Human resource development (HRD) professionals are increasingly called upon to undertake evaluations of learning, performance, and change initiatives. This can arise because of pressure from executives, and it can also indicate a growing awareness of the importance of evaluation in determining both tactical and strategic directions for an organization.

Given this increasing level of importance, we might ask: What are the knowledge and skills (or competencies) needed to undertake such evaluation? Russ-Eft (2005) examined this issue by reviewing various national evaluation association standards and guidelines, different evaluation textbooks, and some local efforts at determining evaluator competencies. The purpose of the present paper is to extend this research to describe a global validation of evaluator competencies.

The International Board of Standards for Training, Performance and Instruction (IBSTPI®) recognizing a need for the development and validation of evaluator competencies commissioned a global validation effort in 2004. The development and validation effort followed the ibstpi procedures previously undertaken for instructors, instructional designers, and training managers. The present paper will provide some of the details and results of that effort, particularly examining the similarities and differences arising between North America and other regions of the world. Implications for research, theory, and practice are described.

Human resource development (HRD) professionals are increasingly called upon to undertake evaluations of learning, performance, and change initiatives. This emphasis comes from a variety of sources. In some cases, it arises because of pressure from executives. For example, a recent study by the Conference Board (Gates, 2005) found that executives plan to make increasing use of human capital metrics—believing that such evaluative tools and the data they generate help the organisation achieve its strategic goals. In other cases, line managers, including those in HRD, recognise the importance of measuring the effects and impacts of HRD interventions—here, again, providing information to ensure both immediate and long-term objectives are met. Thus, knowledge and skills in evaluation appear to be of increasing importance to HRD professionals, particularly those involved in guiding both tactical and strategic initiatives.

We might, then, ask: What are the knowledge and skills (or competencies) needed to undertake such evaluation? Russ-Eft (2005) examined this issue by reviewing various national evaluation association standards and guidelines (e.g., African Evaluators Network, American Evaluation Association, Australasian Evaluation Society, Canadian Evaluation Society, and the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Evaluation), evaluation textbooks, and some local efforts at determining evaluator competencies (e.g., King, et. al., 2001). The purpose of the present paper is to extend this research to describe a global validation of evaluator competencies.

The Search for Evaluator Competencies

Many texts written for the novice evaluator reference the AEA’s recently revised/published *Guiding Principles for Evaluators* in which 25 normative statements are
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organized into five broad categories:

• **Systematic inquiry**: Evaluators conduct systematic, data-based inquiries about whatever is being evaluated.
• **Competence**: Evaluators provide competent performance to stakeholders.
• **Integrity/honesty**: Evaluators display honesty and integrity in their own behavior, and attempt to ensure the honesty and integrity of the entire evaluation process.
• ** Respect for people**: Evaluators respect the security, dignity and self-worth of respondents, program participants, clients, and other evaluation stakeholders.
• **Responsibilities for the general and public welfare**: Evaluators respect the security, dignity and self-worth of respondents, program participants, clients, and other evaluation stakeholders.

While it may be argued that the Principles reflect core competencies, AEA itself cautions that they are meant to "... guide evaluation practice and foster continuing development of the profession" (Russ-Eft & Preskill, 2001, p.120); they are, in effect, a call for ethical behavior (Worthen, et al., 1997). Each stand's illustrative statements—in one way or another—emphasizes personal conduct rather than skill, aptitude or proficiency.

Texts for the "student" of evaluation also tend to emphasize the Program Evaluation Standards (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1994). Like the Guiding Principles, however, they focus less on epistemology than on high-quality evaluation processes and products or evaluative functions (e.g., helping the professional determine whether or not to evaluate; define the evaluation problem or purpose and plan specific study phases; collect and analyze information; report findings and results; and manage the work, specifically, budgeting, contracting, and staffing). In essence, they "... guide evaluators through the myriad ... decisions and choices they must make" (Russ-Eft & Preskill, 2001) as a study unfolds—options generally related to feasibility, utility, accuracy, and propriety. While they certainly help to contextualize or situate evaluation, the standards do not suggest a foundational knowledge or skill base that practitioners should master. In addition, many evaluators in corporate settings have no exposure to these guiding principles unless they happen to belong to one of the professional associations, such as AEA or AHRD.

