

## EVALUATOR COMPETENCIES: THE CANADIAN EXPERIENCE

Heather Buchanan  
Jua Management Consulting Services

Keiko Kuji-Shikatani  
Ontario Ministry of Education

**Abstract:** This article examines the development and adoption of competencies<sup>1</sup> in Canada, created as a key foundation of the Credentialed Evaluator designation under the auspices of the Canadian Evaluation Society (CES). Following a brief description of the Canadian evaluation context and issues that led to the competencies' development, this article reviews the development process. The approved Competencies for Canadian Evaluation Practice are presented with concluding comments on the future of competencies in Canada.

**Résumé :** Cet article examine le développement et l'adoption des compétences au Canada, créées comme un fondement essentiel de la désignation d'évaluateur accrédité sous les auspices de la Société canadienne d'évaluation (SCÉ). Après une brève description du contexte canadien de l'évaluation et des questions qui ont conduit au développement des compétences, cet article passe en revue le processus de développement. Les compétences approuvées pour la pratique canadienne d'évaluation sont présentées avec les observations finales sur l'avenir de compétences au Canada.

### INTRODUCING THE CANADIAN EVALUATION CONTEXT

The evaluation community in Canada, as represented by membership in its national professional organization, the Canadian Evaluation Society (CES), includes roughly 1800 individuals in 11 regionally based chapters. It has been described (Borys, Gauthier, Kischuk, & Roy, 2005) as a “practice-based membership” with roughly 30% employed in the federal government and 19% in provincial governments (who work as internal evaluators conducting and managing evaluations). Another 20% of the CES membership

---

Corresponding author: Heather Buchanan, Consultant, Jua Management Consulting Services, 105–369 North River Road, Ottawa, ON, Canada, K1L 8C2; <hbuchanan@jua.ca>

are external evaluators, employed in the private sector (primarily in consulting firms undertaking evaluations for the public, not-for-profit, and private sectors). Fewer than 10% of members come from academia, a distinct differentiation from our neighbours to the south in the American Evaluation Association (AEA), where roughly 40% are employed in colleges and universities (MacDonald & Buchanan, 2011). Canadian evaluators have diverse educational backgrounds, largely in health, education, psychology, and sociology, and the majority (60%) hold a master's degree with the balance having bachelor degrees (20%) or PhDs (20%). There is an ongoing saga within the community about the "accidental evaluator," where evaluators describe "stumbling upon" (as opposed to pursuing) their professional career paths in evaluation. In part, this may derive from the lack of dedicated evaluation education with the Canadian colleges and universities (Consortium of Universities for Evaluation Education [CUEE], 2008). It has, in any case, brought those with diverse backgrounds into the community, an added challenge in the search for a professional identity.

Regional distribution of the membership is another key feature of the community, with a strong influence from central Canada and from the federal government. Roughly 30% of CES members are located in the National Capital region (Ottawa) and another 20% in the balance of Ontario. Evaluation within the federal government has been influential on both the demand and supply sides of the function in Canada.

Evaluation in the federal government context has been traced back to the 1960s (Muller-Clemm & Barnes, 1997), but was institutionalized with the adoption of the first government-wide evaluation policy in 1977. New policies followed almost each decade (in 1981, 1994, and 2009), building successive and sometimes conflicting foundations for the evaluation function—its purpose, focus, timing, and approach. Policy changes over the years have been described as moving the function away from traditional roots of determining policy and program effect to an increased concern with fiscal accountability and enforcement (Sheppard, 2012). In spite of three-plus decades of history, some have argued that "very little in the way of fundamental change to the function has taken place" (Segsworth, 2005, p. 193). In either view, the Canadian federal government is both a major consumer and producer of evaluations in Canada. Evaluation is currently a \$67.4 million dollar business in the Canadian federal government, involving some 497 internal human resources and ad-

ditional external (consulting) resources used in the large majority (73%) of federal government evaluations (Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat [TBS], 2012).

The evaluation community and the CES have matured alongside the evaluation function in the federal government. Canadian traditions, including tensions arising from geographic dispersion and federal/local power (im)balances, are similarly embedded in this 30-plus year professional organization, which was constituted in 1981. This is the context within which the CES pursued the development of evaluator competencies, under the rubric of professionalizing evaluation and the professional designations initiative.

