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LITERATURE REVIEW ON THE BENEFITS, OUTPUTS, PROCESSES, AND KNOWLEDGE ELEMENTS OF EVALUATION

Benefits of Evaluation

Much of the information about the benefits of evaluation in the literature can be gleaned from discussions regarding what evaluation should and should not be, as well as what it potentially can be if done properly. This summary of the literature suspends judgment on what evaluation should be and looks at how it has been used beneficially and what it potentially can be from the perspective of the client and the client’s clients. In other words, if the client is a funding agency, their clients would be funded programs. If the client is a program, their clients would be users of their programs.

The various definitions of evaluation include statements about the benefits of evaluation. Earlier literature often provides more restrictive definitions of evaluation. For example, in 1980 Scriven defined evaluation in the following way: “Evaluation is what it is, the determination of merit or worth, and what it is used for is another matter.” He later states: “Bad is bad and good is good and it is the job of evaluator to decide which is which.”

However, evaluators such as Carol Weiss saw broader benefits to evaluation than merely defining what is good and bad:

The purpose of evaluation research is to measure the effects of a program against the goals set out to accomplish, as a means of contributing to subsequent decision-making about the program and improving future programming.

Later definitions of evaluation consistently reflect a broader approach, with greater emphasis on the various benefits that can be gained through evaluation. In 1994, Wholey, Newcomer and Hatry point out:

One of our major themes throughout this work is that evaluation . . . should not only assess program results, but also identify ways to improve the program performance.”

---

3 Weiss, Carol H. Evaluation Research: Methods of Assessing Program Effectiveness
In 1997, Michael Quinn Patton provides the following definition of evaluation:

"Program evaluation is the systematic collection of information about the activities, characteristics and outcomes of programs to make judgments about the program, improve program effectiveness, and/or inform decisions about future programming." 5

Shadish, Cook and Leviton provide a definition that focuses even further on the benefits:

"Intrinsic to evaluation is an idealized problem-solving sequence for (a) identifying a problem; (b) generating alternatives to reduce its symptoms; (c) evaluating these alternatives; and then (d) adopting those that results suggest will reduce the problem satisfactorily." 6

Rossi, Freeman and Lipsey reinforce the trend towards defining evaluation in terms of the benefits:

"More specifically, evaluation researchers use social research methods to study, appraise and help improve social programs in their important aspects, including the diagnosis of the social problems they address, their conceptualization and design, their implementation and administration, their outcomes and their efficiency." 7

Both Chelimsky and Patton provide three key areas of benefits. In looking at the literature almost all other benefits specified are subcategories of these three areas. Cheliminsky states:

"These different purposes, along with the questions they seek to address, seem to fall naturally into three general perspectives:

- Evaluation for accountability (e.g. the measurement of results or efficiency)
- Evaluation for development (e.g., the provision of evaluative help to strengthen institutions)
- Evaluation for knowledge (e.g., the acquisition of a more profound understanding in some specific area or field)" 8

Patton identifies a menu for using findings:

Making Overall Judgments
Facilitating Improvements
Generating Knowledge9

These categories are quite similar and have been used to organize the more detailed benefits that have been put forward by others:

---

9 Patton p. 65
Accountability/Making Overall Judgments
- Analyze efficiency and effectiveness
- Measure and account for the results of public policies and programs
- Determine the efficiency of programs, projects and their component processes
- Increase agency responsiveness to the public
- Assess program benefits relative to their cost
- Verify that planned programs do provide services
- Analyze cost compared to outcome
- Determine program quality
- Provide timely and convincing evidence of program effectiveness
- Measure and account for the results of public policies and programs
- Determine the efficiency of programs, projects and their component processes

Development/Facilitating Improvements
- Identify program’s strengths and weaknesses
- Make programs less vulnerable
- Strengthen institutions and improve managerial performance
- Monitor how well programs are functioning
- Examine results
- Provide information needed to maintain and improve quality
- Gain direction for improving programs
- Help agency managers run their programs
- Help policy makers and managers improve their programs while they are underway

