews to identify competencies that most clearly distinguished outstanding reviewers from those who struggled with some aspects of the job 3. Existing international work on evaluation competencies 4. Information about courses typically included in post-graduate evaluation programmes internationally
What are the range of evaluator competencies and cultural competencies (skills, knowledge and	Key needed competencies were classified in terms of the ERO list of reviewer competencies: 1. Analysis and Judgement 2. Professional Knowledge 3. Relationships and Communication However, several others were also identified that did not

Davidson, E. J. (2006). **Needs assessment excerpt from an evaluation completed for ERO of the PGDE**.	
dispositions) that have been / are being written about and used locally and internationally?	fall under any of the ERO list categories, including: • Putting aside strong positive or negative reactions (e.g. to an obnoxious principal) and still evaluate fairly • Understanding school/kura and educational organisations' context and content
Are there some competencies that are more essential than others?	Yes – the ones identified as most important were the ones that were seen to "make or break" the quality and value of a review. Many of the big ones fell under *Analysis and Judgement*: • Seeing the 'big picture'; knowing what's important information and what's not; not getting lost in the details/trivia • Suspending judgment – checking and cross-checking, examining assumptions • Systematic weighting and synthesis of findings to form sound conclusions • Qualitative and quantitative analysis tools & methods • Critical thinking and rigorous reflection; recognising one's own subjectivity • Bias control; rigour; applying the knowledge and skills without fear or favour • Making the evaluation truly evaluative, not just descriptive (i.e. validly going from the 'what's so' to the 'so what') • Clearly understanding the role of the evaluator (e.g. providing ideas/options for improvement rather than very prescriptive instructions)

International

United States of America

Competency Assessment document from the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. in Evaluation (IDPE) at Western Michigan University (WMU) – about 2003. Summary prepared by Jane Davidson.	
What is this document about?	Competency assessment for students starting and progressing through WMU's interdisciplinary Ph.D. in Evaluation. Used to determine whether the student has met competency requirements for advancement to candidacy (i.e. green light to start doctoral dissertation). Competencies were based in part on a needs assessment that included employers and doctoral-level graduates

Competency Assessment document from the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. in Evaluation (IDPE) at Western Michigan University (WMU) – about 2003. Summary prepared by Jane Davidson.	
	working in evaluation.
What are the range of evaluator competencies and cultural competencies (skills, knowledge and dispositions) that have been / are being written about and used locally and internationally?	The competent evaluator's toolkit and knowledge base consists of three interrelated parts: • a solid grounding in research design and methodology (both qualitative and quantitative); • content knowledge and skills pertaining to a particular area of specialization (cognate area); and • a range of evaluation competencies that includes evaluation theory; evaluation-specific methodology; understanding of social, political and cultural context; critical thinking; interpersonal and consulting skills; other evaluation know-how
What does the literature say about different levels (e.g., emergent, novice, experienced, expert) of competence and practice?	0 = Not yet familiar with this concept or skill, or only vaguely recognizes it 1 = Can *recognize* and *recall* key principles, but has not yet developed a solid understanding 2 = Can demonstrate a solid *understanding* by *explaining* the concept clearly and concisely 3 = Demonstrated ability to *apply* the concept competently in practice and/or* (depending on the item) critically but fairly *evaluate* the application of this concept or skill, including whether or not its application is appropriate in a given situation In order to advance to candidacy, each student must have a rating of 3 on all research methods and evaluation competencies <u>and</u> specialized knowledge of one or more types of evaluand (objects of evaluation) and/or evaluation setting, to a level that is at least equivalent to that of a *strong* Master's program graduate in that area. Specifics illustrate what a candidate should be able to do in order to attain a 3 rating on each competency. Example: "<u>Social, Political, and Cultural Context of Evaluation</u>: Students must demonstrate the ability to conduct effective stakeholder analysis; work effectively with diverse or indigenous groups and/or in international settings; and address issues related to both the psychology and the politics of evaluation. In addition, they should be able to critique evaluations with respect to each of [these]."

Stevahn, L., King, J. A., Ghere, G., & Minnema, J. (2005). **Establishing Essential Competencies for Program Evaluators**. *American Journal of Evaluation, 26*, 43-59.	
What is this document about?	**Abstract: "**This article presents a comprehensive taxonomy of essential competencies for program evaluators. First, the authors provide a rationale for developing evaluator competencies, along with a brief history of the initial development and validation of the taxonomy of essential evaluator competencies in King, Stevahn, Ghere, and Minnema (2001). Second, they present a revised version of that taxonomy and describe the revision process. Third, a crosswalk accompanying the taxonomy indicates which competencies address standards, principles, and skills endorsed by major evaluation associations in North America. Finally, the authors identify future needs related to the taxonomy, including the need for validation research, a shared understanding of terms, and the construction of descriptive rubrics for assessing competence." (p.43)
How could it assist the anzea project?	Provides a methodology for establishing and seeking "broad validation and widespread endorsement by" (p.55) evaluation professionals (need to go to article for this detail). Also provides a brief background to the (slow) evolution of competencies in the US evaluation field and rationale for developing competencies (p.44-45) which could be useful when pulling together material for consultation with the anzea membership (and others).
Rationale for developing competencies – in part addressing *What are the key issues in the field of evaluation that may affect the ongoing development of evaluation competencies?*	After 30 or so years of discussion, one may well ask, "If competencies are the solution, what exactly is the problem?" Put another way, are there consequences of *not* having established competencies for program evaluators? …. Building in part on these negatives, we believe that an affirmative rationale for evaluator competencies exists as well. To our way of thinking, the field would benefit from evaluator competencies in four primary ways: (a) improved training, (b) enhanced reflective practice, (c) the advancement of research on evaluation, and (d) the potential for continued professionalization of the field." (p. 44-45) The authors discuss each of these four benefits in detail (refer p. 45-47).
What are the key terms and definitions around competence, competency and practice standards for evaluators?	"… *evaluation standards* provide guidance for making decisions when conducting program, evaluation studies, *evaluator competencies …* specify the knowledge, skills, and dispositions central to effectively accomplishing those standards have the potential to further increase the effectiveness of evaluation efforts." (p.57) "Before elaborating in the following sections how we addressed each need listed above, we wish to note that there is no generally

Stevahn, L., King, J. A., Ghere, G., & Minnema, J. (2005). **Establishing Essential Competencies for Program Evaluators**. *American Journal of Evaluation, 26*, 43-59.	
What are the key issues in designating and reviewing evaluator competence?	accepted definition for *competencies* (Rychen, 2001), nor agreement on how to write them. The term *competencies* is derived from the term *competence*, which in the world of work signifies that a person has reached some level of expertise with the multifaceted abilities needed to be successful in any given field. Different frames of reference, however, influence how competencies are conceived and operationalized (Weinert, 2001). In education, for example, some consider competencies to include specialized skills and knowledge, whereas others also include attitudes or dispositions (Blanton, 1992; Gettinger, Stoiber, Goetz, & Caspe, 1999). Despite a lack of agreement, most competency taxonomies focus on "complex action systems that encompass not only knowledge and skills, but also strategies and routines for appropriately applying these knowledge and skills, as well as appropriate emotions and attitudes and the effective self-regulation of these competencies" (Rychen, 2001, p. 8). Accordingly, we chose to use a competency framework that includes the knowledge, skills, and dispositions program evaluators need to be effective as professionals. We also chose to write the competencies in behavioral language (to the extent possible), describing "the things you can see or hear being done" (Green, 1999, p. 7). As such, the competencies predominantly describe various activities that evaluators carry out to achieve standards that constitute sound evaluations (e.g., *The Program Evaluation Standards*; Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1994). It is important to note, however, that using *behavioral language* is not the same as taking a *behavioral approach* to developing competencies, the latter of which tends to task analyze competencies into discrete behaviors rather than considering whole, functional outcomes (McAllister, 1998)." (p.48)
What is the range of evaluator competencies (skills, knowledge and dispositions) that have been / are being written about internationally?	Stevahn et al use six competency categories: (a) professional practice, (b) systematic inquiry, (c) situational analysis, (d) project management, (e) reflective practice, and (f) interpersonal competence. The detail for these is provided in section 2.4.
What are the key issues in designating and reviewing	<u>Need for a crosswalk comparison</u> – "Any comprehensive taxonomy of evaluator competencies certainly should specify what evaluators need to effectively meet standards, adhere to

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Stevahn, L., King, J. A., Ghere, G., & Minnema, J. (2005). Establishing Essential Competencies for Program Evaluators. American Journal of Evaluation, 26, 43-59.</td></tr>
<tr><td>evaluator competence?

What are the key issues in the field of evaluation that may affect the ongoing development of evaluation competencies?</td><td>principles, or apply guidelines endorsed by professional evaluation associations." (p.52) Stevahn et al outline the steps and decision rules they used to do this and how this exercise proved useful (refer p.53).

<u>Need for precision within each competency</u> – "An item that incorporates multiple descriptors may jeopardize future usefulness of the taxonomy as a tool for self-assessment given that an evaluator may possess different levels of proficiency on each descriptor within that item … [For example, [an] item … in the original taxonomy incorporated three descriptors, referring to competence in quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods.] In some cases, however, we maintained multiple descriptors within one competency because of the close and somewhat inseparable nature of the descriptor. … For example … [e]thical behavior, integrity, and honesty are so intertwined that it seemed most prudent to incorporate all of those descriptors in one competency, rather than listing each separately." (p.54-55)

<u>Long-term endeavour, validation of competencies and definition of terms</u> – "We believe that the ultimate aim of any useful comprehensive taxonomy of program evaluator competencies should be its broad validation and widespread endorsement by professionals in the field. Realistically, this involves a long-term endeavor. Various steps in the process include reviewing the program evaluation literature, formulating initial taxonomies that can merge into one, establishing face validity, seeking diverse input for revision, determining validation strategies, exploring validation in different geographic regions or specific sectors of practice, pursuing widespread validation across the entire field of professional practice, revisiting and refining any agreed-upon taxonomy in light of new developments within the field, and so on." (p.55-56) " … systematically conduct a comprehensive validation study to determine the extent to which program evaluators across the entire field can reach consensus on the importance of a set of essential competencies for professional practice. Doing so will require including a broad representative sample of evaluators in the validation process who represent diverse evaluation roles, orientations, and interests …. It also will require defining terms to promote consistency in meaning and shared understanding." (p.56)

<u>Rubrics</u> – " … construct descriptive rubrics for the essential evaluator competencies that specify various levels of performance proficiency. Most immediately, such a tool would</td></tr>
</table>

Stevahn, L., King, J. A., Ghere, G., & Minnema, J. (2005). **Establishing Essential Competencies for Program Evaluators**. *American Journal of Evaluation, 26*, 43-59.	
	prove useful for self-assessing one's own skills as an evaluator, thereby also illuminating areas for professional development. In addition, such rubrics could immediately be applied in program evaluation training programs to evaluate formative progress or summative achievement. Finally, in the long term, rubrics would be useful in any future credentialing or licensing effort that may be pursued by specific organizations or by the field at large. " (p.56-57)

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Wingate, L. A. (2005). **A Self-Assessment Procedure for Use in Evaluation Training**. *American Journal of Evaluation, 26*, 544-561.	
What is this document about?	**Abstract: "**This article describes the Self-Assessment of Program Evaluation Expertise instrument and procedure developed to help participants assess their learning gains in a 3-week evaluation institute. Participants completed the instrument in a pre- and posttest format. To reduce both the threat of embarrassment from individual results and the temptation to inflate self-ratings, participants responded anonymously. Although each participant saw her or his individual results, only aggregated results were reported to the total group. The article reports on the self-assessment results of a group of recognized evaluation elders and participants in six annual evaluation institutes. The findings indicate that the instrument is sensitive to the respondents' changed perceptions of competency following instruction. Strengths and limitations associated with the procedure are discussed. The procedure is presented as a work in progress and could benefit from adaptation, research, and development. The instrument is available at http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/ess/selfassess.html." (p/544)
Brief description of instrument	"The finalized instrument comprises 77 items divided into eight content areas that correspond to the eight competency areas based on participants' reported needs and institute goals. The eight sections of the instrument are as follows: 1. "Standards/Metaevaluation": This section includes 6 items that address knowledge of metaevaluation, the American Evaluation Association's Guiding Principles, and the program and personnel evaluation standards by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. 2. "Evaluation Approaches and Models": This section has 8 items that address skill in applying various evaluation approaches and

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Wingate, L. A. (2005). **A Self-Assessment Procedure for Use in Evaluation Training**. *American Journal of Evaluation, 26*, 544-561.	
	models (e.g., utlization-focused; context, input, process, product (CIPP); responsive; consumer-oriented; participatory; program theory–based). 3. "Evaluation of Particular Areas": This section has 12 items that address skill in evaluating various things, such as curricular programs, instructional materials, policies, technology, distance education, and community development programs. 4. "Designing Evaluations": This section includes 9 items that address various aspects of evaluation design, such as stakeholder involvement, contracting, staffing, budgeting, scheduling, and data collection. 5. "Evaluation Methods and Techniques": This section has 23 items that deal with a variety of skills, such as constructing instruments, developing performance measures, sampling, conducting interviews, conducting needs assessments, and analyzing information. 6. "Providing Evaluation Training": This section has 6 items related to the provision of evaluation training, such as using a needs assessment to define training objectives, the ability to use presentation software, and using simulations. 7. "Professional Development": This section includes 7 items about professional development in evaluation, including one's familiarity with the major evaluation journals, book series, and organizations; knowledge of the history of evaluation; and level of experience in evaluation and metaevaluation. 8. "Developing a View of Evaluation": The final section has 8 items that address one's overall concept of evaluation, such as definition, main questions, audiences, and standards." (p.548) "For each item, a specific topic is identified, and four response options are offered in the form of an ordinal scale with defined anchors. To illustrate: Item 1.3 …. I have a working knowledge of the Joint Committee Program Evaluation Standards. _ (1) Not at all _ (2) I have only a general knowledge of their main requirements. _ (3) I have used or could use these standards to plan and/or judge evaluation studies. _ (4) I have taught or could teach others to apply these standards to plan and/or judge evaluation studies." (p.549) Use of the instrument translates into proficiency scores for each of the 8 knowledge and skill areas, i.e. strong, moderate, low or no

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Wingate, L. A. (2005). **A Self-Assessment Procedure for Use in Evaluation Training**. *American Journal of Evaluation, 26*, 544-561.	
	proficiency.
How could it assist the anzea project?	Not sure. It provides information on skill and knowledge areas deemed important, however the instrument was designed for a specific use, with groups of evaluators working in a common area, and is focused on eight 'needed' instruction areas identified by an early group of students. The authors note "we are sharing the instrument as an example of how one might approach the task of self-assessment of evaluation expertise …" (p.548).

