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A general Overview

See The Big Picture
Relevant context data to address professionalization

• Most unequal region in the world
• Cultural diversity and high percentage of indigenous population (over 60% in some countries)
• Language gap: English levels are below the global average
Key professionalization trends and changes: 1990’s - today

- Discussions on “professionalization” linked to certification.
- Diversification of meanings and approaches to “professionalization”.
- Focus on quality; attention to issues & competencies beyond the technical dimension; emphasis on mainstreaming an evaluation culture.
- Various initiatives to strengthen national evaluation institutions and systems.
- Attention to the use and users of evaluations – competencies needed beyond practitioners.
Evaluation in the times of the SDGs: Our 5 key priorities today

1. Enhance the **quality** of evaluations & **mainstream evaluation “everywhere”**, emphasizing the **use**.

2. Prioritise **ethics** and expand the understanding of a “good evaluation” to **non-technical dimensions**.

3. Develop academic and training opportunities that respond to **emerging evaluation paradigms**, particular regional realities and the mandate of **no-one left behind**.

4. Expand the opportunities for “professionalization” to **traditionally excluded groups** (indigenous people, young people, women...).

5. Increase **dialogue, exchange and learning** within the region and with other regions to share and nourish views of “good evaluation” and “good evaluators”.
Two key initiatives
Two key initiatives

Evaluation Standards
(FOCEVAL/DEVAL)
2014-2018

Competencies profile (gender transformative evaluation with cultural relevance)
(EVALPARTNERS: INNOVATION FUND, P2P, EVALGENDER+)
2015-2018

2 SHARED CHARACTERISTICS:
- Process approach
- High participation and involvement
# Main similarities and differences

**SIMILARITIES:**
- Multi-actor approach
- Strong emphasis on ethics
- Context relevance: key dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Competencies profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• General approach</td>
<td>• Specific approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimum competencies</td>
<td>• Maximum competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5 dimensions: i) rigorous eval.; ii)</td>
<td>• Focus on gender &amp; transformative potential of evaluators (advocacy &amp; change-management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adequate evaluability; iii) ethical</td>
<td>• Linked to global and Southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and legal principles; iv) adequate</td>
<td>regional initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural understanding; v) relevance and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Emphasis on value and experience of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluators in the region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons learnt:

• Good practices: i) Participative, multi-actor approach; ii) articulation of different phases and initiatives/opportunities

• Projects should not work in silos – importance of a strategic approach to professionalization in the region as a framework to prioritize actions and to negotiate with donors priorities.

• Discussion: paralell vs. evolutive approaches to the development of professionalization inputs/initiatives.

• Key to have follow-up, feedback and actualization mechanisms in place.
Key challenges:

• Articulate, **integrate both initiatives** in a coherent, systemic & strategic approach within the SDG framework

• Increase **national ownership**, institutionalization & implementation

• Influence the **academia**

• Promote **certification mechanisms**

• Deepen dialogue and reflections on the **ethical and political dimensions**

• Linkage with **knowledge management systems**

• Enhance the potential complementary or even alternative role of **systematizations**.

• Address **competencies of other key actors in evaluation**
Thank you!