Knowledge/Generating Knowledge
- Provide evidence of what works and what does not
- Understand how organizations learn
- Expand results or efficiency measurement from that of local or national interventions to that of global interventions
- Assessment of program impact
- Devote resources to meeting unmet need
- Determine which services produce the best results
- Select the types of programs that offer the most needed services
- Help policy makers and managers decide realistically what their programs can do
- Gain explanatory insights into social and other public problems and efforts to address them

Patton has expanded on his three categories, stating that the evaluation process itself is a benefit:

Process use, then, refers to and is indicated by individual and group changes in thinking and behaviour, and program or organizational changes in procedures and culture, that occur among those involved in an evaluation-type activity (regardless of whether it is so named) as a result of the learning that occurs during that activity.\(^{10}\)

Wholey and Chelimsky both make reference to other benefits that are somewhat different from the three main categories and are more related to advocacy.

- Shaping public opinion about government
- To reform governments through the free flow of valuable information

As early as 1975, Stake pointed out that “People expect evaluation to have many different purposes”\(^\text{11}\). This continues to be the case, with increased emphasis on the responsibility of evaluators to understand the benefits that the clients are expecting from the evaluation and designing the evaluation to meet those expectations.

**Discussion questions:**

1. Do you believe all of the benefits have been covered – is anything missing?
2. Are there any benefits that you would question? Is everything listed really a benefit? If not what is it?
3. Do you know of any examples that you can share of instances where these benefits have been realized?

\(^{11}\) Stake, R.E. *Evaluating the Arts in Education: A Responsive Approach*, Merrill, 1975. p. 15
The Outputs and Processes of Evaluation

This review could easily be titled, “The Challenge of Defining Outputs”. One of the challenges in conducting a literature review on the outputs and process of evaluation is that ‘outputs’ is not a term that is commonly used in the literature; hence this review is based on extrapolation and inference, rather than direct reference to outputs. There is a much more substantial body of literature on ‘process’, with Patton’s work emphasizing that the process is at least as important as the outputs. Perhaps the perspective put forward by Joe Hudson almost a decade ago is a good starting point for thinking about outputs and processes: “No one approach to evaluation is likely to be suitable for all purposes, all potential information uses, and users, nor is any particular evaluation approach necessarily suitable for the different developmental stages of programs.”

In other words, outputs and processes are dependent on what a particular evaluation is attempting to achieve.

A second challenge is defining the terms ‘outputs’ and ‘processes’. The literature refers to various types of outputs and processes, generally without defining the terms. For example, a comprehensive evaluation text such as Rossi, Freeman and Lipsey’s identifies key concepts for each of the chapters. Some of the concepts are clearly outputs and processes, but are not identified as such. King, Stevahn, Ghere and Minnema, in their article on evaluator competencies, indicate a number of things that evaluators must be able to do. In other words, competencies are defined by the outputs and processes that an evaluator must do, in addition to certain knowledge, skills and personal characteristics. For the purpose of this review, ‘outputs’ is defined as the information, ideas or results that are produced by an evaluation, either formally or informally. ‘Processes’ are the means by which the outputs are achieved. Processes also produce benefits on their own.

A third challenge is attempting to get a sense of ‘good practice’ in regard to outputs and processes. Which returns us to the notion that there are ever-growing number of potential outputs and processes that are able to produce benefits only if they are applied in the right way to the right situation. There are no clearly defined ‘best practices’. As pointed out by Patton:

“From a systems point of view, a major problem with many ‘best practices’ is the way they are offered without attention to context. Suppose automobile engineers identified the best fuel injection system, the best transmission, the best engine cooling system, the best suspension system, etc. . . . Let us further suppose, as is likely, that these best subsystems … come from different car models (Lexus, Infiniti, Audi, Mercedes, etc). When one had assembled all the ‘best’ systems from all the best cars, they would not constitute a working car.”