Scriven, M. **The real evaluation competencies.** Personal communication with Jane Davidson, 2006; also posted to EVAL-WMU listserv but archives no longer available	
What is this document about?	A reasonably recent list from Michael of very evaluation-specific tools <u>not</u> found in the repertoire of someone with solid training in applied social sciences. Scriven argues that these additional tools are essential for getting from 'what's so' (descriptive findings) to 'so what' (evaluative conclusions).
What are the key terms and definitions around competence, competency and practice standards for evaluators?	Scriven starts not with the definition of "competency" but the definition of "evaluation." He is of the view that most of the evaluator competency lists are incomplete – they lack the fundamental evaluation-specific competencies that are absolutely essential for being able to do what evaluation actually is, i.e. to ask and answer truly evaluative questions. This list of competencies is related to his "Something More List".
What are the range of evaluator competencies and cultural competencies (skills, knowledge and dispositions) that have been / are being written about and used locally and internationally?	<u>Conceptualizing tools, e.g.</u> • Evaluation-specific logic and methodology • Thorough knowledge of views, approaches and theories of evaluation. • Cross-cultural considerations, HSIRB considerations. <u>Investigating tools</u> • Full range of evaluation-specific methodology, including needs assessment, cost analysis, ethical analysis, determination of evaluative (not just statistical) significance, 'hard core qualitative methods' and synthesis methodology. • General design issues in evaluative investigations. • Side-effect searching, goal-free methodology. • Cultural barriers, excess evaluation anxiety and how to minimize it; appreciative inquiry.

Scriven, M. **The real evaluation competencies.** Personal communication with Jane Davidson, 2006; also posted to EVAL-WMU listserv but archives no longer available	
	Reporting tools • Matching the medium to the message and the audience. • Graphical writing, rich description, use and abuse of examples and case studies. • Illustrating via graphing, drawing, film. • Editing, draft-sharing and its problems, negotiating publication rights, etc.
Are there some competencies that are more essential than others?	The evaluation-specific competencies are so central to the core of what evaluation is – this makes them more important than many of the others (such as research methods) that can often be outsourced. [Not explicit in article, so am checking on this via email with Scriven.]

Canadian Evaluation Society (CES)

Canadian Evaluation Society National Council Professional Designation Project Plan: 'Work in Progress', Version 9: November 22, 2007, Professional Designation Core Committee	
What is this document about?	Project plan for pursuing "a system of professional designations for evaluation in Canada" (p.1). Outlines the project definition and scope, approach, authority and structure (incl ToRs for sub-committees), activities and tasks, costs, workplan and timelines, monitoring and evaluation of the project, and a logic model.
How could it assist the anzea project?	Provide guide to project planning involved if such a process is adopted by anzea.
Background and rationale for project	CES National Council voted in Aug 2007 to proceed with project, "following extensive consultation with Members" (p.1). CES credentialing evaluators is a response to issues of "**visibility, profile and credibility**" (p.1) and "evaluation reports and evaluation functions in departments of federal and provincial governments … [being] reported to be of **less than satisfactory quality**" (p.1). Paper lists number of factors contributing to this finding, including "**entrance requirements being essentially non-existent**" (p.1). Notes that "within literature and practice, questions and propositions are formulated and aimed at **clarifying the nature of evaluation and the core skills necessary to carry out a credible evalution**" (p.1) Concern that "if CES does not take control of its own field of expertise, it is possible that **other professionals** (such as management consultants, management accountants and internal auditors) **will "fill the vaccum""** (p.2). Project adopted the following fundamental principles to guide

Canadian Evaluation Society National Council Professional Designation Project Plan: 'Work in Progress', Version 9: November 22, 2007, Professional Designation Core Committee	
	work planning: inclusiveness, partnering, utility, feasibility, transparency.
Concerns regarding professional designation	Expensiveness of project for, and limited volunteer and financial resources of professional organisation; difficulties reaching agreement on core competencies; increased barriers to entry to evaluation work; resistance by those objecting to a gate-keeper role to entry to profession; no guarantee that credentialing will improve quality (if this is the issue); questionable 'success' in other professional organisations; diversity and multi-disciplinary nature of evaluation will be harmed by standardisation.
Costs	Two critical cost elements: ▪ costs of undertaking the project (including development and implementation of system), and ▪ costs of sustaining a system of credentialing. Also: ▪ explicit costs ▪ opportunity costs (time and money spent on professional designation represents loss of other uses of that time and money) ▪ implicit costs (e.g. volunteer burnout, member concerns, dissatisfaction with over-emphasis on one aspect of professional organisation)

Seeking CES Members Input on Competencies for Canadian Evaluation Practice	
What is this document about?	Three pager seeking CES membership input on the proposed *Competencies for Canadian Evaluation Practice* which, if accepted by the CES membership, are to "be used as a basis to develop evaluation credentials" (p.1). Doc provides outline of proposed competencies and reference to fuller crosswalk doc (see below), definitions of terms used, notes the work informing the development of the competencies, and provides link to the 'three pillars of professional designations' for checking fit of competencies with standards and ethics. Feedback sought by April 2008 via short survey of 6 questions http://evaluationcanada.ca/txt/three_pillars.pdf
How could it assist the anzea project?	Provides an example (albeit dense 3-pager) of an approach to consulting with membership. Survey questions may be useful.

Professional Designation Project: THE THREE PILLARS: STANDARDS, ETHICS AND COMPETENCIES, Professional Designation Core Committee – March 12, 2008	
What is this document about?	Provides a table showing the "crosscutting and overlapping nature" of the three important aspects to "the development of a system for credentialed evaluators in Canada": standards, ethics and competencies (p.1). The standards used are the *Joint Committee Program Evaluation Standards* (Utility, Feasibility, Propriety and Accuracy), the ethics the CES Guidelines for Ethical Conduct (Competence, Accountability, Integrity), and the competencies proposed for Canadian evaluation practice (Reflective Practice, Technical Practice, Situational Practice, Management Practice, Interpersonal Practice). These five competency headings subsequently change in the development of the Crosswalk (refer below). More information on the proposed competencies is provided in the following section 2.4.
Definitions (p.1)	**Standards** "define for the practitioner the acceptable characteristics of evaluation *products and services*". **Competencies** "are the skills, knowledge and abilities required in a *person practicing* evaluation". **Ethics** "provide an umbrella, under which the competencies are applied and products produced".
Observations by Committee as result of this exercise	" … the proposed competencies provide the requisite coverage of the standards. We can say that persons with these competencies can produce an acceptable evaluation product. We also observe that the *application of evaluative thinking and evaluation competencies to organizational and program measurement challenges*, is not well represented in the standards. The trend for evaluation practice to play a role in the design and monitoring of programs is perhaps more recent and needs to be considered in future reviews of the standards" (p.1)

CROSSWALK OF EVALUATOR COMPETENCIES – VERSION 10, Prepared for discussion within the CES Professional Designation Project – March 12, 2008	
What is this document about?	It is a matrix which presents the potential competencies for Canadian evaluators (which builds on the taxonomy developed by Stevahn, King, Ghere and Minnema 2005 – summarised later) and aligns them with the following:

CROSSWALK OF EVALUATOR COMPETENCIES – VERSION 10, Prepared for discussion within the CES Professional Designation Project – March 12, 2008	
	▪ CES Essential Skills Series (ESS – which contains the skills and knowledge CES deems important to evaluation) ▪ CES Core Body of Knowledge (CBK) research projects ▪ Treasury Board Secretariat Competencies for Evaluators in the Government of Canada (as a major employer and purchaser of evaluation) ▪ Joint Committee Program Evaluation Standards (now being considered by CES National Council for adoption in Canada) ▪ American Evaluation Association's Guidelines, and ▪ United Nations Competencies for Evaluators in the United Nations System (to provide a broader international perspective). The list of proposed competencies is presented in section 2.4.
Purpose and process	The purpose of "undertaking a "cross-walk" (cross referencing with the goal of determining points of overlap and difference) of different extant knowledge bases [is] to develop a comprehensive list of evaluator competencies" (p.1). They "are in the process of consulting the original authors of all of the works referenced in the crosswalk to ensure agreement in the placement of the competencies in the crosswalk based on their intent" (p.1).
Observations by Committee as result of this exercise	"The Crosswalk of Program Evaluator Competencies further validates the work of Stevahn et al (2005) as comprehensive by showing these current and additional alignments. There are areas where ESS and CBK – the Canadian knowledge base, presents more detail, such as competencies that focus on technical aspects of evaluation practice (design, data collection, analysis, interpretation, and reporting). In contrast, Stevahn et al (2005)'s crosswalk omitted activities common to both research and evaluation, as well as, evaluation activities or particular types of studies (premised on the approach that evaluations should be designed to address questions and issues). This exercise allowed us to identify gaps and overlaps, and most importantly, we see the Crosswalk as validating and providing sufficient confidence in our existing knowledge base to proceed with the development of Competencies for Canadian Evaluation Practice." (p.1)

European Evaluation Society (EES)

EES Questionnaire about evaluation competencies (date unknown)

EES Questionnaire about evaluation competencies (date unknown)	
What is this document about?	Questionnaire seeking EES members input on a competency initiative. Attachments briefly address the background, rationale, risks, scope in a paper titled "Towards a Competencies Framework for Evaluation in Europe?"; recent and on-going work on evaluation competencies in Canada and Germany; and the professional designation debate. European-wide initiative on evaluation competencies and standards launched at 2008 EES conference in Lisbon. Survey first step.
How could it assist the anzea project?	Provides an example questionnaire for exploring priority members assign to developing competencies, what members see as the potential benefits and risks, levels competencies should address (e.g. junior, evaluator, senior; self-evaluators, managers, commissioners), use of a single or multiple framework, and feedback on structure, content and 'critical-ness' (and for whom) of proposed list. (Refer section 2.4 for EES list). Provides useful, brief summaries of the risks re the development of competencies and debates regarding professional designation, if anzea is looking to develop such materials.
EES approach	" … EES proposes to use a validation process grounded in principled deliberations, realistic design and regular updating. Any agreed core competencies framework would be voluntary, readily adaptable to diverse usages and backed up by appropriate safeguards. … The broad outline of competencies … is composed of competencies that relate to (i) evaluation knowledge; (ii) professional practice; and (iii) dispositions and attitudes. … a responsive evaluation competencies framework distinguishes between the generic competencies that are shared with other professions and those that are specific to evaluation." (p.9) "An EES competencies framework would be used on a voluntary basis by evaluators, commissioners and training providers. Its adoption would not signify any intent to promote an exclusive or compulsory designation, licensing or certification or even a credentialing regime for European evaluators." (p.14)
What are the key terms and definitions around competence, competency and practice standards for evaluators?	"Competencies connote the abilities, skills, capacities or qualifications to handle a task, fulfill a function or deliver a service: to be competent is to be fit for purpose. The terms competency and competence are normally considered to be equivalent but for some authors the two concepts differ in the sense that competency is the way in which a state of competence is demonstrated. Just as form follows function in architecture,

EES Questionnaire about evaluation competencies (date unknown)	
What are the key issues in designating and reviewing evaluator competence?	competency follows purpose in the world of work. … in order to achieve results evaluation competencies (the "who") must be complemented by quality standards (the "what") implemented in line with agreed ethical standards (the "how") within a suitable institutional environment (the "where")." (p.7) " … a universal set of competency criteria involves risks. They may have unintended impacts if designed and used in a mechanistic, reductionist or simplistic fashion. (p.8) … They must … be applied with care, flexibility and understanding." (p.7) "There is little doubt that agreed competencies are hard to define and reach agreement on. If rigidly defined, they may inhibit adaptation to diverse contexts. They may also raise unrealistic expectations regarding the feasibility of achieving results from evaluation activities by diverting the spotlight away from inadequacies in commissioning or management. Too demanding a framework may create unreasonable barriers to entry in the profession. Too loose a framework may offer misleading comfort to commissioners, employers, evaluators and other stakeholders. Too static a framework may hinder timely adaptation to new evaluation challenges." (p.9)
What are the key issues in designating and reviewing evaluator competence?	"**Recent and on-going work on evaluation competencies**: Most competency initiatives seek to capture the knowledge content, analytical rigor and presentational quality of products and the interpersonal behavior and leadership characteristics needed for effective evaluation delivery. Whereas input based approaches focus on evaluators' qualifications, the outcome based approach assesses competencies in terms of the results of evaluators' activities. The main advantage of the input based approach is its accessibility and simplicity. The main advantage of the output or outcome based approach is that it aims to make competencies "evaluable". On the other hand, threats to the validity of competencies as performance indicators arise when, as is frequently the case, evaluation outcomes are affected by the behaviors of other actors (commissioners; other stakeholders, etc.) and the characteristics of the enabling environment. Both the input based and outcome based competency frameworks interrogate capabilities in terms of disciplinary content as well as delivery, social interaction and/or management skills. Equally, both models consider theory as well

EES Questionnaire about evaluation competencies (date unknown)	
	as practice; knowledge as well as experience. Finally, both provide for competency assessments at different competency levels ranging from basic entry level requirements to higher order and/or specialized knowledge and skills. … The output based approach is illustrated by the Canadian Evaluation Society initiative. It is geared to a proposed certification scheme for Canadian evaluators and linked to a core body of knowledge qualifications for individuals tasked with the design and delivery of program evaluation products. Canada's approach to evaluation competencies focuses on quality assessments of practice in five categories: (i) reflective; (ii) technical; (iii) situational; (iv) managerial; and (v) interpersonal. Similarly, essential competencies for program evaluators have been codified in the United States to complement the guiding principles for evaluators endorsed by the American Evaluation Association. By contrast, in Europe, the German Evaluation Society (DeGEval) has designed generic, input based recommendations for education and training in evaluation. They outline five competency fields that evaluation education and training programs should cover: (i) theory and history of evaluation; (ii) methodological competencies; (iii) organizational and subject knowledge; (iv) social and personal competencies; and (v) evaluation practice. This approach is more input based than output based: it focuses on the content of education and training programs capable of generating the skills, knowledge and mastery needed to contribute to high quality work." (p.11-12)

United Kingdom

UK Evaluation Society Good Practice Guidelines (date unknown)	
What is this document about?	'Work-in-progress' guidelines (a list of statements) for four interest groups: evaluators, commissioners of evaluation, evaluation participants and those involved in self-evaluation (novice and experienced). E.g. "Evaluators need to: • *be explicit* about the purpose, methods, intended outputs and outcomes of the evaluation; be mindful of unanticipated effects and be responsive to shifts in purpose.

	• *alert commissioners* to possible adjustments to the evaluation approach and practice; be open to dialogue throughout the process informing them of progress and developments." (p.2)
Approach	"The guidelines aim at neutrality in the sense that they provide frameworks for action that does not exemplify any particular evaluation approach. This aim is complex, ambitious and important. There is no evaluation stance for which these guidelines are inappropriate or inapplicable. Many of the statements have at their heart the need to be open and transparent about the expectations and requirements of all the stakeholders ***whoever*** they may be. As such the language used has striven to avoid hidden or tacit assumptions about the efficacy, dominance or normality of any single approach to evaluation. The guidelines are prescriptive only in the sense that they rehearse what those engaged in the practical business of evaluation, from whatever perspective, have found to be both an honourable and effective way of interacting. We believe the guidance will come alive through use in the discussions and negotiations between people involved in evaluations. As such we hope the statements will promote conversation about evaluation in general but also support ways of negotiating some of the critical aspects of the evaluation process from commissioning to dissemination of evaluation findings. " (p.2)
How could it assist the anzea project?	Not sure, other than musing on the above two paras in Approach.