Russ-Eft (2005) compared various national evaluation standards with those derived from evaluation textbooks and from university and certificate programs in evaluation. Table 1 presents a listing of the domains and competencies that emerged from that comparison.

Certainly a number of competency frameworks have been proposed over the years, as suggested above. As stated by Fitzpatrick, Sanders, and Worthen (2004) and shown in the work of Russ-Eft (2005), considerable overlap exists between and among them. Indeed, Fitzpatrick, Sanders, and Worthen (2004) suggested that discrepancies among the various competency frameworks are largely attributable to time frame (i.e., new evaluative needs and issues are constantly being discovered), level of detail, or philosophical mindset (technical, artistic, social/interpersonal, etc.).

But King, Stevahn, Ghere, & Minnema (2001) struck a more practical cord – by noting that as of 2001 — no proposed system had yet been systematically or empirically validated by practitioners in the field. They wrote at the time: "These initial frameworks, along with proposals for certification, have sparked healthy debates at conferences and in the evaluation literature ... but discussions to date have fallen short of reaching consensus" (p. 230). Their groundbreaking exploratory study, designed to assess the extent to which evaluation professionals representing diverse backgrounds and theoretical underpinnings could agree on a competency taxonomy, revealed two enlightening themes.

• Participants/respondents consistently made a broad distinction between evaluation and research, vigorously arguing that evaluators are informed by research but are not necessarily researchers themselves. "Participants generally accepted the idea that evaluators need to know the difference between research and evaluation and be prepared to explain it to others" (pp. 242-3).

• The knowledge, skills, and attitudes that consistently earned the highest ratings were those requiring evaluators to take personal responsibility, and so intimately tied to evaluative
integrity and ethical conduct. Thus, proficiency associated with computer savvy, time and stress management, conflict resolution, cross-cultural awareness, written verbal communication and interpersonal competence was less valued than the ability to frame evaluation questions, serve the information needs of intended users, ensure the study’s honesty and integrity, and organize/manage the project.

While the King et al study can be considered methodologically robust, it did lack in national and international representation, having included evaluators from the Minneapolis, St. Paul area only. In addition, the study results did not have pedagogical implications. It was never the researchers’ intention to couch findings in instructive terms: how the competences might be organized into a comprehensive evaluation curriculum, which instructional activities and strategies might help the student of evaluation gain skill and confidence, and how performance and aptitude might be measured/assessed (and then remediated or enhanced).

At about the same time that King, et al. were collecting data relative to their Essential Evaluator Competencies, two seminal proficiency-oriented projects were underway in Canada.

• The Canadian Evaluation Society’s (CES) Project in Support of Advocacy and Professional Development (Zorzi, McGuire, & Perrin, 2002) resulted in a Core Body of Knowledge that “comprises theories, skills, and best practices that people must possess to plan, carry out, and report on valid and reliable evaluations of programs or policies in governments, not-for-profit organizations, and businesses.”

• Canada’s Treasury Board Secretariat (and its then-newly formed Centre of Excellence for Evaluation) worked with a host of government agencies and divisions to develop a competency profile for professionals engaged in federal public service evaluation (Centre for Excellence for Evaluation, 2002).

The two groups’ investigative processes were remarkably similar—with both efforts distinguished by their directly applicability to evaluator training and education. Each knowledge base is a rich mix of knowledge, skills, and values associated with procedures, logistics, behaviors, concepts, ethics, and higher-order thinking. Underlying the CES version is a logic model of evaluation: inputs, activities, outputs, utilization of outputs, and outcomes. The government’s version features an organizational structure in which 14 competencies are clustered into five distinct areas easily aligned with evaluation phases or stages and the characteristic tasks of each of them.