A fourth challenge is distinguishing outputs and processes from benefits and knowledge. There seems to be substantial overlap with both. Patton’s example provides a warning about the negative side of using knowledge to produce an output without placing the process in context. Under such conditions, the output cannot benefit anyone. Conversely, knowledge that is used to produce an output or process within the context of the situation is much more likely to create something beneficial.

The proposed evaluation standards for the Government of Canada demonstrate the interconnectedness between benefits, outputs/processes and knowledge, covering all three with the various standards. The standards that speak directly to outputs and processes are:  

- Evaluation work must incorporate sufficient and appropriate consultation and, where appropriate, apply the advice and guidance of specialists and other knowledgeable persons.
- Evaluation work must produce timely, pertinent and credible findings and conclusions that managers and other stakeholders can use with confidence, based on practical, cost-effective and objective data collection and analysis.
- Evaluation reports must present the findings, conclusions and recommendations in a clear and objective manner.

Mark, Henry and Julnes outline four inquiry modes (yet another taxonomy for looking at outputs and processes) and perhaps most importantly discuss how to make choices between weaker and stronger options. Unfortunately, the selection of outputs is much more complex than they imply. Most often there are more than two choices of outputs or processes. And as pointed out by Patton, getting the right combination for the particular context is of paramount importance. This leads to a situation where evaluators must choose among a seemingly endless numbers of combinations and permutations of options.

Once one determines the primary purpose of the evaluation, it is possible to get guidance on how to proceed. For example, Nutter sets out steps for ongoing evaluation, which indicate what the processes and outputs are to be:

- Determine who is the client for the evaluation
- Discover the client’s most important evaluation questions
- Discover or develop the program logic or structure model
- Confirm the logic and structure model with the evaluation client
- Develop a formal information system that contains performance indicators that will adequately address the client’s evaluation questions
- Develop an analysis and reporting system to supply the evaluation client with reports that answer the client’s questions.

On the other hand, if the primary goal is empowerment, then Fetterman suggests a different approach. His steps (outputs and processes) in conducting an empowerment evaluation are:

17 Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat. Evaluation Policy, February 1, 2001, pp 7-10
Taking stock

- Setting goals
- Developing strategies
- Documenting progress
- Creating a dynamic community of learners

One way of making sense of this is to think of the outputs and processes as tools that one selects that through products produce benefits, and the more choice one has, the more likely one is to find the right set of tools for the particular situation. The following table outlines output, processes and products which serve as tools that are appropriate for the various stages of planning and implementing an evaluation. It synthesizes information from a number of different sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussions about the program</td>
<td>Identification of gaps</td>
<td>Logic models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing the evaluation</td>
<td>Information about the impacts and effects of the program</td>
<td>Research/evaluation questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing data collection instruments</td>
<td>Information about value for money of the program</td>
<td>Research methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Information about why a program/activity is effective/ineffective</td>
<td>Data collection frameworks and tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreting the data</td>
<td>Information about what programs/activities are effective</td>
<td>Analytical frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action planning</td>
<td>Information about harmful/unwanted program effects</td>
<td>Literature reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating the results</td>
<td>New questions regarding programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggestions of good practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Knowledge and skills are what the evaluator brings to the project. Processes are what the evaluators do with their knowledge and skills to produce information, ideas, and results, which we are calling outputs. Outputs are normally (although not necessarily) delivered through products, such as graphs or figures or reports. This project has not been particularly concerned with products, but it is probably important to consider what one is trying to produce. The client benefits from the outputs when he/she uses the information to increase his/her understanding or to make decisions.