Examples of competencies

Aotearoa New Zealand

Core Competencies for Evaluators: Developed by the Training and Professional Development Committee (with Regional Groups) of the Australasian Evaluation Society, 1995 [Copied from Jakob-Hoff and Coggan reference]
1. Evaluation theory 1.1 An understanding of what evaluation is and its role 1.2 Current theoretical debates surrounding evaluation and the implication for practice 1.3 Organisational and management theory **2 Research methodology**

2.1 Research design types, including quantitative and qualitative

2.2 Data collection types and implications for each

2.3 Data analysis, synthesis, summation and/or interpretation

3 Management of projects and/or consultants

3.1 Ability to analyse and describe programmes and projects prior to evaluation

3.2 Project planning – sequence, time frames, resources

3.3 Negotiating skills

3.4 Contract management, problem clarification, statements of responsibilities, signing off tasks

4 Communication skills (written, visual, oral)

4.1 Presentation of evaluation plans

4.2 Communication with clients and stakeholders

4.3 Presentation of evaluation results

5 Mediation and facilitation

5.1 Mediation and facilitation skills

5.2 Conflict management skills

6 Change management

6.1 Working in the context of the culture of the organisation and its strategic aims

6.2 Understanding the implications of evaluation findings for stakeholders involved

6.3 Understanding constraints, opportunities for utilisation of results

6.4 Facilitation skills in the implementation of organisational changes in flowing from evaluation results

7 Ethics and standards

7.1 Understanding of, and commitment to, a code of ethics relating to professional conduct

7.2 Awareness and ability to apply the 'Evaluation Standards' in the planning, implementation, and reporting of evaluations

7.3 Conducting meta-evaluation

8 Familiarity with tools

8.1 Databases, word processors, spreadsheets

English, B. (2002). **Competencies for evaluation practitioners: Where to from here?** *Evaluation Journal of Australasia, 2*(2), 13-15.

Draft set of competencies developed to inform training and professional development. Web-based survey of membership conducted in Oct 2002 and reported on in above article. Full set of draft competencies no longer appears to be on AES website.

Draft competencies based on the following model of professional competence (p.13):

- Knowledge/Cognitive Competence – 'the possession of appropriate work-related knowledge and the ability to put this to effective use'
- Functional Competence – 'the ability to perform a range of work-based tasks effectively to produce specific outcomes'
- Personal/Behavioural Competence – 'the ability to adopt appropriate, observable behaviours in work-related situations'
- Values/Ethical Competence – 'the possession of appropriate personal values and the ability to make sound judgements based upon these in work-related situations'.

Jakob-Hoff, M., & Coggan, C. (2003). **Core competencies for evaluators**. In N. Lunt, C. Davidson & K. McKegg (Eds.), *Evaluating Policy and Practice: A New Zealand Reader* (pp. 132-137). Auckland: Pearson Education New Zealand Limited.

Maggie and Carolyn' model (detail describing each aspect is provided p. 133-136 of above book – first published in Evaluation News and Comment 1997):

Generic competencies

- Research skills
- Organisational / management theory
- Project management skills
- Ethical behaviour
- Communication skills
- Change skills

Specific competencies

- Understanding the role and purpose of evaluation
- Understanding of the current debates surrounding evaluation and the implications for practice
- Ability to make judgements based on information collected
- Ability to ensure maximum utilisation of evaluation findings
- Synthesis skills to combine the other competencies

Jakob-Hoff, M., & Coggan, C. (2003). **Core competencies for evaluators**. In N. Lunt, C. Davidson & K. McKegg (Eds.), *Evaluating Policy and Practice: A New Zealand Reader* (pp. 132-137). Auckland: Pearson Education New Zealand Limited.
▪ Intuition

Draft Core competencies for Highly Effective Research & Evaluation Analysts and Senior Analysts, Prepared for the Family, Child, Youth & Community Research & Evaluation Unit, Centre for Social Research & Evaluation, Ministry of Social Development by Chris Daly of PS… Services, July 2004.	
What is this document about?	Presents a summary of a set of research and evaluation competencies and indicators developed for analyst and senior analyst roles within the Family Child Youth and Community (FCYC) Research and Evaluation Unit that could "be used for capability development purposes within the Unit" (p.2). Background to the development explained in summary of Gomes and Daly's paper in section 2.1.

Competency 1: Critical thinking, analysis and problem-solving

Definition

The ability and desire to assimilate, synthesise and evaluate complex information, form appropriate judgments about its quality, and apply the knowledge gained to the problem in focus.

This includes:

- Intellectual curiosity
- Conceptual thinking
- Critical review and analytical thinking
- Self-critique and openness to learning
- Interpreting and drawing accurate inferences from data
- Forming judgments in determining what is important and relevant to the problem/issue
- Formulating appropriate courses of action.

Competency 2: Technical expertise

Definition

The ability to demonstrate depth and breadth of knowledge and skill in applying research and evaluation methodologies.

This includes:

- Having an in-depth knowledge and command of one or more research and

evaluation methodologies

- Having a good understanding of the principles and applications of a broad range of methodologies, including both quantitative and qualitative methods
- Designing, running, analysing and reporting on research and evaluation projects
- A willingness to learn and apply new skills and approaches.

Competency 3: Communication skills

Definition

The ability to express and convey information effectively to other people.

This includes:

- Attention to communications
- Oral and written communications
- Making presentations
- Interpersonal communications
- Persuading and influencing others.

Competency 4: Socio-political awareness and sector knowledge

Definition

The ability and desire to understand issues arising in the wider socio-political environment and social sector, and the implications of these for one's work.

This includes:

- An awareness of Government interests
- A good understanding of the social sector, and developing an authoritative expertise in one or more social policy areas
- An awareness of the policy development environment and the constraints it faces.

Competency 5: Customer focus and relationship management

Definition

The ability and desire to remain focused on what the customers and stakeholders need from research and evaluation outputs, and develop collaborative relationships with them

This includes:

- Understanding customer and stakeholder needs and interests
- Remaining focused on delivering services and information that meet those needs

Draft Core competencies for Highly Effective Research & Evaluation Analysts and Senior Analysts, Prepared for the Family, Child, Youth & Community Research & Evaluation Unit, Centre for Social Research & Evaluation, Ministry of Social Development by Chris Daly of PS… Services, July 2004.

- Building good working relationships and alliances (internally and externally)
- Engaging the support and commitment of stakeholders.

Competency 6: Teamworking

Definition

The ability and desire to and work collaboratively and co-operatively to enhance achievements and attain goals.

This includes:

- Supporting and encouraging other team members achieve the best that they can
- Taking an interest in what team members are doing
- Offering and seeking constructive advice
- Participation in peer review processes
- Respecting and able to take on board alternative points of view.
- Maintaining good relations with team members, resolving conflict appropriately and early
- Sharing skills, information and knowledge, to add value to one another.

Identifying evaluator competencies: Workshop facilitated by Pam Oliver and Tania Wolfgramm on behalf of anzea, anzea Conference 2008

What is this document about?	Provides a ranked list of competencies "seen as essential in the Aotearoa sociocultural context" (p.2) identified by a workshop of approx 30 participants held at the anzea Conference 2008. The list is a "summary of attributes, and not a detailed description or understanding of those attributes" (p.1).

The rating of 1-3 represents the approximate level of priority given to each competency area by the workshop participants.

PROFESSIONAL INTEGRITY, INCLUDING ETHICAL UNDERSTANDING AND CONDUCT [1]

These attributes, which were seen as essentially linked, were considered the foundation of good evaluation practice, and comprised the following knowledge, skills and attitudes:

 Passion for supporting people and communities through sound, high calibre evaluation practice

Identifying evaluator competencies: Workshop facilitated by Pam Oliver and Tania Wolfgramm on behalf of anzea, anzea Conference 2008

□ Awareness and acknowledgement of one's own limitations

□ Awareness and acknowledgement of others' reasonable constraints

□ Able to recognise and maintain personal and professional boundaries – one's own and others'

□ Open to new learning

□ Willing to stand up for one's beliefs

□ Commitment to high quality practice

□ Places quality before profit

□ Able to manage uncertainty

CULTURAL COMPETENCIES [1]

□ A real understanding of Te Tiriti o Waitangi as New Zealand's founding principles and active application of those principles in evaluation practice

□ Acknowledgement and understanding of cultural uniqueness and the importance of cultural sensitivity

□ Cultural inclusiveness

□ Knowledge of tikanga and how to work and behave in various Mäori contexts

□ Ability to behave respectfully in cultural contexts that one is not yet familiar in

ANALYTICAL/CRITICAL THINKING [2]

□ The ability to analyse information presented in a range of ways and contexts, including qualitative and quantitative data, observations, meetings, discussions and images

□ Sensitivity to what is not being said, as well as what is

□ An inquiring mind

□ Innovative and creative; lateral thinker

□ Logical thinking combined with ability to see 'the big picture'

INTEGRATION AND FACILITATION SKILLS [2]

□ Open to the full diversity of perspectives and able to acknowledge those perspectives as equally valid, even if not agreeing personally with them

□ Understanding of cultural perspectives representing the range of NZ communities

□ Able to bring together diverse perspectives into an integrated whole, without losing the diversity

KNOWLEDGE OF EVALUATION THEORY, PARADIGMS, MODELS, AND TECHNICAL

Identifying evaluator competencies: Workshop facilitated by Pam Oliver and Tania Wolfgramm on behalf of anzea, anzea Conference 2008

SKILLS [2]

□ Skilled in 'the basics' of evaluation theory and practice

□ Stays up to date with new developments in evaluation theory and practice

□ Has a level of tertiary qualification in some field relevant to evaluation or research

□ Willing to learn

CONTEXTUAL KNOWLEDGE [2]

□ Awareness and understanding of the local environment – sociocultural, policy, services, evaluation

□ Stays up to date with New Zealand's social, cultural and political developments

□ Has or develops sound knowledge relevant to the subject area of particular projects

□ Strong evaluation, research and community networks

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE [2]

□ Social awareness

□ Sensitivity to others' views and emotionality

□ Works in transparent ways

□ Acknowledges personal biases and predispositions

□ Able and willing to make 'considered' judgments

□ Good conflict management skills

□ Resilient – able to take constructive critique

□ Warm; a 'people person'

□ Positive attitude towards change

□ Flexible and non-judgmental

GOOD COMMUNICATION SKILLS [2]

□ Ability to listen well

□ Able to communicate well across a broad range of social and cultural groups

□ Good oral and written communication

EVALUATION PROJECT MANAGEMENT [3]

□ Good planning and organisational skills

□ Ability to manage a project, or part of a project, effectively and respectfully

□ Good risk assessment and risk management skills

Identifying evaluator competencies: Workshop facilitated by Pam Oliver and Tania Wolfgramm on behalf of anzea, anzea Conference 2008

 Good relationship management skills

UTILISATION-FOCUSED [3]

 Espouses utilisation as a fundamental purpose of evaluation

 Works to incorporate uses of their work for the social or community good

REFLECTIVE PRACTICE [3]

 Skills of self- and peer-reflection

 Willingness to self-examine for the purposes of professional improvement

 Willing to accept and act on professional feedback

TEAM PLAYER [3]

 Ability and willingness to work in genuinely collegial ways

 Consultative

 Respectful towards colleagues' (clients' and co-workers') views, time and reasonable constraints

ATTRIBUTES TO BE AVOIDED IN AN EVALUATION PRACTITIONER

Characteristics seen as undesirable in a person working in evaluation were:

 Rigidity

 Not a team player

 Unwillingness to be challenged

 Lacking cultural tolerance; racist

 Perfectionism

 Being partisan or biased in some aspect relevant to the particular evaluation

 Lacking personal or professional integrity

 Not open-minded

 Insensitive to others' feelings

 Poor time management

 Having personal agendas in relation to particular projects

 Dishonesty.

Professional Competencies for External Evaluation and Review Evaluators: Draft for discussion purposes, NZQA (date unknown)	
What is this document about?	List of competencies "set out in the form of a professional practice standard (and indicators) that describes the knowledge, skills and attitudes evaluators are expected to demonstrate and maintain …" (p.2). Intended in the first instance for lead evaluators, with individual evaluators "expected to demonstrate most, but not necessarily all …" (p.2).

The following list outlines the four core domains and competency areas. Refer to the paper for the detail (indicators for each competency area).

Domain One: Professional Practice

Evaluators demonstrate professional credibility through the conduct of their responsibilities and through their self-awareness and reflective practice.

Competency area:

1.1 Effective leadership

1.2 Personal and interpersonal conduct

1.3 Ethical considerations

1.4 Communication skills

1.5 Conduct of evaluations (generic skills)

1.6 Cultural contexts

Domain Two: Evaluation Theory and Practice

Evaluators demonstrate sound knowledge of evaluation in the context of quality assurance of tertiary education in New Zealand Evaluation practice is underpinned by a substantial understanding of relevant evaluation and educational theory and practice.

Competency area:

2.1 Relevant and applied knowledge of evaluation theory and models

2.2 Enquiry methods

Domain Three: Managing and Conducting EER

Evaluators conduct external evaluation and review (EER) systematically and consistent with the approved system to reach valid, useful and defensible judgments on the quality and capability of a TEO.

Competency area:

3.1 Conduct of external evaluation and review

3.2 Administration of external evaluation and review

Professional Competencies for External Evaluation and Review Evaluators: Draft for discussion purposes, NZQA (date unknown)
3.3 Scope of EER 3.4 Planning external evaluation and review 3.5 Reporting EER **Domain Four: Working with the Context of the Evaluation** Evaluators demonstrate appropriate knowledge, understanding and respect for the kaupapa, values, roles and functions of the various parts of the tertiary sector. *Competency area:* 4.1 Knowledge of the tertiary education sector in New Zealand 4.2 Identifies and incorporates the distinctive contribution of a TEO prior to and throughout undertaking the EER 4.3 Te Tiriti o Waitangi 4.4 Recognise and value diversity of approach, and innovation

International

United States of America

Stevahn, L., King, J. A., Ghere, G., & Minnema, J. (2005). **Establishing Essential Competencies for Program Evaluators**. *American Journal of Evaluation, 26*, 43-59.
From Table 1 (p. 49-51) with explanation for each category directly quoted from p.52. **1.0 Professional Practice** competencies focus on fundamental norms and values underlying evaluation practice, such as adhering to evaluation standards and ethics. 1.1 Applies professional evaluation standards 1.2 Acts ethically and strives for integrity and honesty in conducting evaluations 1.3 Conveys personal evaluation approaches and skills to potential clients 1.4 Respects clients, respondents, program participants, and other stakeholders 1.5 Considers the general and public welfare in evaluation practice 1.6 Contributes to the knowledge base of evaluation **2.0 Systematic inquiry** competencies focus on the more technical aspects of evaluation practice, such as design, data collection, analysis, interpretation, and reporting. 2.1 Understands the knowledge base of evaluation (terms, concepts, theories, assumptions) 2.2 Knowledgeable about quantitative methods 2.3 Knowledgeable about qualitative methods

2.4 Knowledgeable about mixed methods

2.5 Conducts literature reviews

2.6 Specifies program theory

2.7 Frames evaluation questions

2.8 Develops evaluation designs

2.9 Identifies data sources

2.10 Collects data

2.11 Assesses validity of data

2.12 Assesses reliability of data

2.13 Analyzes data

2.14 Interprets data

2.15 Makes judgments

2.16 Develops recommendations

2.17 Provides rationales for decisions throughout the evaluation

2.18 Reports evaluation procedures and results

2.19 Notes strengths and limitations of the evaluation

2.20 Conducts meta-evaluations

3.0 Situational analysis competencies focus on analyzing and attending to the unique interests, issues, and contextual circumstances pertaining to any given evaluation.

3.1 Describes the program

3.2 Determines program evaluability

3.3 Identifies the interests of relevant stakeholders

3.4 Serves the information needs of intended users

3.5 Addresses conflicts

3.6 Examines the organizational context of the evaluation

3.7 Analyzes the political considerations relevant to the evaluation

3.8 Attends to issues of evaluation use

3.9 Attends to issues of organizational change

3.10 Respects the uniqueness of the evaluation site and client

3.11 Remains open to input from others

3.12 Modifies the study as needed

4.0 Project management competencies focus on the nuts and bolts of conducting an

evaluation, such as budgeting, coordinating resources, and supervising procedures.