## EVOLUTION AND DISCUSSION OF PROFESSIONALIZATION

The CES vision—“advancement of evaluation theory and practice”—has, over the years, included varying emphases on leadership, knowledge, advocacy, and professional development. CES has pursued several key initiatives related to defining, codifying, and advancing Canadian evaluation practice:

- **Evaluation Ethics:** *Guidelines for Ethical Conduct* was developed through extensive consultations with members from 1988 until approved in 1996.<sup>2</sup> The guidelines address issues of competence, integrity, and accountability for evaluators and were reviewed and reaffirmed by National Council in 2006 and 2008.
- **Evaluation Skills:** The development in 1999 of a flagship training course, the *Essential Skills Series* (ESS),<sup>3</sup> looked to enhance program evaluation skills and promote the professional practice of evaluation across Canada. ESS has been updated over the years to accommodate the evolution of the field of program evaluation. ESS consists of four one-day modules: Understanding Program Evaluation, Building an Evaluation Framework, Improving Program Performance, and Evaluating for Results. The course targets new evaluators, those who manage evaluation projects within their organizations, and those who would like a refresher course on the main concepts and issues in program evaluation.
- **Evaluation Knowledge:** CES commissioned a special research study in 2002, *The Canadian Evaluation Society Project in Support of Advocacy and Professional Development: Evaluation Benefits, Outputs, and Knowledge Elements—*

commonly referred to as the CBK/Core Body of Knowledge study—to gain a better understanding of the knowledge base of evaluation practice. The CBK identified 151 knowledge, skill, and practice items within six overall categories: ethics (integrity and competence); evaluation planning and design; data collection; data analysis and interpretation; communication and interpersonal skills; and project management associated with evaluation practice (Zorzi, McGuire, & Perrin, 2002).

- Evaluation Standards: CES has been a longstanding, active member of the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation and has taken part in the discussion of what constitutes quality practice in evaluation. CES formally adopted the *Program Evaluation Standards* (2008, 2012),<sup>4</sup> which include the categories of utility, feasibility, propriety, accuracy, and accountability in evaluation process and products.

Although these initiatives built a strong foundation and identity for the Canadian evaluation community as to what constitutes ethical, quality evaluation practice, there continued to be an ongoing dialogue on “professionalizing” evaluation practice in Canada, specifically through a professional designation such as certification and/or accreditation. The debate was fueled by issues of poor evaluation quality and underfunding and questions on evaluation usefulness leading to credibility problems (Gussman, 2005). Moreover, the lack of clear demarcations and defined parameters for the evaluation function, as well as standardized entrance requirements (notably in comparison to those in the audit community), were seen to be challenges (CES, 2006). Evaluators questioned their professional identity and spoke of a desire to better define the nature of their work and examine means of recognizing the skills and knowledge required to do that work (Boryst et al., 2005).

In response, the CES commissioned a study, *Fact Finding Regarding Evaluator Credentialing*, through an open request for proposals in 2006. The RFP sought

an action plan that would aid the Canadian Evaluation Society (CES) in establishing a professional credentialing system including a member registry. By professional credentialing system is meant a mechanism or means of determining whether an applicant’s educational or prac-

tical experiences and achievements warrant the award of a professional credential.... The action plan would be based on fact-finding research including reviews or consultation of professional practice organizations that currently operate credentialing systems. The action plan would identify specific benefits and risks of credentialing and provide options for consideration by CES. (CES, 2006, p. 1)

A consortium of experienced evaluators responded to the RFP and produced a comprehensive *Action Plan for the Canadian Evaluation Society with Respect to Professional Standards for Evaluators*, accompanied by a literature review and annex of interview results. The report urged the CES to move forward with a program of professional designations, to include three types: Member, Credentialed Evaluator, and Certified Professional Evaluator (CES, 2007a). It was suggested that the development of core competencies was fundamental to any professional designation.<sup>5</sup> The CES responded to the report (CES, 2007c), essentially supporting the development of a credential level of designation as a first step in exploring this approach to professionalization. The issue was put to the CES membership through an extensive consultation process. There were four approaches to the 2007 consultation:

1. an interactive public exchange on the CES web forum EDÉ-L;
2. private e-mails received by the Chair of the Member Services Committee of National Council;
3. CES chapter consultation events and briefs and briefs received as a consequence of a call for input from various organizations with an interest in the professional designations of evaluators (Cousins, Maicher, & Malik, 2007); and
4. a presentation of consultation results at a town hall meeting convened at the 2007 CES Conference, including an open mike discussion on the issue.