The importance of choosing the right outputs and processes for the right situation is described by Rossi, Freeman and Lipsey:

---


Evaluation must tailored to the political and organizational context to be evaluated. It typically involves assessment of one or more of five program domains: (a) the need for the program, (b) the design of the program, (c) the program implementation and service delivery, (d) the program impact on outcomes, and (e) program efficiency. Evaluation requires an accurate description of the program performance or characteristics at issue and assessment of them against relevant standards or criteria.²²

Owen and Rogers summarize all the complexities quite simply: “. . . evaluation as the process of

- Negotiating an evaluation
- Collecting and analyzing evidence to produce findings
- Disseminating to identified audiences”²³

From this literature review, it seems that the following state exists:

- Nobody has defined the term output. Process has received much more attention, but primarily in terms of its direct relationship to benefits.
- No single output or process is going to be appropriate for all situations and all purposes. The literature does not provide much guidance in this area and this project, which attempts to link outputs/processes and benefits, appears to be breaking new ground if, in fact, the interconnectedness works.
- It is hard to separate outputs from benefits, and it is also hard to separate outputs from knowledge/skills.

Discussion Questions

1. Why is it, given that the plethora of literature on seemingly just about every other aspect of evaluation, that outputs are not spoken of in this way?
2. Given that, does it make sense to use the term?
3. If not, what other term makes sense, given there is a certain logic in thinking about the outputs necessary to attain benefits?

The Knowledge Elements of Evaluation

What is the core body of knowledge required by evaluators to enable them to conduct evaluations competently and ethically? The literature addressing this question is both informative and thought-provoking. Several themes emerged:

- The knowledge required varies, depending on the purpose of each specific evaluation;
- Evaluation is an evolving field, so the knowledge required is constantly changing;
- Despite the variety and evolution of evaluation, inventories of knowledge elements have been developed and there appears to be a fairly high degree of agreement on some basic elements;
- The variety and evolution of evaluation implies a need for evaluators to engage in personal life-long learning.

This literature review will explore each of these themes in more detail.

Determining What Knowledge is Required

The knowledge required for any given evaluation depends on the methods that are to be applied. Michael Quinn Patton articulates the complexities of determining methods:

“There are no universal and absolute standards for judging methods. The consensus that has emerged within evaluation, as articulated by the Joint Committee on Standards (1994) and the American Evaluation Association’s Guiding Principles (Shadish, et al, 1995), is that evaluations are to be judged on the basis of appropriateness, utility, practicality, accuracy, propriety, credibility and relevance. These criteria are necessarily situational and context bound.”

The Canadian Evaluation Society (CES) Guidelines for Ethical Conduct indicate:

- Evaluators are to be competent in their provision of service.
  1.1 Evaluators should apply systematic methods of inquiry appropriate to the evaluation.
  1.2 Evaluators should possess or provide content knowledge appropriate for the evaluation.
  1.3 Evaluators should continuously strive to improve their methodological and practice skills.

---

The American Evaluation Association’s (AEA) Guiding Principles for Evaluators indicate:

**Competence:** Evaluators provide competent performance to stakeholders.

1. *Evaluators should possess (or, here and elsewhere as appropriate, ensure that the evaluation team possesses) the education, abilities, skills and experience appropriate to undertake the tasks proposed in the evaluation.*

2. *Evaluators should practice within the limits of their professional training and competence and should decline to conduct evaluations that fall substantially outside those limits. When declining the commission or request is not feasible or appropriate, evaluators should make clear any significant limitations on the evaluation that might result. Evaluators should make every effort to gain the competence directly or through the assistance of others who possess the required expertise.*

3. *Evaluators should continually seek to maintain and improve their competencies, in order to provide the highest level of performance in their evaluations. This continuing professional development might include formal coursework and workshops, self-study, evaluations of one’s own practice, and working with other evaluators to learn from their skills and expertise.*

Both the CES and AEA guidelines imply that evaluators must first have the skills and knowledge to determine what is required to conduct a particular evaluation and second must have sufficient insights into their own knowledge and skills to determine whether they can undertake a specific evaluation. The AEA guidelines make explicit the expectation that no single evaluator is expected to have the full range of skills, rather that evaluators must be able to form teams with the requisite abilities for any given assignment. This is reinforced by J. Bradley Cousins: “Approaches to evaluation and applied social research are increasingly relying on members of the research community (e.g. trained evaluators) working in collaboration with members of the community practice (e.g., program managers or implementers).”