- 4.1 Responds to requests for proposals
- 4.2 Negotiates with clients before the evaluation begins
- 4.3 Writes formal agreements
- 4.4 Communicates with clients throughout the evaluation process
- 4.5 Budgets an evaluation
- 4.6 Justifies cost given information needs
- 4.7 Identifies needed resources for evaluation, such as information, expertise, personnel, instruments
- 4.8 Uses appropriate technology
- 4.9 Supervises others involved in conducting the evaluation
- 4.10 Trains others involved in conducting the evaluation
- 4.11 Conducts the evaluation in a nondisruptive manner
- 4.12 Presents work in a timely manner

5.0 Reflective practice competencies focus on one's awareness of evaluation expertise and needs for growth, including knowing oneself as an evaluator, assessing personal needs for enhanced practice, and engaging in professional development toward that goal.

- 5.1 Aware of self as an evaluator (knowledge, skills, disposition)
- 5.2 Reflects on personal evaluation practice (competencies and areas for growth)
- 5.3 Pursues professional development in evaluation
- 5.4 Pursues professional development in relevant content areas
- 5.5 Builds professional relationships to enhance evaluation practice

6.0 Interpersonal competence competencies focus on the people skills used in conducting evaluation studies, such as communication, negotiation, conflict, collaboration, and cross-cultural skills.

- 6.1 Uses written communication skills
- 6.2 Uses verbal/listening communication skills
- 6.3 Uses negotiation skills
- 6.4 Uses conflict resolution skills
- 6.5 Facilitates constructive interpersonal interaction (teamwork, group facilitation, processing)
- 6.6 Demonstrates cross-cultural competence

Canadian Evaluation Society

CROSSWALK OF EVALUATOR COMPETENCIES – VERSION 10, Prepared for discussion within the CES Professional Designation Project – March 12, 2008
Potential Competencies for Evaluators:
1.0 Professional Practice competencies focus on the fundamental norms and values underlying evaluation practice, such as adhering to evaluation standards and ethics.
1.1 Applies professional evaluation standards
1.2 Acts ethically and strives for integrity and honesty in conducting evaluations
1.3 Conveys personal evaluation approaches and skills to potential clients
1.4 Respects clients, respondents, program participants, and other stakeholders
1.5 Considers the general and public welfare in evaluation practice
1.6 Contributes to the knowledge base of evaluation
2.0 Systematic Inquiry competencies focus on the more technical aspects of evaluation practice, such as design, data collection, analysis, interpretation, and reporting.
2.1 Understands the knowledge base of evaluation (terms, concepts, theories, assumptions)
2.2 Knowledgeable about quantitative methods
2.3 Knowledgeable about qualitative methods
2.4 Knowledgeable about mixed methods
2.5 Conducts literature reviews
2.6 Specifies program theory
2.7 Frames evaluation questions
2.8 Develops evaluation designs
2.9 Identifies data sources
2.10 Collects data
2.11 Assesses validity of data
2.12 Assesses reliability of data
2.13 Analyzes data
2.14 Interprets data
2.15 Makes judgments
2.16 Develops recommendations
2.17 Provides rationales for decisions throughout the evaluation
2.18 Reports evaluation procedures and results

2.19 Notes strengths and limitations of the evaluation

2.20 Conducts meta-evaluations

3.0 Situational Analysis competencies focus on analyzing and attending to the unique interests, issues, and contextual circumstances pertaining to any given evaluation.

3.1 Describes the program

3.2 Determines program evaluability

3.3 Identifies the interests of relevant stakeholders

3.4 Serves the information needs of intended users

3.5 Addresses conflicts

3.6 Examines organizational context of the evaluation

3.7 Analyzes the political considerations relevant to the evaluation

3.8 Attends to issues of evaluation use

3.9 Attends to issues of organizational change

3.10 Respects the uniqueness of the evaluation site and client

3.11 Remains open to input from others

3.12 Modifies the study as needed

4.0 Project Management competencies focus on the nuts and bolts of conducting an evaluation, such as budgeting, coordinating resources and supervising procedures.

4.1 Responds to requests for proposals

4.2 Negotiates with clients before the evaluation begins

4.3 Writes formal agreements

4.4 Communicates with clients throughout the evaluation process

4.5 Budgets an evaluation

4.6 Justifies cost given information needs

4.7 Identifies needed resources for evaluation, such as information, expertise, personnel, instruments

4.8 Uses appropriate technology

4.9 Supervises others involved in conducting the evaluation

4.10 Trains others involved in conducting the evaluation

4.11 Conducts the evaluation in a non disruptive manner

4.12 Presents work in a timely manner

CROSSWALK OF EVALUATOR COMPETENCIES – VERSION 10, Prepared for discussion within the CES Professional Designation Project – March 12, 2008
5.0 Reflective Practice competencies focus on one's awareness of evaluation expertise and needs for growth, including knowing oneself as an evaluator, assessing personal needs for enhanced practice, and engaging in professional development toward that goal. 5.1 Aware of self as an evaluator (knowledge, skills, dispositions) 5.2 Reflects on personal evaluation practice (competencies and areas for growth) 5.3 Pursues professional development in evaluation 5.4 Pursues professional development in relevant content areas 5.5 Builds professional relationships to enhance evaluation practice **6.0 Interpersonal Competence** competencies focus on the people skills used in conducting evaluation studies, such as communication, negotiation, conflict, collaboration, and cross-cultural skills 6.1 Uses written communication skills 6.2 Uses verbal/listening communication skills 6.3 Uses negotiation skills 6.4 Uses conflict resolution skills 6.5 Facilitates constructive interpersonal interaction (teamwork, group facilitation, processing) 6.6 Demonstrates cross-cultural competence The Crosswalk document includes notes describing and defining a number of the terms and concepts used above, and the key documents used in developing the Crosswalk.

European Evaluation Society

EES Questionnaire about evaluation competencies (date unknown – possibly 2008)
Tentative framework for purpose of triggering debate. <u>Evaluation knowledge</u> 1.1 *Appreciates the social role played by evaluation* 1.11 Shows awareness of evaluation history and doctrines 1.12 Understands the linkages between evaluation and social research 1.13 Understands program theory and its implications 1.14 Can relate evaluation to policy and governance environments

1.15 Demonstrates familiarity with theories of causality

1.2 *Understands evaluation methods*

1.21 Uses appropriate concepts and terms

1.22 Knows how to structure an evaluation

1.23 Comprehends the value of diverse evaluation approaches

1.24 Appreciates their limits in diverse contexts

1.25 Displays awareness of triangulation methods

1.3 *Grasps the basics of major evaluation tools*

1.31 Data collection and analysis

1.32 Indicators and scores

1.33 Case studies, surveys and interviews

1.34 Evaluation panels

1.35 Monitoring systems

2. Professional practice

2.1 Demonstrates capacity to deliver

2.11 Ascertains the evaluative context

2.12 Assesses policy logic and program content

2.13 Selects appropriate approaches, methods and tools

2.14 Chooses judicious evaluation criteria

2.15 Focuses on evaluation results

2.2 *Evinces interpersonal skills*

2.21 Writes fluently and communicates clearly

2.22 Displays listening skills and appreciates the value of team work

2.23 Uses sound negotiating and conflict resolution skills

2.24 Demonstrates cultural sensitivity

2.25 Nurtures professional relationships

3. 1. Dispositions and attitudes

3.1 Upholds ethical and democratic values

3.2 Respects clients and stakeholders

3.3 Promotes the public interest

3.4 Exercises sound, rigorous and fair judgment

3.5 Displays self-awareness and pursues professional development

Section three: Cultural competency

The following section includes a few notes from the writer while the potential implications (as perceived by the writer) were fresh from reading.

Aotearoa New Zealand developments and approaches

Indigenous

Guide developed by Māori

Evaluation for Māori: Guidelines for Government Agencies. (1999). Te Puni Kokiri.	
What is this document about?	The report discusses: ▪ "Why evaluate for Māori?" (potentially useful for addressing the question *What are the cultural imperatives that could underpin the development of [cultural] competencies in NZ?*). This section includes an adaption of Chris Cunningham's (1989) Māori research framework: not involving Māori, involving Māori, focus on Māori and kaupapa Māori. ▪ ethical issues in relation to skills and competencies, working with communities, valid research tools, informed consent and koha; and provides ▪ detailed guidelines for each stage of the evaluation process (planning, design, analysis and reporting and communicating results), including "critical success factors, a commentary of issues, common gaps and a checklist". (p.7) The key points from the last two sections were developed as a set of checklists by TPK and have been included in Appendix two. In relation to ethics, the guidelines state "Ethics is about the safety, respect, comfort, dignity and confidentiality for the individual, their whānau, hāpu and iwi." (p.14) Re considering ethical issues in relation to skills and competencies, the document states that "evaluators with cultural, language/reo, subject and research competencies are required to undertake an evaluation involving Māori". (p.14) The following were specifically identified: evaluators and/ or interviewers who: o value and are able to apply tikanga and manaakitanga principles, o treat Māori respondents with respect and regard, and

Evaluation for Māori: Guidelines for Government Agencies. (1999). Te Puni Kokiri.	
	○ appreciate and are able to apply culturally appropriate research methods / methdologies, e.g. hui, collaborative research design, kaupapa Māori research methods.
How could it assist anzea?	As noted later in relation to another guide, the checklists provide a 'tool' or guide to 'carrying out' evaluation with Māori (that is, evaluation as practice). It maybe of a different order or nature from what is needed at this stage, tho' an important and complementary part to developing cultural competency? If the anzea approach to developing competencies is to involve specifying what should occur at each part of the evaluation process for cultural competency to occur, then this, and the other such guides, will be important to review in detail.

Guide developed in collaboration with Māori

Report on the SPEaR Best Practice Maori Guidelines Hui 2007. (2007). A collaboration between SPEaR and anzea.	
What is this document about?	The aim of these (and other SPEaR) guidelines is to develop the research and evaluation capacity and capability of the social sector via providing real-world guidance, a basis for training, examples, further resources etc. These (and the other) guidelines have been developed on the basis of a principles approach, the principles being – **respect, integrity, responsiveness, competency and reciprocity**.
What are the key issues in designating and reviewing evaluator competence?	"Feedback from Māori participants … indicated that in order to meet the aim of providing real world guidance, there was a need to some rich illustrative examples … Principles, and in particular their application, were seen to occur within, and be subject to, the cultural context and values of the practitioner and the people/community party to the research/evaluation." (p.3) SPEaR in conjunction with anzea subsequently sought, and the report provides, reflections on each principle and "rich practice 'vignettes'" from a hui of "a wide range of Māori researchers and evaluators and to iwi and Māori provider and community-based organisations" held in July 2007(p.4). The hui and report was regarded by participants "as part of a process." (p.31) Go to http://www.spear.govt.nz/documents/good-practice/spear-bpg-maori-final-report-anzea.pdf
Definition of SPEaR best practice	Reciprocity: Relationships between social sector officials, researchers and participants should enable reciprocal, balanced exchanges of knowledge, resources and time that recognise the value of diverse

Report on the SPEaR Best Practice Maori Guidelines Hui 2007. (2007). A collaboration between SPEaR and anzea.	
principles (as provided in the above report)	contributions in a respectful and appropriate manner. Responsiveness: The methods of engagement and the technologies of all researchers and evaluators should ensure they acknowledge, understand and respond to differences in institutional, professional and cultural practice, including the appropriate provision of means for a suitable level of engagement. Respect: Relationships between all stakeholders in social sector research should be based on respect for the inherent value of each contributor (be they researcher, contractor, policy manager, project manager or participant) and the skills, experience and knowledge each person brings to the research and evaluation process. Integrity: The actions and behaviours of social sector officials advancing research and evaluation should work to establish, maintain and enhance the integrity of all stakeholders, and the professional and ethical integrity of the research and evaluation, policy and service delivery functions. Competency: All research and evaluation officials and contractors involved in the development and execution of social research and evaluation should possess the core competencies necessary for performing their duties to a high level.

Cultural competency of health providers

Thomas, D. R. (2007). ***Client views about cultural competence in primary health care encounters.*** Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland.	
What are the range of evaluator competencies and cultural competencies (skills, knowledge and dispositions)?	▪ This paper reports on three areas of cultural competence clients valued in primary health care providers: (i) feeling welcomed and acknowledged, (ii) shared communication and understanding, and (iii) provider strategies which address cultural styles and ethnic status of clients. ▪ These were identified from a secondary, inductive analysis of interviews and focus groups with Maori, Pacific and Asian primary health care clients, though the author noted most comment came from Maori respondents (and as such further "investigations would be required to assess to what extent the three themes … are generalisable across multiple ethnic groups" (p.5)). ▪ The premises underlying the research were:

	○ given "most countries, including New Zealand …, have ethnically diverse populations, … it is important for evaluators assessing the effectiveness of health and human services to address the extent to which services and programmes are suitable to appropriate for the multiple ethnic and cultural groups represented among clients" (p.1); and ○ "The assessment of cultural competence in health and human services has at least two requirements; (a) clear identification of the dimensions or attributes underlying cultural competence and (b) trustworthy indicators to measure cultural competence. In this context trustworthy is taken to mean quantitative indicators that are valid, reliable and directly relevant to the service or programme being assessed. A brief perusal of literature indicates very few measures are reported. Those which are described are often focused on very specific types of services, with sparse information about validity or reliability" (p.1). The author noted while "there are a considerable number of reports discussing the importance of cultural competence … there are relatively few reports which go into details about the specific attributes associated with cultural competence (e.g., Lieu, Finkelstein, Lozano, Capra, Chi, Jensvold, et al., 2004) and many of these are specific to particular ethnic groups (e.g., Kim, Bean, & Harper; 2004). As well there appear to be few descriptions derived inductively from clients or service providers' perspectives. Many are derived from a general theory or framework relating to cultural competence" (p.2). ▪ The above three themes were intended to be a contribution to developing specific dimensions of cultural competence for "assessing [client] satisfaction with health and human services in multicultural communities" (p.5). The author noted they are "generally consistent with previous research on cultural competence" (p.5).
What are the key terms and definitions around competence, competency and practice standards for evaluators?	▪ The author found that "a search of the relevant literature indicates that multiple meanings and definitions have been used to describe cultural competence. In some cases the term is used in research reports without any description or definition of its meaning. In the United States, the department of Health and Human Services website has compiled a list of definitions of cultural competence (US Department of Health and Human Services, 2007). This website notes that no single definition of cultural competence has been broadly accepted, either in human services practice or in professional education. Most definitions contain a common element focusing on the awareness of key attributes of one's own

	culture in order to understand differences between the service provider's culture and the culture of a patient" (p.2). ▪ He notes that "a more specific framework has been outlined by Reimann et al (2004) in their research among physicians treating Mexican-Americans with diabetes. They described cultural competence as comprising three general factors; cultural knowledge (a physician's familiarity with facts relevant to Mexican Americans with diabetes), cultural awareness (the manner of feeling and thinking that shows physicians' disposition or opinion toward cultural issues relevant to Mexican Americans with diabetes) and culturally appropriate behaviors (specific actions physicians reported taking). (p. 2198)" (p.2). ▪ Two of the (three) definitions provided by the author were: ○ "A typical definition included in the US Department of Health and Human Services, web site noted above is the following: *… a set of attitudes, skills, behaviors, and policies that enable organizations and staff to work effectively in cross-cultural situations. It reflects the ability to acquire and use knowledge of the health-related beliefs, attitudes, practices and communication patterns of clients and their families to improve services, strengthen programs, increase community participation, and close the gaps in health status among diverse population groups.* http://bhpr.hrsa.gov/diversity/cultcomp.htm" (p.2) ○ "For the current project the working definition of cultural competence adopted was: *The delivery of programs and services so that they are consistent with the cultural identity, communication styles, meaning systems and social networks of clients, program participants and other stakeholders.*" (p.2)