Although there were (and are) mixed feelings on the pursuit of any type of professional designation, CES decided in August 2007 to move forward with the development of a Credentialed Evaluator (CE) designation. This laid the foundation for developing evaluator competencies, which were seen, in concert with ethics and standards, to be one of the three essential pillars to a designation (CES, 2007b).

## PROCESS OF COMPETENCY DEVELOPMENT

The CES National Council noted that “a well-structured and agreed knowledge base is essential to any system of professional designation” and proposed “undertaking a ‘cross-walk’ (cross referencing with the goal of determining points of overlap and difference) of different extant knowledge bases to develop a comprehensive list of evaluator competencies” (CES, 2007c, pp. 6, 7). CES had not clearly articulated what competencies are required in evaluation, although they had been steadily refining what foundational knowledge is required of evaluators through updating of the ESS and research activities such as the CBK projects.

As a first step, the Professional Designations Project conducted the crosswalk of evaluation competencies to inform the development of the *CES Competencies for Canadian Evaluation Practice*. The crosswalk builds on the taxonomy of Essential Competencies for Program Evaluators (ECPE) advanced by Stevahn, King, Ghere, and Minnema (2005), in which they conducted a crosswalk of evaluator competencies by examining guidelines developed by organizations that primarily function to advance the professional practice of program evaluation. The Stevahn et al. (2005) analysis included the 1999 version of the CES’ Essential Skills Series, along with the Joint Committee Program Evaluation Standards and the American Evaluation Association’s Guiding Principles. For the purpose of the Professional Designations Project, Stevahn et al.’s (2005) definition of competencies, “the knowledge, skills, and dispositions program evaluators need to achieve standards that constitute sound evaluations” (p. 48), was used. Competencies are attributed to people’s skills, which constitute the source of their ability to carry out effective, quality evaluations. The CES crosswalk was built on the ECPE (Stevahn et al., 2005) and aligned with

1. ESS of the Canadian Evaluation Society (2007 version)—ESS is a four-day introductory training course and represents what CES understands as the overview of essential competencies required in program evaluation.
2. CES CBK study—The CBK study identified six categories of knowledge elements: ethics (integrity and competence); evaluation planning and design; data collection; data analysis and interpretation; communication and interpersonal skills; and project management.

3. Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS) Competencies for Evaluators in the Government of Canada. These were included because the Treasury Board is both a major employer and purchaser of evaluation in Canada. The TBS Evaluation Profile describes generic characteristics deemed important for successful performance of evaluation work at the junior, intermediate, and senior professional levels, up to but not including positions at the executive or equivalent levels within the Canadian federal government's public service community. The 14 evaluation competencies are organized into five clusters: (a) intellectual competencies, (b) future building competencies, (c) management competencies, (d) relationship competencies, and (e) personal competencies.<sup>6</sup>
4. Joint Committee Program Evaluation Standards (1994) as in Stevahn et al. (2005). As noted above, Canadian evaluators have been involved in the development of the JCPE standards as a member of the committee and have endorsed them for Canadian evaluation practice.
5. American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles (1995) as in Stevahn et al. (2005).
6. United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), Evaluation Capacity Development Task Force (2007) Core Competencies for Evaluators in the UN System. Competencies were developed for four levels of evaluator. As these tend to be successive levels of responsibility, but generally capture the competencies, those listed at the Intermediate level only were used in this crosswalk comparison. This was included to provide a broader international perspective.

The crosswalk of program evaluator competencies was conducted using the decision rules applied in Stevahn et al.'s (2005) study where the intent or grounding spirit for each item was considered, rather than specific words or phrases (without context). In addition, all original authors of the works in the crosswalk (cited above) were consulted to validate the placement of the competencies based on their intent.

The Crosswalk of Program Evaluator Competencies had two important outcomes:

1. It validated the work of Stevahn et al. (2005) by showing alignment with their ECPE.

2. It highlighted areas where the Canadian knowledge base (represented in ESS and CBK) presented additional details, such as in competencies that focus on technical aspects of evaluation practice (design, data collection, analysis, interpretation, and reporting).

This exercise allowed for the identification of gaps and overlaps, and—most importantly—CES saw the crosswalk as validating and providing sufficient confidence in the existing knowledge base to inform the development of the CES Competencies for Canadian Evaluation Practice (CCEP). The Professional Designations Core Committee (PDCC) drafted the CCEP by drawing from all of the references in the crosswalk and reflecting the then-current Canadian evaluation environment. The CCEP attempted to fully capture the specialized evaluation skills, knowledge, and abilities of our community, yet be generic enough to be applicable across the broad range of evaluation work undertaken, notably sector-specific expertise.