Whitehead and Avison further support that the selection of methods must be appropriate to the circumstances: “Two principal conclusions can be drawn from this analysis of evaluation frameworks. First, not only do different types of analyses produce different information, but that information differs in scope and validity. . . The second conclusion is that although not all evaluations need to do everything, if they are to be accurate and useful it is nevertheless important that there be a reasonable balance of scope and validity. The framework that we call comprehensive evaluation can be used as the basis for making choices and trade-offs in selecting the circumstances, what needs to be done, and how it will be used.”

The Kellogg Foundation provides advice on what to look for in an evaluator, depending on what the evaluation is intended to do. “If the evaluation purpose is to determine the worth or merit of

---

a program, you might look for an evaluator with methodological expertise and experience. If the evaluation is focused on facilitating program improvements, you might look for someone who has a good understanding of the program and is reflective. If the primary goal of the evaluation is to design new programs based on what works, an effective evaluator would need to be a strong team player with analytical skills. Experience tells us however that the most important overall characteristic to look for in an evaluator are the ability remain flexible and to problem-solve.”

In order for the evaluator to produce the benefits expected by the client, as well as any unanticipated benefits, it is essential first to assess those expectations in the context of the program in order to determine the appropriate evaluation approach and methodology. The selected approach and methodology determine the knowledge required by the evaluation team.

Evaluation: A Constantly Changing Field

Evaluation is a relatively new and quickly changing area, making it both exciting and challenging at the same time. This is reflected in discussions regarding the changes as well as in thinking about the future. The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation devoted the special issue in 2001 to reflecting on the development of evaluation in provinces across Canada. The American Journal of Evaluation devoted the fall issue to reflections on the future of evaluation. The American Evaluation Association also publishes New Directions for Evaluation, a journal entirely devoted to changes in evaluation.

Arnold Love pointed out, “During the past 30 years, evaluation has made enviable strides in theory and practice around the globe. Evaluation is becoming increasingly diverse and reflects an ever-changing socio-economic and political context. To remain relevant, however, evaluation must innovate.” This implies that evaluation will continue to change.

What are some of these changes? As indicated by Les McLean, “Case studies, performance indicators, logic models, high-tech measurement, critical theory – none of these were discussed widely, if at all, even 20 years ago. The theory and practice of program evaluation are both rich and varied in ways no one predicted, as the annual conferences of the CES and AEA attest. What we can safely predict is that they will continue to evolve and grow in exciting ways.”

New terms are constantly coming into use. Meta-evaluation, evaluability assessment, economic evaluation, and data mining all represent changes in evaluation within recent years. Changes in technology have changed the ways in which data is gathered and analyzed. Any comprehensive discussion on surveys must include e-based methodologies. The notion of comparative research takes on a different meaning as the potential for global data bases become reality. User-friendly, PC compatible statistical packages make it possible for anyone with the skills to collect and analyze relatively large quantitative data bases. It can also make it possible for those without adequate skills to have access to tools that may be misused. The technological advances place increased responsibility on evaluators to know the limits of their abilities.

---

A review of evaluation practices across Canada reinforces the evolving nature of the field. Mark Season concludes, “The message is clear: evaluation is evolving at the provincial level. As Bradley argues, evaluation practice will survive where it is perceived to add value to public-sector management and enhances the learning environment. Further, evaluation must adapt to the prevailing political and administrative culture if it is to survive”.

As evaluation changes, so do the expectations of the users of evaluations. Valerie J. Caracelli points out, “These changes in practice expanded the roles and responsibilities of evaluators, with confident changes occurring in our understanding of the multi-dimensional aspects of use.” Clients are becoming more knowledgeable and expecting more. The related field of evaluation capacity building (ECB) is being developed, which can only serve to raise expectations even further. “ECB is the intentional work to constantly co-create and co-sustain an overall process making quality evaluation and its uses routine in organizations and other systems . . . The ECB practitioner’s orientation is to a longer-term, ongoing process of co-creation and co-sustention rather than to completing discrete, isolated evaluation studies.”