Pacific cultural competence

Tiatia, J. (2008). ***Pacific Cultural Competencies: A literature review***: Ministry of Health.	
This report provides an overview of the local and overseas literature on Pacific cultural competence in health care. Whilst it does not address evaluation, the report provides a lot of very useful general and Pacific-specific health sector-related information, frameworks and arguments that could be 'extrapolated' to the development of cultural competence in evaluation. A slightly different summarizing approach has been used for this document given the amount of potentially useful information. Most of the following boxes below include cut'n'paste statements from the Executive Summary and other parts of the report, followed by references to potentially relevant information.	
▪ "Cultural competence is … generally … considered a	*What are the key issues …*

Tiatia, J. (2008). ***Pacific Cultural Competencies: A literature review***: Ministry of Health.	
behavioural approach and functions on the principle that behavioural changes can only be achieved first and foremost by changes in attitude. The capacity to affect attitudes and behaviours is influenced by many factors, including leadership in the field, access to information, goodwill, informed decision-making, a learning environment, best-quality practices, and organisational processes and procedures." (p.vii)	*that may affect the … development of evaluation competencies?*
▪ "The New Zealand Health Practitioners Competence Assurance Act 2004(HPCA Act) came into effect in September 2004, and covers all health professionals. Its function is to protect the health and safety of New Zealanders by providing mechanisms to ensure health professionals are competent, registered and subject to regulation. The HPCA Act requires that professional registration bodies[2] set standards of clinical competence, cultural competence and ethical conduct, and ensure these are observed by health practitioners in their profession. In achieving the goal for all health professionals of being familiar with the concept of cultural competence, it is also critical that they be able to demonstrate it. It follows that teaching programmes and registering bodies need to develop and support competency standards as the first step (Bacal et al 2006)." (p.8)	This is an example of what is occurring in the health sector that could inform the case for the development of evaluation competencies.
▪ "Cultural competence is achievable within health care if leadership and workforce development are supported." (p.viii)	
▪ "Increasing cultural competency is a shared responsibility, requiring partnerships across a wide range of sectors – including health, social services, education, justice and research – using systematic and sustainable approaches." (p.viii)	
▪ "The interpersonal relationship between the health professional and the client is believed to be the determining factor for whether services are appropriate (Minnesota Department of Human Services 2004). The culturally skilled professional is one who is in the process of actively developing and practising strategies and skills at working with culturally diverse clients. An individual professional cannot be culturally competent alone: organisational	Case for complementary importance of both individual and organisational competence. A framework for individual and organisational cultural competencies is provided at

Tiatia, J. (2008). ***Pacific Cultural Competencies: A literature review***: Ministry of Health.	
commitment is also required. Therefore, management forms the service delivery structure and environment whereby cultural competence is achievable (Minnesota Department of Human Services 2004)." (p.19) ▪ "There is the view that establishing cultural competency standards may run the risk of reducing complex cultural processes into simplistic formulas, which may underestimate and ritualise culture (Southwick 2001). In other words, standards imply normative behaviours within a defined group, but it must be understood that individual behaviours vary widely from these norms. Thus, individual health workers require a sensitivity to the possibilities of beliefs, meaning, behaviours and needs that may be discernible by any Pacific person (Foliaki 2003). Standards, coupled with training, should enable the health [*replace with evaluator?*] to identify the specific cultural needs of Pacific people, and the health [*evaluation?*] provider organisation must then have the capacity to respond to these needs (Foliaki 2003). " (p.20) ▪ "An evaluation of the Pegasus Global Budget Contract undertaken by Kirk et al (2002) found that non-Pacific general practitioners were not expected to have in-depth knowledge of cultural knowledge, customs and traditions of their Pacific clients. It was argued that while such knowledge would have been beneficial to improving communication, it is only one aspect of a Pacific culturally competent service. Study participants (patients, doctors) believed that cultural sensitivity was of the utmost importance. For instance, participants agreed that the ability to build rapport and express empathy and respect should take precedence in quality general practice consultations and service delivery (Kirk et al 2002)." (p.30) ▪ "The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) conducted a review of an array of strategies to improve both the cultural competence of health care providers and the quality of health care received by 'minority' populations in the United States. After examining over 3500 papers (of which 91 were suitable for full evaluation), investigators found that	end of this table.

Tiatia, J. (2008). ***Pacific Cultural Competencies: A literature review***: Ministry of Health.	
cultural competency training improves the knowledge, attitudes and skills of health care providers as well as improving patient satisfaction and adherence to care (Beach et al 2004). However, it is important to note that training in cultural competence cannot be achieved in a 'one-off' course or workshop, but rather necessitates a lifelong process (Bacal et al 2006)." (p.30)	
▪ "Although there is no universally accepted single definition of cultural competence, most definitions have a common element, which requires an adjustment or acknowledgement of one's own culture in order to understand the culture of clients, patients, working colleagues or communities. This is achieved by recognising and respecting the culture of the person, family, community and/or organisation being served." (p.vii) ▪ "Cultural competence does not suggest treating all members of a cultural group in the same way. Rather, it presumes that difference and diversity between and within groups are valued, and acknowledges a positive integration of diversity, difference and multiculturalism within a system of care. Universals and normative standards that reference 'the average person' are avoided. Failure to do so will mask differences that significantly influence access, utilisation and quality (Chin 2006)." (p.13) ▪ "Seeking clear definitions for Pacific peoples alone is rather complex, for within Pacific communities themselves, there are diversities. For instance, Pacific peoples occupy different social positions, hold various places of status and encompass a range of backgrounds and experiences. Cultural competence should include all these diverse dimensions." (p.vii) ▪ It is evident that cultural competence involves a dynamic interplay among socioeconomic status, ethnicity and language – an interplay that definitions and interpretations of the term do not always acknowledge (Zambrana et al 2004). ▪ "Pacific cultural competence is a relatively recent concept with very little development, resulting in few clear definitions and limited buy-in. There are,	*What are the key terms and definitions around competence, competency and practice standards for evaluators?* Pages 3-5 provides definitions building from culture and competency to cultural competency and Pacific cultural competence, and individual and organisational cultural competency. It also describes other related terms – cultural safety, cultural sensitivity, culturally safe practice and acculturation. These are included in Appendix three. A variety of frameworks are included at the end of this table.

Tiatia, J. (2008). ***Pacific Cultural Competencies: A literature review***: Ministry of Health.	
however, working definitions, including the ability to understand and appropriately apply cultural values and practices that underpin Pacific peoples' world views and perspectives on health. A pertinent definition also includes the ability to integrate or acknowledge Pacific values, principles, structures, attitudes and practices in the care and delivery of service to Pacific clients, their families and communities." (p.vii)	
▪ Chapter 3 *Why the Need for Pacific Cultural Competencies?* briefly describes the NZ Pacific population, Pacific peoples' health status, the need for Pacific cultural competencies and 3 current NZ Pacific health initiatives. ▪ This chapter provides info specific to making the case for Pacific cultural competencies in the health sector via highlighting the place of Pacific peoples in NZ, their poorer health status and government initiatives focused on improving "access to health services for Pacific peoples by supporting the development of Pacific health providers and the Pacific health workforce" (p.7). ▪ The 3 Pacific initiatives make the case for culturally competent service delivery which in turn has implications for the evaluation of culturally competent policy / service delivery (Thomas' thesis and comment in attached column). ▪ "Culturally competent attitudes and aptitudes are critical for all marginalised sub-groups, whether gender groups (male, female, trans-gender, fa'afafine); age groups (elderly, adolescent, children); sexual-preference groups (gay, heterosexual, lesbian, bisexual); place of birth (island-born or raised, New Zealand-born or raised, and multi-ethnic); people with disabilities; or religious groups." (p.vii)	*What are cultural imperatives that could underpin the development of competencies in New Zealand?* The information in Chp 3 could be extrapolated to making a case for cultural competency in evaluation, as well as making the case for Pacific cultural competency in evaluation. The link with evaluation could be approached via the link between evaluation and policy / programme development and delivery, that is, if evaluation is about contributing to policy and programmes that achieve better outcomes for all NZ, then it's imperative that evaluation has the [cultural] competency to assess whether policies and programmes are actually achieving better outcomes, particularly for those who are currently achieving poorer or less outcomes than the rest of the NZ population (who are often Maori, Pacific …). I have heard some Pacific researchers speaking of doing their work because it is

Tiatia, J. (2008). ***Pacific Cultural Competencies: A literature review***: Ministry of Health.	
	about making a difference between whether their people live or die, that is, cultural competency is not a luxury item.
▪ "Southwick (2001) has explored Pacific women's experiences of nursing and their first year of practice post-registration within the New Zealand setting. Southwick acknowledges that the nursing profession requires all nurses to be 'culturally safe'. However, Southwick's argument is that this is compromised by the reality that only one culture has the power to determine what 'safety' really means. Therefore, the criteria for shaping successful knowledge and skill acquisition, and the standards and competency measures for what constitutes 'good practice', are all derived from a mainstream world view. Southwick does not suggest that the mainstream nursing profession deliberately sets out to dominate or oppress other groups, or that Pacific nurses are victims. Rather, this argument reinforces the notion that cultural safety and competence can only be achieved if the nursing profession reflects the evolving, pluralistic and diverse nature of New Zealand society and responds appropriately to the needs of Pacific peoples (Southwick 2001)." (p.8) ▪ "Assessment of cultural competence should include all stakeholders (ie, provider, care delivery system, purchaser, payer and consumer) and the different world views they bring to the system of care. It is the amalgam of all stakeholders and perspectives that results in culturally competent systems of care (Chin 2006)." (p.29) ▪ "There is substantial evidence to suggest that cultural competence is imperative. However, there is little evidence on which approaches and techniques are effective and how and when to implement them appropriately. In addition, the development of suitable cultural competence measures is hampered by a lack of clarity on the meaning of cultural competence in the first instance. So although there is no universal understanding of what culturally competent care is, the challenge lies in identifying	*What are the key issues in designating and reviewing evaluator competence?* This reinforces the earlier points about the need for cultural competency to be an 'active' process, and that the **anzea** process of exploring / identifying cultural competence will also need to take care to not replicate the 'mainstream'.

Tiatia, J. (2008). ***Pacific Cultural Competencies: A literature review***: Ministry of Health.	
ways of measuring or evaluating appropriate care and cultural competence training, defining successful programmes, and creating innovative methods for assessing a construct that is continually evolving at multiple levels within a service community." (p.viii) ▪ "An important issue for Pacific peoples is that cultural competencies lack rigorous evaluation. As a result, it is uncertain what actually works to improve outcomes. It must also be said that criteria for what a culturally appropriate service entails need to be established and must be clearly defined in order to develop cultural competencies or best practices within the context of continuous quality (Kirk et al 2002)." (p.viii) ▪ "A study by Robinson et al (2006), which explored Pacific health care workers and their treatment interventions for Pacific clients with AoD problems in New Zealand, found that clinical concepts of assessment, treatment and outcome measures were not well understood by Pacific health care workers. Findings indicated that the most effective assessments were those conducted by skilled Pacific staff with sound knowledge, not only in their field of expertise, but in Pacific cultures and processes, and in the ability to combine mainstream and Pacific knowledge to benefit the client (Robinson et al 2006). … The findings also reinforced the notion that when working with Pacific clients, it is not enough to simply be 'Pacific'; it is equally, if not more, crucial to have formal training and skills development (Robinson et al 2006)." (p.27)	
The following are some examples of <u>frameworks</u> that could be potentially useful for conceptualizing cultural competence. Refer Chapter 4 *Conceptualising Cultural Competence* when this area is to be more fully explored and a level of detail is needed. It includes both overseas and locally developed frameworks that could be used to guide the development of evaluation competencies, and frameworks specifically developed for working with Pacific peoples. ▪ "In 2001 the US Department of Health and Human Services Office of Minority Health conducted a literature review conceptualising cultural competence. … nine areas were identified and considered important to the development of a measurement profile for cultural competence in health care. These areas are referred to as domains, and include: values and attitudes; cultural sensitivity; communication; policies and	

Tiatia, J. (2008). ***Pacific Cultural Competencies: A literature review***: Ministry of Health.

procedures; training and staff development; facility characteristics, capacity and infrastructure (with a focus on access and the availability of care and the environment in which it is provided, such as the location); intervention and treatment model features; family and community participation; and monitoring, evaluation and research." (p.13) They also provided a list of what "culturally competent care" would include (refer p.14 if relevant).

- "Foliaki … maintains that the key to successful interpersonal engagement between Pacific peoples and cross-cultural engagement between Pacific and non-Pacific peoples is respect. In a one-on-one interaction with a client, respect is expressed through:
  - appropriate greetings, including saying the name of the person/s correctly
  - introducing yourself, your function and the function of other people that are present in the meeting
  - establishing a connection between yourself and the patient/family, sharing something personal of yourself (humanising yourself, taking yourself out of your professional role before tackling the business at hand)
  - explaining/demonstrating what you expect to happen during your meeting
  - asking the person/family what they want/expect to happen in the meeting
  - reassuring them that they have your full attention by not engaging in other activities while talking with them.

  When interacting with a group, Foliaki reiterates that respect should continue to be regarded with the utmost importance and demonstrated by:
  - knowing the structure of the group and acknowledging the key people in the right order
  - expressing appreciation for the opportunity to meet
  - acknowledging past interactions
  - sharing some personal information about oneself that may have some connection with the group or with the purpose of the meeting
  - addressing the business at hand only after an emotional/spiritual connection has been made." (p.16)

<u>Individual cultural competence</u>:

- "At the personal level it is argued (Campinha-Bacote 2003; Olavarria et al 2005) that three main components are required to become culturally competent:
  - a sensitivity and understanding of one's own cultural identity
  - having knowledge of other cultures' beliefs, values and practices
  - having the skills to co-operate effectively with diverse cultures.

Tiatia, J. (2008). ***Pacific Cultural Competencies: A literature review***: Ministry of Health.

Campinha-Bacote's (2002) model, *The Process of Cultural Competence in the Delivery of Healthcare Services*, posits five constructs of cultural competence for an individual: cultural awareness, cultural knowledge, cultural skill, cultural encounters and cultural desire." (from and refer to p.19 for more detail on each of these 5 constructs).