The CCEP consists of five competency domains—high-level categories—under which the competencies are organized. Each of the five categories is seen to be an essential component of overall evaluation practice, comprehensive without being exhaustive, and attempting to include the increasing work done in the area of performance measurement in Canada. The five domains identified for evaluation work in Canada are

*1.0 Reflective Practice:* Competencies focus on the fundamental norms and values underlying evaluation practice and awareness of one's evaluation expertise and needs for growth.

*2.0 Technical Practice:* Competencies focus on the specialized aspects of evaluation, such as design, data collection, analysis, interpretation, and reporting.

*3.0 Situational Practice:* Competencies focus on the application of evaluative thinking in analyzing and attending to the unique interests, issues, and contextual circumstances in which evaluation skills are being applied.

*4.0 Management Practice:* Competencies focus on the process of managing a project/evaluation, such as budgeting, coordinating resources, and supervising.

*5.0 Interpersonal Practice:* Competencies focus on people skills, such as communication, negotiation, conflict resolution, collaboration, and diversity.

The development of the CCEP included a series of member consultations. In March 2008, CES members were provided with the background<sup>7</sup> on the development of the CCEP and the crosswalk of competencies, and were asked to consider how the proposed competencies fit with other dimensions of evaluation practice, notably standards and ethics. PDCC noted that the development of a system for credentialed evaluators in Canada rests on three important aspects, “the three pillars: standards, ethics, and competencies,” which collectively define and shape evaluation practice (Buchanan, Maicher, & Kuji-Shikatani, 2008). 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, then, provide an umbrella under which the competencies and standards are applied. This is not a static picture. It is one that needs to evolve as the demand and supply of evaluation services evolve and grow over time in response to both changing contexts and innovation within the profession itself.<sup>8</sup> PDCC noted:

- The alignment of these “three pillars” of professional designations (standards,<sup>9</sup> ethics, and proposed competencies) demonstrates the crosscutting and overlapping nature of these three dimensions.
- The proposed competencies will provide the requisite coverage of the standards: *given these competencies, an acceptable standard of product can be produced.*
- The CCEP demonstrate the comprehensive coverage of the three pillars or underpinnings of Canadian evaluation practice from which credentials can be developed.<sup>10</sup>

With this information, CES members were asked to offer feedback in an online survey about the competencies for Canadian evaluation practice and National Council considerations. Table 1 presents some of the questions included.

Draft competencies were sent to all CES members in a survey to which 99 members (roughly 5.5%) responded. Within this very limited response, 75% agreed that overall the *Competencies for Canadian Evaluation Practice* provided a good basis for the development of credentials. To engage a greater number of CES members, broader consultations were held across Canada through chapter-run initiatives. A total of 256 members, or roughly 17% of the 1500 CES members (2008), were reached through in-person sessions, teleconferences,

**Table 1**  
**Sample Questions from the Online Survey to Gain Feedback on Competencies**

- 
1. Do you agree that overall the *Competencies for Canadian Evaluation Practice* provide a good basis for the development of credentials?  
 I agree    I do not agree    I don't know  
 Why or why not:
  2. Is there something missing?  
 No    Yes, please indicate the competency and provide a brief explanation.
  3. Is there any competency that should be omitted?  
 No    Yes, please indicate the competency and provide a brief explanation.
  4. Are there modifications needed to a competency listed?  
 No    Yes, please indicate the competency and provide a brief explanation.
  5. Do you have any other comments on the competencies or any suggestions for the professional designation project?
  6. Do you hold any other professional designation?  
 No    Yes, please let us know what it is:
  7. Please let us know about yourself:
    - Gender: [female male ]
    - CES chapter you belong to:
    - To what extent are you involved in program evaluation in your present position?  
 [Primary focus, major focus, minor focus, not at all]
    - Number of years conducting evaluation:
- 

and web-based sessions. In addition, individual e-mail input was received from members who could not attend their chapter's session. Each CES chapter submitted a report summarizing the input from local consultation sessions, as well as thoughts from their respective Boards of Directors, and these were analyzed in an aggregate consultation summary report, which National Council reviewed in 2009. It was recognized that the consultations did not form a representative sample, and the PDCC did not generalize the feedback across all CES members. The consultations were inevitably attended by members who were interested in or against professional designations, but they did provide input and ideas on the CE model and the approach to development and implementation.