This constant evolution means that the knowledge required to carry out evaluations must be expected to expand.

**Inventory of Knowledge**

Determining the knowledge required to carry out evaluation feels a bit like shooting a high-speed missile with a musket – no matter how close we come we can never be fully on target. Despite this challenge, a significant portion of the literature speaks to the skills, knowledge, abilities and attributes required to conduct evaluation. It also shows progression from the asking of questions to the development of taxonomies that can serve as useful tools to both evaluators and those who use evaluators.

In 1991, Shadish, Cook and Leviton listed questions related to knowledge construction. Although aimed at the evaluator, they can also be useful to those making decisions about engaging an evaluator. Perhaps more importantly, their questions provide a context in which to explore the knowledge required. Their overview questions are summarized as follows:

1. **What criteria are you going to use in deciding what constitutes acceptable knowledge?**
2. **What kind of knowledge does the client who paid for the evaluation want?**
3. **What kind of knowledge, if any, do you think should be most important in the evaluation?**
4. **Can you produce the required knowledge, at the desired level of certainty, in the time available?**

---

What arrangements will you make to carry out critical evaluation of your own evaluation?35

Daniel Caron outlined what he felt were the nucleus of courses for a study program in evaluation. The four key modules he suggested are:

Module 1: Understanding the Investigation Environment
Module 2: Research Methods
Module 3: Design and Analysis
Module 4: Management and Communication36

The functional table of contents from The Program Evaluation Standards, 2nd Edition,37 outlines the major tasks of program evaluation, and can be viewed as a starting point for determining evaluation competencies and complete the picture when combined with the associated guidelines and standards.

In its paper on evaluation competencies, the Australian Evaluation Society38 outlines four key areas of competence:

- Knowledge or cognitive competence (e.g. models, theories, context, research methodology, project management, communication, organizational processes)
- Functional competence (e.g. focus, design, data collection, analysis, planning, reporting)
- Personal or behavioural competence (e.g. problem-solving, analytical thinking, conceptual thinking, self-control, self-confidence, tenacity, initiative, professional development)
- Values/ethical competence (e.g. personal, professional)

Consistent with the functions outlined in the standards is a taxonomy of essential competencies developed by King, Stavahn, Ghere and Minnema39, based on their exploratory study on the extent to which evaluation professionals could reach agreement on essential evaluator competencies. They concluded that there may be more agreement on the competencies needed by evaluators than initially anticipated, based on finding a 78% agreement on the competencies in their taxonomy. They also concluded that the areas where consensus did not emerge reflected the role- and context-specific nature of evaluation practice, thus supporting the notion that the knowledge depends on the expected benefits and the outputs necessary to gain those benefits. Their table of essential evaluator competencies is comprehensive and shows areas of agreement and disagreement.

---

38 Australian Evaluation Society. Evaluation Competencies, no date.
### Essential Evaluator Competencies: Means and Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Systematic Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA. Able to do research-oriented activities*</td>
<td>95.10</td>
<td>60-100</td>
<td>87.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA1. Framing the research questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA2. Research design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA3. Measurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA4. Research methods (quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB. Able to do evaluation-oriented activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB1. Evaluation theory, models, and underlying philosophical assumptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB2. Needs assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB3. Framing the evaluation questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB4. Evaluation design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB5. Evaluation processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB6. Making judgments*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB7. Developing recommendations*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB8. Meta-evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC. Able to do activities common to both research and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC1. Literature review*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC2. Sampling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC3. Instrument construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC4. Data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC5. Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC6. Data interpretation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