<u>Organisational cultural competence</u>:

- Mason's (1993) continuum of cultural competence: Cultural Destructiveness – Incapacity - Blindness - Pre-competence – Competence. "The benefit of Mason's continuum is that, with honest self-appraisal, individuals and organisations can determine their present state and measure their change towards cultural competence over time." (p.23)
  - "Cultural destructiveness: The most negative end of the continuum is indicated by attitudes, policies and practices that are damaging to individuals and their cultures.
  - Incapacity: The system or organisation does not intentionally seek to be culturally ruinous or destructive, but the system may lack the capacity to assist different cultures of individuals and/or communities.
  - Blindness: At the midpoint of the continuum, the system and its organisations provide services with the expressed intent of being unbiased. They function as if the culture makes no difference and all the people are the same.
  - Pre-competence: Individuals and organisations move towards the positive end of the continuum by acknowledging cultural differences and making documented efforts to improve.
  - Competence: The most positive end of the continuum is indicated by acceptance and respect of cultural differences, continual expansion of cultural knowledge, continued cultural self-assessment, attention to the dynamics of cultural differences, and adoption of culturally relevant service delivery models to better meet needs." (p.23)
- Refer Leininger's Sunrise Model (p.24-25) re cultural competency at the provision of health care level (the evaluand).
- *Cultural Competence Works* (2001), produced by the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) in the United States, provides best practices for cultural competence undertaken mainly in managed care settings and may be worthy of consideration for Pacific peoples. The HRSA sponsored a Cultural Competence Works competition and conducted a national search to recognise and expose programmes that provide culturally competent care for diverse populations. The HRSA report found that, overall, those who provided culturally competent services most successfully tended to do the following (see Table 5, p.26-27 for detail): define culture broadly, value clients' cultural beliefs, recognise complexity in language interpretation, involve the community in defining and addressing service needs, collaborate with other agencies, professionalise staff hiring and training, and **insitutionalise** cultural competence.

Tiatia, J. (2008). ***Pacific Cultural Competencies: A literature review***: Ministry of Health.
▪ Refer Table 6 (p.28-29) for measures of organisational Pacific competency in relation to governance, management, communication, human resources, service delivery, information and evaluation.

International developments and approaches

Indigenous

Guidelines developed by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander

Guidelines for Ethical Research in Indigenous Studies. (2000). AIATSIS: The Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies.	
What is this document about?	Lists a series of principles of ethical research under three headings: ▪ Consultation, negotiation and mutual understanding o Consultation, negotiation and free and informed consent are the foundations for research with or about Indigenous peoples. o The responsibility for consultation and negotiation is ongoing. o Consultation and negotiation should achieve mutual understanding about the proposed research. ▪ Respect, recognition and involvement o Indigenous knowledge systems and processes must be respected. o There must be recognition of the diversity and uniqueness of peoples as well as of individuals. o The intellectual and cultural property rights of Indigenous peoples must be respected and preserved. o Indigenous researchers, individuals and communities should be involved in research as collaborators. ▪ Benefits, outcomes and agreement. o The use of, and access to, research results should be agreed. o A researched community should benefit from, and not be disadvantaged by, the research project. o The negotiation of outcomes should include results specific to the needs of the researched community.

Guidelines for Ethical Research in Indigenous Studies. (2000). AIATSIS: The Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies.	
	○ Negotiation should result in a formal agreement for the conduct of a research project, based on good faith and free and informed consent. The principles are included above minus the accompanying explanation. It refers to *Guidelines for Implementation of Principles of Ethical Research.*

United States of America

Cultural competence of evaluation as a profession and practice

A Cultural Reading of the Program Evaluation Standards, 2nd edition*: Executive Summary*. (2004). AEA Cultural Diversity Committee Cultural Reading Task Force.	
What is this document about?	"Following the 2002 annual meeting, the Diversity Committee of the American Evaluation Association formed a Task Force to review the *Program Evaluation Standards* of the Joint Committee … to assess how cultural content was addressed in the second edition. We approached culture broadly, inclusive of race, ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, social class, disability, language, and educational level or disciplinary background. We considered both individual characteristics and those of a group or collective (e.g., community or organizational culture)." This document provides an executive summary of their findings.
How could this assist anzea?	Their top-level findings have been included in Appendix four as a example of what to avoid (particularly given the *Program Evaluation Standards* have such wide usage and, from a quick check of the website, appear to be still at the 2nd edition stage?).

SenGupta, S., Hopson, R., & Thompson-Robinson, M. (2004). **Cultural Competence in Evaluation: An Overview**. *New Directions for Evaluation*(102), 5-19.	
Key issues in designating evaluator competence: ▪ Implication of this argument is that cultural competency in evaluation requires competency <u>beyond</u> evaluation methods and methodologies to understanding the cultural contexts and impacts on	▪ The authors argue that while there is recognition that evaluation takes place in a range of contexts (social, cultural, historical, economic and political) and many "demographic attributes of contextual diversity" (p.6) are recognised (e.g. race, ethnicity, language, gender, age, religion and sexual orientation), there are two "contextual dimensions" (p.6) that are not commonly recognised in evaluation. These are the <u>contextual dimensions of</u> (i) denominators of

SenGupta, S., Hopson, R., & Thompson-Robinson, M. (2004). **Cultural Competence in Evaluation: An Overview**. *New Directions for Evaluation*(102), 5-19.	
problem definition, policy formulation etc. ▪ This has implications for evaluation as a profession and/or evaluators individually attempting to recognise and address the contextual factors of cultural in a policy or operational setting which may not. ▪ Implication of House's analysis is that cultural competency needs to be "active", an explicitly conscious act, going beyond treating people "equally" (House, or the authors, have potentially used the term 'equality' incorrectly).	equity and sociopolitical status (e.g. power, economy, living situation and class), and those specific to (ii) culture. They describe how "culture is present in evaluation not only in the contexts in which programs are implemented but also in" (p.6) how problems are defined (use of the deficit model), theories are developed, the policy discourse used, policy and programme design / development, programme implementation, and "the approach, stance, or methods evaluators chose to use in their work" (p.6). ▪ They provide an example of an analysis of US educational policymaking in which House (1999) finds "that inherently racist and biased policies go unnoticed behind the appearance of equality [where he] characterizes the system as one of institutional racism, whereby racism can persist even in the absence of hostile racist thoughts" (p.9).
Are there some competencies that are more essential than others? ▪ This suggests that the very essence of evaluation places cultural competency at the core of evaluator competency.	▪ The authors argue that the "common thread between culture and evaluation is the concept of *values*. Culture shapes values, beliefs, and worldviews. Evaluation is fundamentally an endeavour of determining values, merit, and worth" (p.6). "… Stufflebeam (2003) describes values as the core of an evaluative endeavour" (p.10).
What are the key terms and definitions around competence, competency and practice standards for evaluators? Note the repeated use of "active"	▪ They note that "cultural competence has been defined in the social program literature from a systemic viewpoint" (p.9) and that in other fields (psychology, mental health, counseling) it covers behaviours, attitudes, policies, practice and research. ▪ They note that "the term *cultural competence* has not been commonly used to characterize evaluator competency in incorporating cultural context in evaluation" (p.11) and some of the recent evaluation papers (up to 2004) were starting "to frame the issue in a culturally responsive framework" (p.11).

SenGupta, S., Hopson, R., & Thompson-Robinson, M. (2004). **Cultural Competence in Evaluation: An Overview**. *New Directions for Evaluation*(102), 5-19.	
here and below, in light of earlier comment.	▪ They identify the beginnings of a definition of cultural competence in evaluation "as a systematic, responsive inquiry that is actively cognizant, understanding, and appreciative of the cultural context in which the evaluation takes place; that frames and articulates the epistemology of the evaluative endeavour; that employs culturally and contextually appropriate methodology; and that uses stakeholder-generated interpretive means to arrive at the results and further use of the findings" (p.13).
What are the range of evaluator competencies and cultural competencies (skills, knowledge and dispositions)?	▪ They note "evaluator[s] active recognition, appreciation and incorporation of culturally related contextual factors into [their] practice (p.11) … also include the less spoken issues of power, institutional racism and social justice (p.11) … [and] that addressing issues of power in evaluation constitutes a significant task" (p.13). ▪ They discuss the how using a range of methods, strategies and resources in order to tease out culture and culturally related contextual factors is "germane to the concept of cultural competence in evaluation" (p.13); and there is a "persistent disconnect between "acceptable" methodologies and the cultural aspects of evaluation" (p.14) (e.g. experimental or quasi-experimental designs) which are "simply incompatible with culturally competent strategies" (p.15). "Cultural competence, by its very nature, calls for a flexible approach to evaluation" (p.15). ▪ "… there are no black and white solutions to the challenges of becoming a culturally competent evaluator. Rather, cultural competence in evaluation is an nuanced endeavour that demands context-specific flexibility and a capacity for understanding and appreciation" (p.14) ▪ They note that "accomplishing cultural competence in one's practice does not mean abandoning one's cultural background,

SenGupta, S., Hopson, R., & Thompson-Robinson, M. (2004). **Cultural Competence in Evaluation: An Overview**. *New Directions for Evaluation*(102), 5-19.	
	worldview, training, and skill sets. Accomplishing cultural competence requires increased and critical self-reflection as the first building block" (p.14).
What are the key issues in the field of evaluation that may affect the ongoing development of evaluation competencies?	▪ They identify the need for: (i) policies, (ii) practice guidelines, (iii) a critical pool of multicultural, multifaceted evaluators, (iv) more available examples of reports and literature on culturally competent theory and practice (where "the issues of cultural competence are addressed as an explicit criterion rather than an unspoken expectation" (p.15)).

Hood, S., Hopson, R., & Frierson, H. (2005). Introduction: **This is Where We Stand**. In S. Hood, R. Hopson & H. Frierson (Eds.), *The Role of Culture and Cultural Context: A Mandate for Inclusion, the Discovery of Truth, and Understanding in Evaluative Theory and Practice* (pp. 1-5). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.	
What are the cultural imperatives that could underpin the development of [cultural] competencies in NZ?	"We accept and willingly act upon our responsibilities as researchers, evaluators, scholars, and socially responsible professionals to serve communities of color and the underserved that have been traditionally disenfranchised in *our* American society. Culturally responsive evaluation is a powerful tool that has not been employed in the evaluation community at large. Moreover, there is a growing knowledge base about the practice of culturally responsive evaluation that can assist us in making our efforts more sensible, robust, and useful. We contend that if evaluators consider and become more responsive to cultural context and adopt strategies that are congruent with cultural understandings, the face of educational evaluation can be profoundly changed for the better." (p.1) "Rapidly changing demographics in the United States and the world make our efforts at once daunting and inescapable. We must not continue to dodge the issue of cultural competence … We must move forward and the time is *now*. Disagreements about how to approach the issue are welcome. We feel the evaluation community should assiduously mount efforts to address issues of related to training culturally competent evaluators, designing culturally competent evaluations, and enhancing the usefulness of those efforts." (p.2)
Imperatives contd	"Our collective experience now enables us to reject the notion

Hood, S., Hopson, R., & Frierson, H. (2005). Introduction: **This is Where We Stand**. In S. Hood, R. Hopson & H. Frierson (Eds.), *The Role of Culture and Cultural Context: A Mandate for Inclusion, the Discovery of Truth, and Understanding in Evaluative Theory and Practice* (pp. 1-5). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.	
and … *What are the key issues in designating and reviewing evaluator competence?*	that methodological training alone will suffice for evaluations of educational activities that serve children of the underclass. … We have zero tolerance for continuing the current practice of assigning evaluators unaware of the cultural landscape to projects that serve the least-served children of our society (i.e., children of color and those in poverty). This is *not* a matter of race of one ethnic group having exclusive rights or insights because of their family of origin. It *is* a matter of acknowledging who is aware of what and how we can maximise our collective talent, skills and insight to make education evaluation as effective as possible." (p.3) "The coeditors of this volume are throwing down their collective gauntlet … : If you don't know our territory, either work in your own territory or open your mind or heart to matters that heretofore have escaped you. We welcome all sentient human beings in our quest to enhance the power of educational evaluators to become more culturally competent in their practice … The road ahead is a long one and we have already experienced defeat – but our quest is invincible. " (p.5)

Nelson-Barber, S., LaFrance, J., Trumball, E., & Aburto, S. (2005). **Promoting Culturally Reliable and Valid Evaluation Practice**. In S. Hood, R. Hopson & H. Frierson (Eds.), *The Role of Culture and Cultural Context: A Mandate for Inclusion, the Discovery of Truth, and Understanding in Evaluative Theory and Practice* (pp. 61-85). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.	
What are the cultural imperatives that could underpin the development of [cultural] competencies in NZ?	"Failure to understand how cultural context interacts with program implementation and impact jeopardizes the validity of the evaluation. In the worst case, spurious conclusions may be drawn that unfairly affect access to resources. One can only conclude that there are both ethical and validity concerns that make it mandatory for all evaluators to learn about cultural context. Culture and cultural diversity influence every context …" (p.61-62) "in the process of assessing strengths and weaknesses of a program, evaluators must have the competence to build on important aspects of cultural knowledge. Without specific understandings of the cultural context in which a program is being implemented, for example, evaluators are likely to miss important information that can shed light on *why* a program has

Nelson-Barber, S., LaFrance, J., Trumball, E., & Aburto, S. (2005). **Promoting Culturally Reliable and Valid Evaluation Practice**. In S. Hood, R. Hopson & H. Frierson (Eds.), *The Role of Culture and Cultural Context: A Mandate for Inclusion, the Discovery of Truth, and Understanding in Evaluative Theory and Practice* (pp. 61-85). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.	
	particular outcomes of impact on a community. … With knowledge of the context, evaluators might be able to contribute positively to future outcomes." (p.62) "… evaluators must have increased awareness of both external and internal factors impacting program goals, and such knowledge would contribute to more valid assessment of a program's overall functioning. Continuing to rely on a universal approach to evaluation will likely to fail to produce reliable and valid inferences about program implementation and outcomes, …" (p.63) "… for the most part, the conceptual foundations for what is accepted as "good" or "progressive" practice do not include the experiences, perspectives, and knowledge of populations that fall outside of American mainstream" (p.64) "… frequently observe a high degree of discontinuity between the assumptions and expectations of many program evaluators and the operational norms of the indigenous communities under study" (p.64)
What are the key issues in designating and reviewing evaluator competence?	"It is a matter of surfacing the culture-based assumptions of both those being evaluated and those doing the evaluation." (p.62) "Evaluators need to be aware of diverse perspectives and knowledgeable about how variables represent themselves across various groups. They must understand factors that require special attention or that may be manifested in unique ways (e.g., the impact of second language acquisition in the case of English learners, … or in indigenous or Asian communities the power of tribal and filial influences). Certainly evaluators cannot know "everything" about all cultural contexts. However developing understandings about local cultures and contexts, and the issues arising in those contexts, would better enable them to adopt strategies that are consistent with the settings under examination." (p.62-63) "… no method can ensure valid evaluation outcomes if deep understanding of the cultural (and historical and political) context is lacking on the part of the person or persons carrying out or facilitating the evaluation. (p.63) Even such fundamental questions as "What counts as data?, "How should key informants

Nelson-Barber, S., LaFrance, J., Trumball, E., & Aburto, S. (2005). **Promoting Culturally Reliable and Valid Evaluation Practice**. In S. Hood, R. Hopson & H. Frierson (Eds.), *The Role of Culture and Cultural Context: A Mandate for Inclusion, the Discovery of Truth, and Understanding in Evaluative Theory and Practice* (pp. 61-85). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.	
	be identified?" … cannot be answered without reference to the immediate context." (p.64) "… need for … program evaluators to become more knowledgeable about indigenous ways of knowing" (p.64) "Such fine-grained understandings depend upon knowledge of local language and culture, which evaluators may make attempts to discern. However, context and culture must also be understood within broader political and historical contexts … The evaluator, as well, must understand his or her own cultural perspective. "[P]eople are always functioning in a sociocultural context. One's interpretation of [any] situation is necessarily that of a person from a particular time and constellation of background experiences" (Rogoff, 2003, p.28). Perhaps the most difficult task is to make explicit one's own culturally influenced assumptions … " (p.64) "Often when seeking "cultural understanding" of different ethnic and minority groups, there is a tendency to overgeneralize a set of histories, attributes, and behaviors to a particular group. … When group membership alone is accepted as an explanation for a pattern of performance, the truth is deeply distorted. … There is no single answer even to such a seemingly simple and well-meaning question as this one." (p.65)
The chapter … As noted previously, cultural competence seems to mean the use of particular methodological approaches. So what are the implications of this, i.e. does this touch on the question - *What are the key issues in the field of evaluation that may affect the ongoing development of evaluation*	… goes on to discuss changes in what type of evaluation is now being valued, i.e. that which is contributing to organizational learning, capacity building and change, such as participatory, practitioner-centered action research or empowerment approaches to evaluation. Links this with indigenous evaluators "stress[ing] that evaluation should create knowledge useful to the community and contribute positively to people's personal lives." (p.67) Notes "there should be some degree of reciprocity: Evaluators ask for a community's time and information and should give something in return" (p.67)