Following the consultations, a second draft of the competencies was created and included, for example, additions to the technical competencies domain (specifying competencies around validity and reliability) as well as an addition to reflective practice to address issues of speaking truth to power.

A further process of validation was then undertaken. Expert evaluators from the community (selected individuals who had been recognized as thought leaders in the community through receipt of CES awards and Fellowship membership) participated in a more detailed survey that involved providing input on each competency on the CCEP. Seventeen CES Fellows and National Award winners shared their expertise, providing detailed input necessary for refining the competencies and the confidence in the CCEP list. There was also an internal review and validation process within the Professional Designations Project that involved some 33 volunteers across Canada.

In concert with the development of the CCEP, an extensive product was developed to elaborate on each competency and to provide greater definition and clarity. This information—Domains, Competencies, and Descriptors—went through a targeted validation among selected expert members of the CES Professional Designations Project team. The revised Competencies for Canadian Evaluation Practice became the foundation for the development of the Canadian Credentialed Evaluator designation and were formally adopted by CES in May 2009.

## COMPETENCIES FOR CANADIAN EVALUATION PRACTICE

The Competencies for Canadian Evaluation practice are reproduced in Table 2 and include 5 domains and 49 competencies (CES, 2010). These competencies are the foundation of the Credentialed Evaluator designation and program. Applicants are required to have graduate-level education and two years of evaluation experience, and demonstrate their education and/or experience related to 70% of the competencies in each domain through the application submission. The development of the professional designation involved in excess of 450 days of volunteer effort, although the precise allocation to the development of the competencies is not known. It was a significant undertaking for CES. The competencies are not meant or designed to be prescriptive. CES understands that competency profiles and evaluator job descriptions will be written with a focus on specific employment settings. In this regard it is hoped the CCEP will be

**Table 2**  
**Competencies for Canadian Evaluation Practice (CCEP)**

- 
- 1.0 **Reflective Practice.** *Competencies focus on the fundamental norms and values underlying evaluation practice and awareness of one's evaluation expertise and needs for growth.*
- 1.1 Applies professional evaluation standards
- 1.2 Acts ethically and strives for integrity and honesty
- 1.3 Respects all stakeholders
- 1.4 Considers human rights and the public welfare in evaluation practice
- 1.5 Provides independent and impartial perspective
- 1.6 Aware of self as an evaluator (knowledge, skills, dispositions) and reflects on personal evaluation practice (competencies and areas for growth)
- 1.7 Pursues professional networks and self development to enhance evaluation practice
- 2.0 **Technical Practice.** *Competencies focus on the specialized aspects of evaluation, such as design, data collection, analysis, interpretation, and reporting.*
- 2.1 Understands the knowledge base of evaluation (theories, models, types, methods, and tools)
- 2.2 Specifies program theory
- 2.3 Determines the purpose for the evaluation
- 2.4 Determines program evaluability
- 2.5 Frames evaluation questions
- 2.6 Develops evaluation designs
- 2.7 Defines evaluation methods (quantitative, qualitative or mixed)
- 2.8 Identifies data sources
- 2.9 Develops reliable and valid measures/tools
- 2.10 Collects data
- 2.11 Assesses validity of data
- 2.12 Assesses reliability of data
- 2.13 Assesses trustworthiness of data
- 2.14 Analyzes and interprets data
- 2.15 Draws conclusions and makes recommendations
- 2.16 Reports evaluation findings and results
- 3.0 **Situational Practice.** *Competencies focus on the application of evaluative thinking in analyzing and attending to the unique interests, issues, and contextual circumstances in which evaluation skills are being applied.*
- 3.1 Respects the uniqueness of the site
- 3.2 Examines organizational, political, community, and social contexts
- 3.3 Identifies impacted stakeholders
-