40 Ibid. pp233-235
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Competent Evaluation Practice</strong></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II A. Able to serve the information needs of intended users</td>
<td>94.35</td>
<td>55-100</td>
<td>96.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II B. Able to do situational analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II B1. Knowledgeable about organizational development, change and politics</td>
<td>95.48</td>
<td>75-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II B2. Able to analyze the political context of an organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II B3. Respectful of the uniqueness of the evaluation site and client</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II B4. Open to others’ input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II B5. Able to adapt/change study as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C. Able to organize and manage evaluation projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C1. Able to respond to a request for proposal</td>
<td>93.23</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C2. Able to write formal agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C3. Able to budget an evaluation</td>
<td>98.06</td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>78.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C4. Able to access needed resources (information, personnel, instruments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C5. Able to supervise others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C6. Able to train others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C7. Able to conduct the evaluation in a non-disruptive manner*</td>
<td>87.58</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C8. Able to complete work in a timely manner</td>
<td>95.29</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II C9. Able to deal with stress during a project*</td>
<td>79.42</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>81.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.65</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>94.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89.52</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. General Skills for Evaluation Practice</strong></td>
<td>91.61</td>
<td>60-1001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III A. Logical and critical thinking skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III B. Written communication skills</td>
<td>97.58</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III C. Verbal communication skills</td>
<td>92.90</td>
<td>60-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D. Interpersonal competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D1. Negotiation skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D2. Conflict resolution skills*</td>
<td>95.71</td>
<td>60-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D3. Group facilitation skills</td>
<td>94.19</td>
<td>75-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D4. Group processing skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D5. Teamwork/ collaboration skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III D6. Cross-cultural skills*</td>
<td>87.10</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III E. Computer application skills*</td>
<td>87.26</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.61</td>
<td>75-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.32</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td>Domains</td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV: Evaluation Professionalism</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVA. Knowledge of yourself as an evaluator*</td>
<td>88.39</td>
<td>60-100</td>
<td>89.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVB. Ethical conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVB1. Ensures the honesty and integrity of the evaluation</td>
<td>99.52</td>
<td>85-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVB2. Is able to convey to potential clients your evaluation approach and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVB3. Respects the security, dignity and self-worth of the respondents, program, participants, clients and other stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVB4. Is responsible for contributing to the general and public welfare*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC. Knowledge of professional standards (e.g., Joint Committee Standards, AEA Guiding Principles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVD. Application of professional standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVE. Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVE1. Is aware of needs for professional growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVE2. Reflects on practice*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVE3. Networks*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVE4. Updates personal knowledge in the evaluation field (e.g., workshops, conferences, journals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVE5. Updates knowledge in relevant content areas*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVE6. Contributes to the knowledge base of evaluation*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Bold and asterisk (*) indicate “real” disagreement on perceived importance: see text for explanation.

Donna Mertens\textsuperscript{41} provides a slightly different taxonomy, categorizing the knowledge and skills into the following areas: research methodology; borrowed from other areas; and unique to specific disciplines. As with others, she emphasizes the importance of a range of skills and knowledge set in the context of the ethics and values. Torres, Preskill and Piontek reinforce the importance of the range of competencies presented by King in their discussion of the breadth and depth of knowledge required by evaluators pointing to the key areas of: organizational change, consultation and facilitation; gender and multicultural sensitivity and ethics and values.\textsuperscript{42}

Hatry, Newcomer and Wholey further emphasize the need for a diversity of skills, knowledge and attributes: \textit{“Evaluators need a variety of skills to be effective. They should be good analysts. They should be gifted at listening. Evaluators should also possess marketing skills. They must communicate the value of evaluation to policy-makers and managers who may not...”}


appreciate the benefits to be derived from systematic evaluation efforts."\textsuperscript{43} Torres, Preskill and Piontek emphasize the need to develop the softer skills in order to communicate and report findings effectively. They point out: "Indeed, the entry point for any learning to occur is communication. For the evaluator’s part, this communication is about evaluation approaches, activities and findings. It occurs throughout all phases of an evaluation, from early planning stages to follow-up."\textsuperscript{44}