Nelson-Barber, S., LaFrance, J., Trumball, E., & Aburto, S. (2005). **Promoting Culturally Reliable and Valid Evaluation Practice**. In S. Hood, R. Hopson & H. Frierson (Eds.), *The Role of Culture and Cultural Context: A Mandate for Inclusion, the Discovery of Truth, and Understanding in Evaluative Theory and Practice* (pp. 61-85). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.	
competencies?	
Standards of exemplary evaluation practice If anzea puts cultural competence at the centre of its development of competencies, then this will determine the associated importance of some competencies over others, such as is highlighted here.	" … exemplary evaluation practice necessarily entails attention to sociocultural and historical contextual factors in a given community. Teasing apart the components of cultural competence in evaluation, we arrive at the following four broad areas: (p.71) 1. Ability and willingness to take into account the influences of cultural context on program goals, implementation, and outcomes (how to understand the interaction of context with the program). 2. Ability and willingness to honor community-based values, traditions, and customs and capitalize on opportunities to draw from cultural understandings (how to be responsive to the values of the community). 3. Ability and willingness to engage knowledgeable community members in developing focused interventions, communications, and other supports to help ensure that strategies make sense and deliver valid results (how to engage community members). 4. Ability and willingness to create mutuality with community members (how to recognize that others have knowledge; how to distinguish between interpretation and ownership). Development of competence in these areas requires *first* an awareness that one needs to learn as much as possible about a community and *second* a disposition to identify one's own values and assumptions and set aside judgements associated with them … Of course, what is also needed is the skill to connect with community members in meaningful ways in order to learn from them. Negotiating how the evaluation will proceed, who will participate, and how information is to be interpreted and shared will follow." (p.72) The conclusion highlights the role of facilitation skills (in light of the place of participatory evaluation practices as a key strategy to contributing to culturally responsive evaluation). The chapter goes onto discuss each area in detail (p.72-78). And also briefly discusses "ethics in evaluation": "In cases where a program has been designed without regard for

Nelson-Barber, S., LaFrance, J., Trumball, E., & Aburto, S. (2005). **Promoting Culturally Reliable and Valid Evaluation Practice**. In S. Hood, R. Hopson & H. Frierson (Eds.), *The Role of Culture and Cultural Context: A Mandate for Inclusion, the Discovery of Truth, and Understanding in Evaluative Theory and Practice* (pp. 61-85). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.	
	variation in cultural settings, can the same standards and expectations be applied? This question has bearing on the ethical requirement to ensure that evaluation does not cause damage but brings about good for a community." (p.79)

Frierson, H. T., Hood, S., & Hughes, G. B. (2002). Strategies that address culturally responsive evaluation: **A guide to conducting culturally responsive evaluations**. In J. Frechtling (Ed.), *The 2002 user-friendly handbook for project evaluation*: National Science Foundation.	
What is this document about?	This document firstly describes what culture is, why cultural context is important to evaluation and then makes the case for culturally responsive evaluation (have not included the arguments here given time constraints and that some of these will have already been canvassed in review of above documents). It then "examine[s] the role of culturally responsive evaluation at each of the critical phases of the evaluation process, showing how its principles can be applied to enhance good inquiry" (p.64), i.e. (the following quotes are those highlighted in doc) ▪ preparing for the evaluation – "Multiethnic evaluation teams increase the chances of really hearing the voices of underrepresented [participants]." (p.65) ▪ engaging stakeholders – "Stakeholders play a critical role in all evaluations, especially culturally responsive ones." (p.65) ▪ identifying the purpose(s) and intent of the evaluation – "Culturally responsive progress evaluations examine connections through culturally sensitive lenses." (p.66) ▪ framing the right questions – "It is critical that the questions of significant stakeholders have been heard and, where appropriate, addressed. … Questions regarding what constitutes acceptable evidence should be discussed before conducting the evaluation." (p.67) ▪ designing the evaluation ▪ selecting and adapting instrumentation - "Previous use does not guarantee cultural responsiveness. " (p.68) ▪ collecting the data – "The need to train data collectors in

	evaluation studies is great. … Too often the nonverbal behaviors are treated as "error variance" in the observation and ignored." (p.69) ▪ analyzing the data – "Disaggregation of collected data is a procedure that warrants increased attention." (p.71) ▪ disseminating and utilizing the results – "Evaluation results should be viewed by audiences as not only useful, but truthful as well." (p.71).
How could it assist the anzea project?	This document is a 'tool' or guide to 'doing' culturally competent evaluations. It is potentially of a different order or nature from what is needed at this stage, tho' an important and complementary part to developing cultural competency? If the anzea approach to developing competencies is to involve specifying what should occur at each part of the evaluation process for cultural competency to occur, then this, and the other guides referred to, will be important to review in detail.

Hood, S. (2008). The Role of Culture and Cultural Context in Evaluation: **Continuing thoughts on Culturally Responsive Evaluation**. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education Seminar.	
What is this document about?	Slides accompanying a presentation / discussion as above. Definitions included below. Presentation also discusses what is culturally responsive evaluation (i.e. building on Robert Stake's responsive evaluation framework) and relating it to other social justice oriented evaluation approaches (e.g. advocacy evaluation models, values engaged evaluation, empowerment evaluation, transformative participatory evaluation).
What are the key terms and definitions around competence, competency and practice standards for evaluators?	Culture (slide 8): ▪ *the way of life of a group of people, the complex of shared concepts and patterns of learned behaviour that are handed down from one generation to the next through the means of language and imitation*. (Barnouw, 1985) ▪ *the ever-changing values, traditions, social and political relationships, and worldview created, shared and transformed by a group of people bound together by a combination of factors that include a common history, geographic location, language, social class, and religion* (Nieto, 1999) Contextual diversity (slide 12, referenced to SenGupta, Hopson & Thompson-Robinson, 2004)): ▪ Demographic dimensions (race, ethnicity, language, gender,

Hood, S. (2008). The Role of Culture and Cultural Context in Evaluation: **Continuing thoughts on Culturally Responsive Evaluation**. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education Seminar.	
	age, religion, sexual orientation) ▪ Sociopolitical dimensions (power, economy, living situation, class) ▪ Contextual dimensions specific to culture Evaluation and culture (slide 13): ▪ All evaluation standards, guidelines or frameworks are culturally saturated – imbued with both implicit and explicit cultural assumptions. ▪ Cultural competence involves identifying culturally imbedded assumptions, understanding one's own cultural position, and doing evaluation that is multiculturally valid. Cultural competence (slide 14): ▪ *A set of academic and interpersonal skills that allow individuals to increase their **understanding and appreciation** of cultural differences and similarities within, among, and between groups. This requires a **willingness and ability** to draw on community-based values, traditions, and customs, and to work with knowledgeable persons of and from the community in developing focused interventions, communications and other supports*. (Orlandi, 1992)
What are the cultural imperatives that could underpin the development of [cultural] competencies in NZ?	Postscript (slide 34): ▪ All evaluative understandings, judgements, standards, and guidelines are grounded in culture. ▪ Culture is relevant, if not central, to all aspects of the evaluation process. ▪ Evaluators must reflect on their own cultural positions = social location matters ▪ Evaluation is art and science = beyond technicians

Literature reviewed

Most papers have been referenced using APA 5th.

A Cultural Reading of the Program Evaluation Standards, 2nd edition: Executive Summary. (2004). AEA Cultural Diversity Committee Cultural Reading Task Force.

Canadian Evaluation Society National Council Professional Designation Project Plan: 'Work in Progress', Version 9: November 22, 2007, Professional Designation Core Committee

CROSSWALK OF EVALUATOR COMPETENCIES – VERSION 10, Prepared for discussion within the CES Professional Designation Project – March 12, 2008

Competency Assessment document from the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. in Evaluation (IDPE) at Western Michigan University (WMU) – about 2003.

Davidson, E. J. (2006). Needs assessment excerpt from an evaluation completed for ERO of the PGDE.

Draft Core competencies for Highly Effective Research & Evaluation Analysts and Senior Analysts, Prepared for the Family, Child, Youth & Community Research & Evaluation Unit, Centre for Social Research & Evaluation, Ministry of Social Development by Chris Daly of PS… Services, July 2004.

English, B. (2002). Competencies for evaluation practitioners: Where to from here? *Evaluation Journal of Australasia, 2*(2), 13-15.

EES Questionnaire about evaluation competencies

Evaluation for Māori: Guidelines for Government Agencies. (1999). Te Puni Kokiri.

Frierson, H. T., Hood, S., & Hughes, G. B. (2002). Strategies that address culturally responsive evaluation: A guide to conducting culturally responsive evaluations. In J. Frechtling (Ed.), *The 2002 user-friendly handbook for project evaluation*: National Science Foundation.

Gomes, A., & Daly, C. (2004). *What do you need to do to be a highly effective social science evaluator?* Paper presented at the Australasian Evaluation Society International Conference, Adelaide, South Australia.

Guidelines for Ethical Research in Indigenous Studies. (2000). AIATSIS: The Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies.

Hood, S. (2008). The Role of Culture and Cultural Context in Evaluation: Continuing thoughts on Culturally Responsive Evaluation. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education Seminar.

Hood, S., Hopson, R., & Frierson, H. (2005). Introduction: This is Where We Stand. In S. Hood, R. Hopson & H. Frierson (Eds.), *The Role of Culture and Cultural Context: A Mandate for Inclusion, the Discovery of Truth, and Understanding in Evaluative Theory and Practice* (pp. 1-5). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

Identifying evaluator competencies: Workshop facilitated by Pam Oliver and Tania Wolfgramm on behalf of anzea, anzea Conference 2008

Jakob-Hoff, M., & Coggan, C. (2003). Core competencies for evaluators. In N. Lunt, C. Davidson & K. McKegg (Eds.), *Evaluating Policy and Practice: A New Zealand Reader* (pp. 132-137). Auckland: Pearson Education New Zealand Limited.

Nelson-Barber, S., LaFrance, J., Trumball, E., & Aburto, S. (2005). Promoting Culturally Reliable and Valid Evaluation Practice. In S. Hood, R. Hopson & H. Frierson (Eds.), *The Role of Culture and Cultural Context: A Mandate for Inclusion, the Discovery of Truth, and Understanding in Evaluative Theory and Practice* (pp. 61-85). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

Professional Competencies for External Evaluation and Review Evaluators: Draft for discussion purposes, NZQA (date unknown)

Professional Designation Project: THE THREE PILLARS: STANDARDS, ETHICS AND COMPETENCIES, *Professional Designation Core Committee – March 12, 2008*

Report on the SPEaR Best Practice Maori Guidelines Hui 2007. (2007). A collaboration between SPEaR and anzea.

Scriven, M. The real evaluation competencies. Personal communication with Jane Davidson, 2006.

Seeking CES Members Input on Competencies for Canadian Evaluation Practice

SenGupta, S., Hopson, R., & Thompson-Robinson, M. (2004). Cultural Competence in Evaluation: An Overview. *New Directions for Evaluation*(102), 5-19.

Stevahn, L., King, J. A., Ghere, G., & Minnema, J. (2005). Establishing Essential Competencies for Program Evaluators. *American Journal of Evaluation, 26*, 43-59.

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Wingate, L. A. (2005). A Self-Assessment Procedure for Use in Evaluation Training. *American Journal of Evaluation, 26*, 544-561.

Thomas, D. R. (2007). *Client views about cultural competence in primary health care encounters.* Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland.

Tiatia, J. (2008). *Pacific Cultural Competencies: A literature review*: Ministry of Health.

UK Evaluation Society Good Practice Guidelines (date unknown)

Appendices

Appendix one: Example of Gomes and Daly competencies

	Analyst		
	Expected behaviours	**Indicators of competency**	**Activities, training or other means of developing the element**
Critical thinking	• Reads, digests and understands written material quickly • Reviews and combines a range of ideas, knowledge and/or information to identify the key relevant issues and policy implications, and come up with coherent/logical findings • Demonstrates good judgement in deciding what issues are important and need to be communicated • Critically evaluates the respective strengths, weaknesses and quality/ robustness of analysis for arguments and evidence in literature and research reports • Forms sound judgements about the validity, relevance and efficacy of research approaches and analysis, and thinks constructively about how to remedy limitations and problems • Able to make connections between alternative information sources, and identify knowledge gaps • Intellectually curious, with the capacity to raise germane questions and issues in a constructive way, and embrace new ideas • Conclusions show consideration of broader issues, and judgements reflect cogent, coherent, well-structured arguments in constructive debate	• Identifies and locates appropriate sources of information for low complexity issues/problems • Written and oral communications demonstrate understanding and consideration of weaknesses and limitations in articles and reports (eg noting how these detract from generalisations/conclusions, presenting a balanced perspective), and their implications for the issue/problem in focus • Shows evidence of considering broader salient issues and different options available • Notices discrepancies and inconsistencies in available information • Judgements in deciding what is important are sound • Presents sound, well-reasoned arguments	• Establish teams or discussion forums around project problems • Pose a problem for staff to work on, and provide opportunities to present and discuss in wider groups • Require critiques or assessments of proposals and reports, or literature reviews – provide structured coaching and constructive feedback on performance • Ensure responsibility for literature reviews is incorporated into scope of evaluation undertaken for clients • Peer reviews and debriefing on completion of projects/key project phases to reflect on learning experiences and constructive feedback on performance • Team-working opportunities to provide opportunities to see more experienced staff/role models in action • Institute formal coaching and feedback sessions, with identified role models, mentors (internal or external), or manager • Making organisational time available to review literature in a field of study • Provide variety in work, so they're not focused solely on a single project • Give latitude for staff to develop their own ideas; be constructive with advice and praise; suggest other people for them to talk to get alternative points of view • Send on carefully chosen conferences (good ones!) to expose staff to other views, bring speakers to workplace