- 
- 3.4 Identifies the interests of all stakeholders
  - 3.5 Serves the information needs of intended users
  - 3.6 Attends to issues of evaluation use
  - 3.7 Attends to issues of organizational and environmental change
  - 3.8 Applies evaluation competencies to organization and program measurement challenges
  - 3.9 Shares evaluation expertise
  - 4.0 **Management Practice.** *Competencies focus on the process of managing a project/evaluation, such as budgeting, coordinating resources, and supervising.*
  - 4.1 Defines work parameters, plans, and agreements
  - 4.2 Attends to issues of evaluation feasibility
  - 4.3 Identifies required resources (human, financial, and physical)
  - 4.4 Monitors resources (human, financial, and physical)
  - 4.5 Coordinates and supervises others
  - 4.6 Reports on progress and results
  - 4.7 Identifies and mitigates problems/issues
  - 5.0 **Interpersonal Practice.** *Competencies focus on people skills, such as communication, negotiation, conflict resolution, collaboration, and diversity.*
  - 5.1 Uses written communication skills and technologies
  - 5.2 Uses verbal communication skills
  - 5.3 Uses listening skills
  - 5.4 Uses negotiation skills
  - 5.5 Uses conflict resolution skills
  - 5.6 Uses facilitation skills (group work)
  - 5.7 Uses interpersonal skills (individual and teams)
  - 5.8 Uses collaboration/partnering skills
  - 5.9 Attends to issues of diversity and culture
  - 5.10 Demonstrates professional credibility
- 

helpful in capturing the breadth and diversity of skills and knowledge needed in these roles.

The competencies are not solely helpful to the professional designation. They also serve as a foundation for the development of professional development (training) and education programs. The Canadian Consortium of Universities for Evaluation Education (2011) has made use of the CCEP in their work, and the CES professional development efforts are becoming more aligned with the competencies.

## CONCLUSION

The evaluation community in Canada is not easily brought to consensus on critical issues, and the development of competencies for the community was—and perhaps continues to be—contentious. Diversity in the membership is valued, and a “one size fits all” solution will not be readily adopted. Concerns expressed during the development of the CCEP mirrored those expressed about the development of a professional designation: issues of barriers to entry, the immaturity of the Canadian evaluation education system and private sector training providers to support evaluation competency development, the richness brought to the community through diverse educational and experiential paradigms. Concerns were expressed about the potential for negative effects if evaluation practice was overly uniform in its defined knowledge and skills base. Worries about generic evaluation skills (versus subject matter expertise) were frequently raised.

Extensive consultations and use of experts went a long way toward compromising and addressing member issues. The adoption of the CCEP may have flown somewhat beneath the radar as members were also focused on the nature and process of a designation being concurrently developed. However, those authoring this foundational piece believe it was a significant achievement within the Professional Designations Initiative and an important step in defining who we are as evaluators. In retrospect, it is difficult to separate the development of competencies from the development of a Credentialed Evaluator designation. In regard to both, perhaps the most critically important and energizing part of the work is not in the result (i.e., the CCEP or the CE), but rather in the cross-country conversation and debate on evaluator identity that the initiative prompted. The consultation process and the engagement of CES members in the development of the competencies, while labour intensive, gives them credibility and value.

The Competencies for Canadian Evaluation Practice are admittedly in their infancy and are not intended to be static. The Professional Designations Program brings attention to the CCEP in several ways. CES members who have applied or are applying for their Credentialed Evaluator designations are reviewing and thinking deeply about the CCEP to articulate their own competencies as part of the requirements to qualify. Those awarded the Credentialed Evaluator designation must undertake ongoing professional development to retain the designation, and continued professional learning based

on the CCEP is growing steadily. Credentialing Board members who are reviewing submissions to qualify for the Credentialed Evaluator designation are also deepening and increasing our understanding of the CCEP. Members of the Canadian Consortium of Universities for Evaluation Education (Kuji-Shikatani, McDavid, Cousins, & Buchanan, 2013) and, increasingly, more providers of professional evaluation education programs in Canada and internationally (see, e.g., Certificate of Advanced Study in Evaluation at Claremont Graduate University, <http://www.cgu.edu/pages/670.asp>) are using the Competencies for Canadian Evaluation Practice to develop their programs. We are also witnessing more employers and organizations who commission evaluations using the CCEP in their descriptions of jobs and contract requirements. These are signs of the CCEP taking root in evaluation practice.

As more members of the Canadian evaluation community deepen their understanding and use of the CCEP, demand will increase to review and refine the current set of competencies and their descriptions to ensure they reflect the changing nature of evaluation work and talents. The CES is well positioned to undertake this work and to collaborate with other professional associations/organizations to build a common understanding of the evaluation profession beyond Canadian borders.