The competency standard established by the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat states: “The person or persons carrying out evaluation, or evaluation-related work, must possess or collectively possess the knowledge and competence necessary to fulfill the requirements of the particular evaluation work.”\textsuperscript{45} The guidance provided states: “Evaluators should possess or ensure the provision of content knowledge appropriate for the evaluation and continuously strive to improve their methodological and practice skills. Evaluators should possess the knowledge, skills and experience in:

- The application of sound research design able to answer the chosen questions;
- The collection and analysis of reliable quantitative and qualitative data; and
- The development of valid, credible and unbiased conclusions and recommendations.”\textsuperscript{46}

This standard reinforces the responsibility for evaluators to first determine the benefits or outcomes that are anticipated by the client, and develop approaches, methodologies and outputs appropriate to achieve those benefits and outcomes. That will then determine the specific knowledge and skills required for the specific evaluation.

M.F. Smith, in responding to the articles on the future of evaluation in the fall, 2001 American Journal of Evaluation, points out the range of opinion regarding what skills are needed: “Many authors identify needed evaluation skills. These include:

- Strategies for coping with the information revolution (Love); that is, assisting government with electronic delivery of information and services; learning to use new technologies for real-time data collection and analysis; and moving beyond simply collecting and storing data to performing analyses and making reports accessible and useful for intelligent and timely decisions;
- Strategies for engaging, coping with and capitalizing on the political side of evaluation (Stake)
- Skills for promoting organizational learning; for example collaboration and facilitation, interpersonal communication, team development, group process, consulting, organizational behaviour and change (Torres & Preskill)
- Interpersonal and group dynamic skills for working in collaborative relationships, partnering with stakeholders, and serving as coach, facilitator and critical friend

\textsuperscript{44} Torres, Preskill and Piontek. p. 64
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid.
Cultural sensitivity, mediating, negotiating and conflict resolution (Datta);

A few evaluators will serve as technical experts (Fetterman); and

Skills for providing training for organization members in such areas as strategic planning and development of goals (Wholey), though Worthen predicts that evaluators will fail to embrace such areas and then face the consequence of competition from other professions that will satisfy these needs.”

Implications for Professional Development

Based on this review, it seems that both users and providers of evaluation need to have sufficient basic knowledge to enable them to determine what knowledge, skills and attributes are required for a specific evaluation. The literature also emphasizes the evolving and diverse nature of evaluation. Some, such as Enoch Sawin may view this as a problem: “There are serious problems and issues in program evaluation in terms of both theory and practice. This seems to be attributable largely to the wide diversity of approaches. Redefining the evaluation in a specific way that will be generally acceptable seems impossible. Unless the diversity is reduced, we need a new name for the field, or more likely a generally agreed-on set of names. Team approaches and some specialization by evaluators should help to cope with the diversification that increasingly characterizes the field.”

The majority of the literature presents the diversity of evaluation as a challenge, but also a strength. It speaks to the need for ongoing professional development, both for evaluators and for those who use evaluators. There are clearly both soft skills required such as communication, mediation, listening and hard skills such as statistics, survey design to name but a few. As pointed out by Burt Perrin: “You should acknowledge that there are gaps in your knowledge and skill base. In particular, you may need to enhance your people skills and learn the ‘art’ of practical utilization-focused evaluation.”

All of this also speaks to what makes evaluation unique: a field that is diverse and flexible, while at the same time is built on long-standing and respectable fields of study including sociology, economics and mathematics.

Discussion questions:

(1) Does the knowledge required depend on the specific evaluation?

(2) If we agree that the knowledge required depends on the specific evaluation, what are the implications for the development of evaluators?

(3) Even a comprehensive list such as King’s does not get into the knowledge related to specific methods such surveys, focus groups, cost-benefit analysis, etc. Should it? Is it more important to talk about attributes and competencies than about specific knowledge?

---