1. Intellectual (cognitive capacity, creativity)
2. Future building (visioning)
3. Management (action management, organizational awareness, teamwork, partnering)
4. Relationship (interpersonal relations, communication)
5. Personal (stamina and stress resistance, ethics and values, personality, behavioral flexibility, self-confidence).

Important pedagogically is that the competencies are leveled; at a glance one can see how the competencies of a junior evaluator differs in degree or kind from that of an intermediate or senior.

What is lacking from all of these various competency frameworks and approaches is an empirical base that is international in scope. Certainly, evaluation activities take place in organizations throughout the world, as seen in the international growth of evaluation associations and societies. In addition, particularly from the standpoint of HRD researchers and scholar-practitioners, there has been no effort to focus on the competencies needed by those undertaking evaluation efforts within organizational settings. Thus, the focus of the present study is to undertake the development and international validation of competencies for evaluators working within organizations and undertaking evaluations within those organizations.
Table 1  
 Listing of Domains and Competencies Derived from Standards, Textbooks, and Programs

**Professional Foundations and Competence**
- Communicate accurately and effectively
- Observe ethical standards
- Obtain and maintain needed skills
- Understand evaluation background and history

**Professional Responsibility, Integrity, Accountability**
- Accurately represent skills
- Disclose conflicts of interest
- Negotiate honestly
- Communicate accurately and fairly
- Understand politics

**Respect for People**
- Use informed consent
- Maintain confidentiality
- Maximize benefits and reduce harms
- Communicate respect for stakeholders
- Understand multicultural and cross-cultural aspects

**Social Responsibility**
- Consider wider implications and side effects
- Recognize obligations for public good

**Evaluation Understanding and Practice**
- Understand and use alternative evaluation theories, models, and approaches
- Focus the evaluation
- Work with stakeholders to determine evaluation questions
- Understand and use program theory / logic modeling
- Communicate and report progress and results
- Ensure use of findings
- Evaluate the evaluation / conduct meta-evaluation
- Build and sustain support for evaluation / build organizational capacity for evaluation

**Research Skills**
- Develop or select an evaluation design
- Develop appropriate data collection instruments and procedures
- Use appropriate data collection methods
- Understand and use appropriate sampling methods
- Use appropriate analysis procedures – qualitative and quantitative

**Project Management Skills**
- Plan and negotiate the evaluation
- Develop plan for and manage communications
- Develop plan for and manage the budget
- Develop plan for and manage the schedule

---

1 Reproduced from Russ-Eft (2005).
Methods

The International Board of Standards for Training, Performance, and Instruction® (www.ibstpi.org) has a long and rich history of competency development. This includes the development of competencies for online training and teaching (Goodyear, et. al, 2001; Spector & de la Teja, 2001), instructional design (Richey, Fields, & Foxon, 2001), training managers (Foxon, Richey, Roberts, & Spannaus, 2003), and instructor (Klein, Spector, Grabowski, & de la Teja, 2004).

The evaluator competency project was launched in June 2004, primarily as an outgrowth to the previous work. Specifically, there was recognition that instructional designers, in particular, as well as other professions within the ibstpi scope, needed information on the competencies for evaluators. Because of the various national and association standards that existed and that focused primarily on evaluators undertaking large-scale, government-funded evaluation projects, the Board focused more narrowly on the competencies needed by internal staff or external consultants conducting evaluations in the following settings:
* For-profit and not-for-profit organizations
* Public schools/universities
* Armed forces (military)
* Government agencies evaluating their own internal programs.

The competencies needed by such individuals may be somewhat different from those needed by evaluators examining the effectiveness of large-scale state-wide or national programs often funded by government departments or agencies.