## NOTES

- 1 Stevahn et al.'s (2005) definition of competencies, "the knowledge, skills, and dispositions program evaluators need to achieve standards that constitute sound evaluations," has been used for this article.
- 2 Retrieved from [http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/site.cgi?s=5&ss=4&\\_lang=EN](http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/site.cgi?s=5&ss=4&_lang=EN)
- 3 ESS was originally collaboratively authored by Paul Favaro and Elana Gray with inputs from Fred Asbury, Shelley Borys, Rhonda Cockrill, Karen Korabic, Arnold Love, Greg Mason, Mark Pancer, Nancy Porteous, Abe Ross, and George Teather. [http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/site.cgi?s=3&ss=3&\\_lang=en](http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/site.cgi?s=3&ss=3&_lang=en)
- 4 Program Evaluation Standards were adopted first in 2008 and again in 2012, when they were updated by the JCPES. Retrieved from [http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/site.cgi?s=6&ss=10&\\_lang=EN](http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/site.cgi?s=6&ss=10&_lang=EN).

- 5 See Canadian Evaluation Society (2007a) discussion on evaluator competencies, which used Huse and McDavid (2006) as a support document for the CES-commissioned Action Plan for the Canadian Evaluation Society with respect to professional standards for evaluators. The Action Plan document (January 6, 2007) was led by Gerald Halpern and (in alphabetical order) Benoît Gauthier and James C. McDavid as primary authors; Bud Long and Arnold Love, primary reviewers; and Shelley Borys, Natalie Kishchuk, Keiko Kuji-Shikatani, Robert Lahey, John Mayne, and Robert Segsworth as additional reviewers. *Interview Results Professional Designations for Evaluators* (February 5, 2007) is also the support document for this project, authored by Gerald Halpern and Bud Long with interviewing assistance from Natalie Kishchuk, Keiko Kuji-Shikatani, Arnold Love, John Mayne, Ezra Miller, Gaela Pink Nelson, and Karen Ryan.
- 6 From the Centre for Excellence for Evaluation (2002).
- 7 The Competencies for Canadian Evaluation Practice and background on their development are found at [http://evaluationcanada.ca/txt/competencies\\_consultation.pdf](http://evaluationcanada.ca/txt/competencies_consultation.pdf).
- 8 [http://evaluationcanada.ca/txt/three\\_pillars.pdf](http://evaluationcanada.ca/txt/three_pillars.pdf)
- 9 PDCC also observed 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.
- 10 [http://evaluationcanada.ca/txt/three\\_pillars.pdf](http://evaluationcanada.ca/txt/three_pillars.pdf)

## REFERENCES

- Borys, S., Gauthier, B., Kishchuk, N., & Roy, S. (2005, October). *Survey of evaluation practice and issues in Canada*. Paper presented October 2005 at the Joint CES/AEA Conference, Toronto, ON. Retrieved from [http://evaluationcanada.ca/distribution/20051026\\_borys\\_shelley\\_gauthier\\_benoit\\_kishchuk\\_natalie\\_roy\\_simon.pdf](http://evaluationcanada.ca/distribution/20051026_borys_shelley_gauthier_benoit_kishchuk_natalie_roy_simon.pdf).
- Buchanan, H., Maicher, B., & Kuji-Shikatani, K. (2008, May). *Canadian Evaluation Society Professional Designations Program*. Presentation at the national conference of the Canadian Evaluation Society, Ottawa, ON. Retrieved from [http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/txt/20090602\\_designations.pdf](http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/txt/20090602_designations.pdf).