	Senior Analyst		
	Expected behaviours	**Indicators of competency**	**Activities, training or other means of developing the element**
Critical thinking	• Reads, digests and understands complex written material quickly • Synthesises and combines a range of ideas, knowledge and/or complex information to identify the key relevant issues and policy implications, create new insights, and come up with coherent/logical findings • Demonstrates good judgement in deciding what issues are important and need to be communicated • Critically evaluates the respective strengths, weaknesses and quality/ robustness of analysis for theories and different schools of thought • Forms sound judgements about the validity, relevance and efficacy of theories, and constructively remedies limitations and problems • Able to merge/integrate alternative information sources, theories, perspectives and/or priorities, put old things together in different ways, identify knowledge gaps and come up with new insights and ideas • Can offer complex analyses, seeing the interplay between theory and "real world" research and situations • Finds effective solutions by taking a holistic, abstract, or theoretical perspective • Intellectually curious, with the capacity to raise germane questions and issues in a constructive way, challenge norms, think about possibilities, issues and problems from alternative frames of reference, and embrace new ideas • Conclusions show consideration of broader salient issues, and judgements reflect cogent, coherent, well-structured arguments in constructive debate	• Synthesises a broad range of complex information to identify key issues/implications and offer complex analyses • Considers issues/problems and implications in broader environmental contexts and from alternative frames of reference • Integrates and combines different perspectives and knowledge from different areas to create new insights and ideas • Notices similarities between different and apparently unrelated situations • Quickly identifies the central or underlying issues in a complex situation • Leads debates from evidence on areas in focus, what is/is not known and how knowledge gaps can be met through research programmes • Written and oral communications demonstrate understanding and consideration of strengths and weaknesses in the literature and research relating to an area of social policy • Shows evidence of considering broader salient issues and the consideration of a range of options and the consequences of each • Confidently explains the reasoning behind judgements, conclusions and recommendations • Presents clear straightforward summaries of complex issues • Can think on their feet, assess key issues rapidly • Makes sound decisions under pressure and/or in the face of opposition • Applies a theoretical framework to understand a specific situation	• Task with responsibility to develop a expertise in a particular subject matter for presentation to internal and/or external forums/conference • Peer reviews and debriefing on completion of projects/key project phases to reflect on learning experiences • Exposure to wide range of project types, to challenge and stretch skills/experience • Provide variety in work, so they're not focused solely on a single project • Making organisational time available to review literature in a field of study • Institute formal coaching and feedback sessions, with identified role models, mentors (internal or external), or manager • Give latitude for staff to develop their own ideas; be constructive with advice and praise; suggest other people for them to talk to get alternative points of view • Send on carefully chosen conferences (good ones!) to expose staff to other views, bring speakers to workplace • Encourage further study, networking with other professionals • Establish "formal" mentor system externally to Unit

Appendix two: Checklists from *Evaluation for Māori: Guidelines for Government Agencies* 1999

A set of checklists drawn from:

EVALUATION FOR MÄORI
Guidelines for Government Agencies

A report prepared by

Aroturuki me te Arotakenga
Monitoring and Evaluation Branch
Te Puni Kökiri

May 1999

http://www.tpk.govt.nz/en/in-print/our-publications/publications/evaluation-for-maori---guidelines-for-government-agencies/

Ethical Considerations

- ❑ Adhere to basic principles of respect, upholding integrity, confidentiality and safety
- ❑ Recognise these basic principles and apply these to Mäori individuals and to their whänau, hapü and iwi
- ❑ Employ evaluators with the necessary cultural, language/reo, subject and research competencies to undertake the evaluation
- ❑ Apply valid research methodologies (dependent on the topic and who the Mäori participants are)
- ❑ Convey clearly to Mäori the aims of the evaluation and the anticipated outcomes of the evaluation
- ❑ Ensure Mäori participants know what will become of the information they have volunteered, and its possible use and application
- ❑ Report back to Mäori involved in or affected by the evaluation in a timely and appropriate manner

Planning an evaluation

- ❑ Assess Treaty implications of the programme or policy
- ❑ Analyse potential, actual and future participation by Mäori
- ❑ Get input on issues for Mäori by:
  - Involving Mäori staff within their agency
  - Talking to other agencies such as Te Puni Kökiri
  - Involving stakeholders (at a national and local level)
- ❑ Identify potential Mäori stakeholders
- ❑ Specify clear and realistic objectives for Mäori
- ❑ Estimate resources required for the collection of quality information from Mäori

Designing evaluations

- ❑ Involve Mäori as:
  - stakeholders (local level, participants etc)
  - researchers
- ❑ Select evaluators with the necessary cultural, language/reo, subject and research competencies
- ❑ Collect quality information on and from Mäori by:
  - using high quality research designs for Mäori
  - getting a representative sample for Mäori
  - selecting appropriate interviewers
  - training interviewers to relate to Mäori participants
- ❑ Collect data on Mäori women and men
- ❑ Use appropriate data collection methods for Mäori
- ❑ Use the Statistics New Zealand Principles for Mäori data collection

Conducting evaluation analysis

- ❑ Involve Mäori as:
  - stakeholders (local level, participants etc.)
  - researchers
- ❑ Undertake high quality information and data analysis for Mäori
- ❑ Consider Mäori diversity (differences in age, gender, education, and cultural experiences)
- ❑ Analyse data for Mäori compared to non-Mäori
- ❑ Recognise issues raised by Mäori that fall outside the original objectives
- ❑ Look beyond patterns to try to explain what is happening for Mäori and why?
- ❑ Understand and apply Mäori concepts, paradigms, view points and terms to the analysis

Reporting and communicating evaluation results

- ❑ Consider Mäori diversity (age, gender etc.)
- ❑ Highlight Mäori viewpoints and the diverse needs of Mäori
- ❑ Present results which are significant for Mäori
- ❑ Validate the evaluation results with Mäori (as participants, researchers, and stakeholders)
- ❑ Report the results and findings of the evaluation for Mäori
- ❑ Ensure well-structured and concise reporting
- ❑ Report results back to Mäori
- ❑ Distribute evaluation results in a timely way
- ❑ Feed results into policy and improvements to service delivery for Mäori.

Appendix three: Definition of terms from *Pacific Cultural Competencies: A literature review* 2008

The following is directly copied from the above report.

2. Definitions

There are a number of terms that need to be defined in the context of this literature review. These are discussed in further detail throughout the report. Various concepts are used in the literature, but for the purposes of this review the following terms have been chosen. It is also important to note that for this review, the terms 'competence' and 'competency' are used interchangeably.

Culture and cultural competency

Culture

There are two types of culture: material elements that people create and assign meaning to; and non-material elements that include language, beliefs, ideas, rules, customs, myths and skills (Macpherson and Macpherson 1990). The non-material elements of culture are the focus of this review.

Culture influences an individual's and family's health beliefs, practices, behaviours, and even the outcomes of interventions. Health behaviour depends on how one understands the cause of illness (Minnesota Department of Human Services 2004).

Culture has an effect on how we see, understand and respond to physical and social phenomena (Macpherson and Macpherson 1990; New Zealand Nurses Organisation 1995). It extends beyond language and ethnicity: factors such as age and generational issues, gender, sexual orientation, geographic location, religion and socioeconomic status may have as much – or more – cultural significance for an individual or community (Bennett et al 2005).

Culture is a process, and is not fixed or predetermined. It is formed by individuals, and expresses the interaction between individual subjectivities and collective objectivities (Airini, 1997). Culture, therefore, is dynamic and fluid by nature.

Competency

Competency has been broadly defined as the ability to do something well or effectively (Makins, 1994). A high degree of competency that constitutes effective performance in a defined role is marked by knowledge, attitudes and skills (Ministry of Health National Screening Unit 2004).

Competency, therefore, in the health and disability sector may be described as the ability to effectively produce knowledge and skill to a required standard in order to produce excellence in quality health care, with the ability to transfer this knowledge and skill to new and differing contexts (Ministry of Health National Screening Unit 2004).

Cultural competency

Cultural competence can be defined as a set of academic, experiential and interpersonal skills that allow individuals and systems to increase their understanding and appreciation of cultural differences and similarities within, among and between groups (Counties Manukau DHB 2001; Jansen and Sorrensen 2002).

Therefore, becoming culturally competent requires the ability to draw on the values, traditions and customs of other cultural groups, to work with knowledgeable persons from other cultures,

and shape service delivery to meet patients' social, cultural and linguistic needs by developing targeted interventions and other supports (Betancourt et al 2002; Counties Manukau DHB 2001).

Cultural competency is not merely a skill set to be taught, as argued by Rhymes and Brown (2005); it also involves a fundamental shift in the way one perceives the world. It is a path on which to travel, as opposed to an end to be achieved (Rhymes and Brown 2005).

Pacific cultural competence

Pacific cultural competence is a relatively new concept, and there are no clear definitions. There are, however, working definitions which include the ability to understand and appropriately apply cultural values and practices that underpin Pacific peoples' world views and perspectives on health (Tiatia and Foliaki 2005). It also involves acknowledgement of the various facets of culture, particularly in terms of understanding cultural differences between Pacific clients and their families (Suaalii-Sauni and Samu 2005). Pacific cultural competence has also been defined as the ability to integrate Pacific values, principles, structures, attitudes and practices into the care and delivery of service to Pacific clients, their families and communities (Counties Manukau DHB 2001).

Major complications arise due to lack of agreement on definitions and approaches to cultural competence. For instance, Pacific people occupy different social positions, hold various places of status and encompass a range of backgrounds and experiences. Cultural competence should include all of these diverse dimensions. Culturally competent attitudes and aptitudes are crucial for all marginalised sub-groups, whether based on gender (male, female, trans-gender, fa'afafine); age (elderly, adolescent); sexual preference (gay, heterosexual, lesbian, bisexual); place of birth (island-born or raised, New Zealand-born or raised, or multi-ethnic); disability; or religion.

Individual and organisational cultural competency

Individual cultural competence is the state of being capable of functioning effectively in the context of cultural differences (Finger Lakes Health Systems Agency 2003).

The most commonly used definition for organisational competence is a set of matching behaviours, attitudes, practices, policies and structures that come together in a system, agency or among professionals, enabling that system, agency or those professionals to work effectively in culturally diverse situations (Cross et al 1989).

Other related terms

Cultural safety

The concept of cultural safety is a political idea promoted by M¯aori nurses, which arose from the colonial context of New Zealand society in response to the poor health status of M¯aori and the demands for changes in service delivery (Papps and Ramsden 1996).

Cultural safety attempts to transform health professionals' attitudes with regard to the power relationships they have with their patients (National Aboriginal Health Organization 2006). It has been described as interactions that recognise, respect and nurture the unique cultural identity of each person to safely meet their needs, expectations and rights, and involves showing respect and sensitivity to people, and taking into account their spiritual, emotional, social and physical needs (Paediatric Special Interest Group 1998). In other words, it is an approach that asserts, respects and fosters the cultural expression of the client. This usually requires health professionals to have undertaken a process of contemplation of their own cultural identity, and to have learned to practise in a way that asserts the culture of clients and health professionals (Papps and Ramsden, 1996).

Cultural sensitivity

Cultural sensitivity is defined as a state in which the health professional has regard for a client's beliefs, values and practices within a cultural context, and shows awareness of how their own cultural background may be influencing professional practice (Lister 1999). It also includes the extent to which ethnic/cultural characteristics, experiences, values, behavioural patterns and beliefs of a target population, as well as relevant historical, environmental and social factors, are integrated in the design, delivery and evaluation of targeted health materials and programmes (Resnicow et al 1999).

Culturally safe practice

Culturally safe practice has been described as recognising negative attitudes and the stereotyping of individuals on the basis of their ethnicity, and acting accordingly. Like cultural safety and cultural sensitivity, it involves actions that respect and nurture the unique cultural identity of people and safely meet their needs, expectations and rights. It is believed that a key element of culturally safe practice is establishing a trusting relationship with the patient. It is seen to empower people by emphasising the notion that each person's knowledge and reality are important and valid.

Culturally safe practice facilitates open communication and allows patients to voice their concerns about practices that they may deem unsafe (Nurses Working with First Nations Professional Practice Group et al 2005).

Unsafe cultural practice occurs when the patient is disempowered, humiliated and alienated on the basis of their cultural identity, and is therefore directly or indirectly discouraged from accessing necessary health care (National Aboriginal Health Organization 2006; New Zealand Nurses Organisation 1995).

Acculturation

Acculturation is the process of acquiring, adapting to or adopting a second culture, whereby two distinct cultural groups have continuous first-hand contact, resulting in subsequent changes in the original cultural patterns of either or both groups (Administration of Aging 2004; Strickland and Gale 2001).

Appendix four: Excerpt from *A Cultural Reading of the Program Evaluation Standards, 2nd edition: Executive Summary*. (2004)

The following is directly copied.

Overall observations with Respect to Culture. In reviewing the second edition of the *Programe Evaluation Standards*, we find scant attention to both cultural context overall and specific dimensions of human diversity. In addition to missed opportunities to infuse appropriate cultural considerations in the *Standards*, there are a number of entries that are culturally inappropriate or offensive by virtue of language or content. We appreciate that much of this language/content originated over two decades ago, and we applaud the Joint Committee's intent to bring the *Standards* up to the current level of culturally competent professional practice. We encourage the Joint Committee to reflect on these concerns and take the following actions in rewriting the *Program Evaluation Standards*:

Provide for increased cultural sensitivity.

- Correct dated (and by current usage, insulting) language with respect to cultural diversity, and update cultural examples with current research.
- Avoid taking a deficit approach in addressing culture—e.g., treating it as a barrier or a handicap. Include examples of ways in which culture strengthens and enriches evaluation.
- Either remove racist (e.g., U2), sexist (e.g., A3) and ageist (e.g., U4) illustrative cases or include explicit critique of racism, sexism, and ageism in the case analyses.
- Update the *Standards* for congruence with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and other legislation related to human rights and cultural diversity.

Strengthen references to cultural competence to illustrate its centrality to quality practice.

- Discuss the standards in relation to the entire process of evaluation, including assumptions made early on. Culture infuses the entire evaluation process; however, many of the standards focus on the end stages of interpreting and communicating findings.
- Use the Overview as an opportunity to highlight the relevance of the standard to cultural context and to complex issues of public good. Avoid restrictive language that narrows the scope of the standard.
- Add more descriptive content on cultural context to the case illustrations. Lack of content sends an implicit message that it is not necessary to understand cultural context to practice evaluation well.
- Expand core principles of reliability and validity beyond narrow measurement concerns, incorporating current theory and research and addressing multicultural perspectives.

- Include explicit attention to cultural critique in the analyses of the case illustrations, raising questions, noticing omissions or concerns, and commenting on the use of the standard from a cultural perspective.

- Give greater attention to cultural diversity in operationalizing Guidelines and Common Errors, seeking to broaden the dimensions of cultural diversity that are illustrated or addressed, as well as incorporating cultural content more consistently.

- Expand the focus of the *Standards* beyond micro issues to consider mezzo (organizational) and macro (societal) issues as well, making them more relevant to issues of social justice, public good and other community/social concerns.

- Add a standard on evaluator self-reflection. Self-awareness is a central component of cultural competence and a basic element of responsible professional practice.

- Add a standard on time and timing—a complex issue of great relevance to cultural competence and one that extends far beyond dissemination of results.

- Add a separate standard on sampling so that issues of cultural diversity can be explored and discussed.

Avoid tacitly diminishing cultural competence by overemphasizing preordinate and traditional designs.

- Move away from the current assumption that evaluation designs are preordinate, and give more balanced attention to emergent designs. Because emergent designs are increasingly visible in culturally responsive models of practice, to omit attention to them creates cultural as well as epistemological bias.

- Avoid overly detailed prescriptions that imply a single (majority) approach to implementing a standard. Instead, raise issues important to consider in selecting contextually appropriate strategies.

- Insure even-handed treatment of multiple epistemological and methodological perspectives, including but not limited to those that are grounded in cultural standpoints. The *Standards* should strive to be relevant to the practice of evaluation under all models.

- Notice how the *Standards* position the evaluator in relation to the client and other stakeholders—especially consumers. Standards should be even-handed with respect to evaluator role and privilege so that they apply equally across evaluation models.