Procedures

In undertaking this research study, ibstpi followed the systematic approach laid out in previous ibstpi work (and described by Richey, 2002). Initially we undertook an extensive literature search, including a review of academic programs, courses, and training modules in evaluation provided by universities’ evaluation curricula in several countries. Simultaneously we contacted professional associations for evaluators in North America, Australia, and Europe seeking any listings of competencies or related research, as well as training courses and modules offered by these associations. (Some of the results of this work were presented in Russ-Eft, 2005.)

A subgroup from ibstpi developed a draft set of competencies for initial review and comment by the full board. The draft was next scrutinized (two rounds) by a group of 10 evaluation experts from around the world (North America, Europe, Australia)—practicing evaluators representing for-profit and not-for-profit organizations, government agencies, and academia.

The instrument based on the final draft set of domains, competencies, and performance statements, along with specific demographic items, was pilot tested. It was then translated into French and Spanish and back-translated into English. The French and Spanish versions were reviewed and revised by native speakers familiar with evaluation. The three versions of the instrument (in English, French, and Spanish) were then administered through the ibstpi website to evaluation practitioners and academics in diverse geographical locations and work environments.

Numeric results from the survey were tabulated (frequency distributions, mean ratings)—and then triangulated with respondents’ open-ended comments/reactions. Sharing with the full ibstpi board led to spirited debate and (ultimately) an array of revisions (statement additions and deletions, wordsmithing to improve clarity and meaning, re-ordering).

Some of the revisions and comments were shared again with the 10 evaluation experts for their additional comments and feedback. In addition, a separate survey focused on evaluation tools and approaches is currently being undertaken with respondent groups at the AEA, AHRD, and AERA meetings in the U.S., ibstpi workshops held in Melbourne, Sydney, and Brisbane, Australia, and the 8th International Conference on Human Resource Development Research & Practice across Europe held in Oxford, England. This survey will help to deal with one major criticism involving the lack of evaluation-specific tools and approaches within the competency list.

What the evaluator competencies share with its predecessor sets (instructor in face to face, online, and blended settings, instructional design, and training manager) is a common
organizational structure. Domains represent a cluster of related competencies; in the case of the evaluator competencies, these domains consist of: professional foundations, planning and designing the evaluation, implementing the evaluation plan, and managing the evaluation. Each competency within a domain represents (observable and measurable) knowledge and skills that enable one to perform effectively the activities of a given occupation or function to the standards expected in employment. Each performance statement is an explanation or elaboration of the activities that comprise a competency statement.

**Instrumentation**

The instrument used in the validation study began with an introduction to the study, indicating its purpose and the intended use of the data, and provided the informed consent materials approved by the Institutional Review Board of Oregon State University. It included three separate sections: (1) the criticality statements, (2) the respondent background characteristics, and (3) additional comments.

- **Section 1: Criticality Statements**
  The 14 competencies and 86 performance statements were listed, and respondents were asked to assign an importance rating to each in relation to their work role. The rating employed a 5-point Likert scale with 5 as “very high importance,” 4 as “high importance,” 3 as “moderate importance,” 2 as “low importance,” and 1 as “no importance.”

- **Section 2: Respondent Background Characteristics.**
  This section contained 12 questions, and sought demographic data to establish a rationale for the level of generalizability of data. Questions covered evaluation role, organizational setting, geographical region, educational level and whether evaluation was studied at University, field of occupational expertise, years doing evaluation, percentage of time spent on evaluation, whether a member of a professional association for evaluators, gender, and age.

- **Section 3: Additional Comments**
  The survey contained three open-ended questions seeking information on any competencies that should be added or reworded, and general feedback.

**Results**

The following section will provide some of the results of the validation survey. It will begin with a description of the demographics of the respondents. It will, then, turn to some of the results of the ratings of the competencies.

**Demographics of Respondents**

The sample was a diverse group of 443 respondents although not all respondents answered all questions. In terms of education, the majority possessed a masters level (47%) or a post-masters or doctoral level (34%) degree. Slightly more of the respondents were female (55%). The typical respondent was between 41 and 60 years of age (61%). It should be noted that this sample appears to be more educated and slightly older than those participating in either the validation research for the ibstpi Training Manager Standards (Foxon, et.al., 2003) or the Instructional Design Standards (Richey, et.al., 2001). Such a result may be because valuation work is not something that the majority of practitioners do when they begin to work in the training and learning field.