- Canadian Evaluation Society. (2006). *Request for proposals for fact finding regarding evaluator credentialing*. Retrieved from [http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/txt/1\\_rfp\\_e.pdf](http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/txt/1_rfp_e.pdf).
- Canadian Evaluation Society. (2007a). *An action plan for the CES with respect to professional standards for evaluators*. Retrieved from [http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/txt/4\\_consortium\\_e.pdf](http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/txt/4_consortium_e.pdf).
- Canadian Evaluation Society. (2007b). *Professional designations project plan*. Retrieved from [http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/txt/6\\_council\\_e.pdf](http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/txt/6_council_e.pdf).
- Canadian Evaluation Society. (2007c). *Response to proposed action plan for the CES with respect to professional standards for evaluators*. Retrieved from [http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/txt/6\\_council\\_e.pdf](http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/txt/6_council_e.pdf).
- Canadian Evaluation Society. (2008). *Crosswalk of evaluator competencies version 10*. Retrieved from [http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/distribution/20080312\\_ces\\_professional\\_designation\\_core\\_committee.pdf](http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/distribution/20080312_ces_professional_designation_core_committee.pdf).
- Canadian Evaluation Society. (2010). *Competencies for Canadian evaluation practice*. Retrieved from [http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/txt/2\\_competencies\\_cdn\\_evaluation\\_practice.pdf](http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/txt/2_competencies_cdn_evaluation_practice.pdf).
- Centre for Excellence for Evaluation. (2002). Building community capacity: Competency profile for federal public service evaluation professionals. Retrieved from [http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/eval/stud\\_etud/capa-pote\\_e.pdf](http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/eval/stud_etud/capa-pote_e.pdf).
- Consortium of Universities for Evaluation Education. (2008). *Business plan for the development of the Consortium of Universities for Evaluation Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.evaluationeducation.ca/documents/cuee%20business%20plan.pdf>.
- Consortium of Universities for Evaluation Education. (2011). *Framework for collaboration on shared inter-university graduate evaluation education courses*. Retrieved from <http://www.evaluationeducation.ca/documents/Framework%20for%20Collaboration.pdf>.
- Cousins, J. B., Maicher, B., & Malik, S. (2007). *Integration of consultative input: Professional designations for evaluators*. Retrieved from [http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/distribution/20070605\\_input.pdf](http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/distribution/20070605_input.pdf).
- Gussman, T. K. (2005). *Improving the professionalism of evaluation*. Prepared for the Centre of Excellence for Evaluation, Treasury Board

of Canada Secretariat. Retrieved from <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/cee/prof-eval-eng.asp>.

Huse, I., & McDavid, J. (2006). *Literature review: Professionalization of evaluators*. Retrieved from [http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/txt/2\\_literature\\_e.pdf](http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/txt/2_literature_e.pdf).

Kuji-Shikatani, K., McDavid, J., Cousins, J. B., & Buchanan, H. (2013). Consortium of Universities for Evaluation Education and its impacts on professionalizing evaluation in Canada. *Japanese Journal of Evaluation Studies*, 12(2), 11–22.

MacDonald, W., & Buchanan, H. (2011, November). *Evaluation ethics*. Presented at the conference of the AEA, Anaheim, CA. Retrieved from <http://comm.eval.org/resources/viewdocument/?DocumentKey=86372e88-3e0b-4445-ba21-29baff2e28b0>.

Muller-Clemm, W., & Barnes, M. (1997). A historical perspective on federal program evaluation in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 12(1), 47–70.

Segsworth, R. (2005). Program evaluation in Canada: Plus ça change.... *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 20(3), 195–197.

Sheppard, R. (2012). In search of a balanced Canadian evaluation function: Getting to relevance. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 26(2), 1–45.

Stevahn, L., King, J. A., Ghere, G., & Minnema, J. (2005). Establishing essential competencies for program evaluators. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 26(1), 43–59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1098214004273180>

Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat. (2012). *2011 annual report on the health of the evaluation function*. Retrieved from <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/report/orp/2012/arhef-raefetb-eng.asp>.

Zorzi, R., McGuire, M., & Perrin, B. (2002) *Canadian Evaluation Society project in support of advocacy and professional development*. Retrieved from [http://evaluationcanada.ca/distribution/200210\\_zorzi\\_e.pdf](http://evaluationcanada.ca/distribution/200210_zorzi_e.pdf).

**Heather Buchanan** is an independent consultant specializing in evaluation and building evaluation capacity, domestically and internationally. She is an experienced practitioner and educator in evaluation, having taught at Carleton University, the United Nations Staff College, and the World Bank's International Program for Development Evaluation (IPDET). She holds the Credentialed Evaluator (C.E.) designation from the CES and a Master's degree in public policy and administration. Heather was the recipient of the CES 2003 Leadership in Evaluation award and the 2010 Contribution to Evaluation in Canada award.

Dr. **Keiko Kuji-Shikatani**, C.E., is passionate about the role of evaluation in supporting programs and organizations for the betterment of society. Keiko is an internal evaluator (Education Officer, Research Monitoring and Evaluation Team, Student Achievement Division) for the Ontario Ministry of Education, infusing evaluative thinking in collaborative teams to build ministry and sector capacity for the use of evidence to inform decisions and implementation in reaching every student. Keiko's evaluation practice and research focuses on infusing evaluative thinking, evaluation use, and evaluation capacity building as an active member in the international community of evaluators.