The respondents primarily worked in for-profit organizations of various types (36%), educational institutions (20%), and associations or non-profits (16%); the remainder worked in government agencies or the military. As for primary areas of expertise, training and development or human resources/organizational development accounted for almost 30% of the responses, with 15% selecting training and development and 13% human resources / organizational development. Approximately 20% of the responses indicated expertise in education, including instructional design and adult education. Only 11% specifically reported evaluation as their primary field of expertise. These results indicate that the majority of respondents are not trained in evaluation although they may undertake evaluation as part of their job role. Most of the
respondents (66%) reported that they were an employee or internal consultant, and the remainder served as an external consultant to various organizations.

The primary regions in which these respondents were located and worked were the United States and Canada (69%), Australia and New Zealand (9%), Western Europe (6%), Asia (6%), Eastern Europe (4%), with only a few in Africa and the Middle East (3%) or in South America (2%). Although strenuous efforts were made to reach professionals throughout the world, the majority of respondents were located in North America. It should be noted, however, that this percentage is much lower than in the ibstpi validation efforts for instructional designers (Richey, et al, 2001) or for training managers (Foxon, et al, 2003). There appeared to be a bimodal distribution in terms of years having worked in evaluation, with some 30% having worked five years or less and 21% having worked over 20 years in the field.

Criticality Ratings Overall

There was generally a high level of support for the domains, competencies, and the performance statements. Furthermore, a Cronbach’s alpha showed that the criticality ratings yielded a high level of reliability with $\alpha = .99$. An indication of the level of general support for the competencies appeared in the responses to the open-ended items. Most of the respondents (81%) did not indicate any additional competencies, with a typical open-ended response stating “The list was comprehensive and accurate.” Table 2 provides more specific results and shows the mean criticality rating and the related standard deviation for each individual competency. The competencies are also ranked from 1 to 14, based on the importance rating.

Three of the top five ranked competencies were those within the Professional Foundations domain – Communicate Effectively (as number 1), Observe Ethical and Legal Standards (as number 2), and Establish and Maintain Professional Credibility (as number 5). It should be noted that the communication competency was also ranked as number 1 in the training manager validation study (Foxon, et. al, 2003) and the instructional design validation study (Richey, et al, 2001). The high rating indicated that professionals working in all these areas – evaluators, training managers, and instructional designers – depend on clear and effective communications to accomplish their work. The high rankings given by evaluators to observing standards and maintaining credibility indicated that these professionals rely upon their integrity and professional credibility to accomplish much of their work.
### Table 2
Summary of the Criticality Ratings of the 2006 ibstpi Evaluator Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Foundations</td>
<td>Communicate effectively in written, oral, and visual form</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrate awareness of the politics of evaluation</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrate effective interpersonal skills</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish and maintain professional credibility</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observe ethical and legal standards</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Designing the Evaluation</td>
<td>Develop an effective evaluation plan</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Designing the Evaluation</td>
<td>Develop an evaluation management plan</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Designing the Evaluation</td>
<td>Devise data collection strategies to support the evaluation questions and design</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing the Evaluation</td>
<td>Collect data</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing the Evaluation</td>
<td>Pilot test the data collection instruments and procedures</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the Evaluation</td>
<td>Analyze and interpret data</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the Evaluation</td>
<td>Disseminate and follow-up the findings and recommendations</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the Evaluation</td>
<td>Monitor the evaluation plan</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the Evaluation</td>
<td>Work effectively with personnel and stakeholders</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two competencies received somewhat low ratings – Pilot Test the Data Collection Instruments and Procedures (rating of 3.75, ranking of 13<sup>th</sup>) and Demonstrate Awareness of the Politics of Evaluation (rating of 3.67, ranking of 14<sup>th</sup>). The first of these related to pilot testing may indicate that evaluators in organizations are under time and resource pressures and so this important step gets skipped, as does the needs assessment step in instructional design. Furthermore, it suggests that they are either not aware of the need or knowledgeable about how to do a pilot test. The second competency, that involving “politics,” may reflect some misconceptions regarding the politics surrounding all evaluations. The results from both of these competencies do suggest that ibstpi focuses on developing a set of competencies reflecting not only what is but what should be. For this reason these two competencies emphasizing the criticality of pilot testing and an awareness of political issues within the organization continue to be included in the ibstpi standards despite the criticality rating on the validation study being quite low.

**Differences by Geographic Location**

A Multiple Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was run comparing the criticality ratings of respondents from the United States and Canada with the respondents from other regions of the world. In general, respondents in North America rated competencies more highly than did respondents from other regions of the world. Table 3 presents the competencies showing statistically significant differences between the two groups of respondents.
Table 3
Comparison of North American Respondents with Those from Other Regions
As to the Criticality of the Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>US &amp; Canada</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>MANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate effectively in written, oral and visual form</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate awareness of the politics of evaluation</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate effective interpersonal skills</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe ethical and legal standards</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devise data collection strategies to support the evaluation questions and design</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect data</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze and interpret data</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work effectively with personnel and stakeholders</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the differences appearing above simply arise because of the higher ratings provided by the U.S. and Canadian respondents. Among all of these competencies, however, only two competencies showed significant differences in both the ratings and rankings: Collect Data, and Analyze and Interpret Data. In both cases, the North American respondents rated and ranked these competencies significantly higher than did those from other regions.

There are two possible reasons for this difference. The first is that the respondents in other regions, as compared with those in North America, are able to rely on others to undertake the data collection and analysis work. A second reason may be the increasing focus on randomized designs and higher level statistics within North America.

Conclusions

The purpose of the study was to determine and then validate competencies needed by evaluators working within organizational settings. The development and validation effort revealed the importance of competencies critical for evaluators throughout the world.

The results of the ibstpi work on evaluator competencies will have implications for HRD researchers and evaluators and for strategy development and organizational learning. These competencies can be used in future studies of HRD evaluation to determine what competencies have the greatest impact on the success of an evaluation effort and what competencies lead to organizational learning. In addition, researchers can examine whether or not certain competencies are more critical in specific organizational settings and in specific cultural contexts. This initial work revealed certain differences emerging between respondents from North American
and those from other regions. Certainly, it will be important to undertake further examination as to the reasons for the higher ratings among the North American respondents. In addition, given both higher ratings and higher rankings of two of the competencies – Collect Data and Analyze and Interpret data – by North American evaluators, it will be important to determine the reasons for these ratings. If, for example, other people are assigned those responsibilities (and competencies) in regions outside North America, it may mean that these two competencies will deserve less attention among these evaluators. Another area of investigation would be the low ratings overall, but particularly for those outside North America, for the competency – Demonstrate Awareness of the Politics of Evaluation. It may be that the concept of “politics of evaluation” has not been communicated and discussed as much in the literature outside of North America.

From the evaluator and practitioner standpoint, these competencies are critical for determining what further professional development might be needed. Furthermore, evaluation consultants and evaluation association can use these competencies to determine the types of professional development workshops and training that are needed. In addition, universities and other educational institutions providing professional development for evaluators can use these competencies in order to enhance the quality of their offerings. Certainly, it will be important for evaluators working in various regions of the world to determine which of these competencies are of greatest importance within a particular region. In addition, they can be used by organizations interested in hiring a staff member or a consultant to undertake evaluation work within that organization. Given the importance of these competencies and given the specific requirements of the organization, selection efforts can be tailored to those competencies most needed.

In summary, the work of ibstpi has provided a framework for use by evaluators and those interested in evaluation. This internationally-validated framework can help to enhance both research and practice in evaluation throughout the world.
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