

**An Action Plan  
for the  
Canadian Evaluation Society  
with respect to  
Professional Standards for Evaluators**

**January 6, 2007**

This Action Plan is supported by two research papers completed as part of this Canadian Evaluation Society commissioned study.

**Literature Review:  
Professionalisation of Evaluators**

Prepared for the  
CES Evaluation Professionalisation Project  
Irene Huse and James C. McDavid  
University of Victoria  
November 15, 2006

**Interview Results  
Professional Designations  
for Evaluators**

Prepared for the  
Canadian Evaluation Society  
Gerald Halpern and Bud Long  
Professional Designations Project  
Draft of November 03, 2006

Address all correspondence to:

Gerald Halpern  
Fair Findings Inc.  
[gerald@fairfindings.com](mailto:gerald@fairfindings.com)  
613-761-9010

Primary Authors (in alphabetical order) and Consortium members

Benoît Gauthier  
Gerald Halpern  
James C. McDavid

Primary Reviewers (in alphabetical order) and Consortium members

Bud Long  
Arnold Love

Additional Reviewers (in alphabetical order) and Consortium members

Shelley Borys  
Natalie Kishchuk

Keiko Kuji-Shikatani  
Robert Lahey

John Mayne  
Robert Segsworth

Prepared for:

Canadian Evaluation Society  
Member Services Committee

Bea Courtney  
Bridgette Maicher

Bradley Cousins  
Martha McGuire

Jim Cullen (Chair)

# Professional Standards for Evaluators

## Table of Contents

Foreword	
Executive Summary	
Study Background.....	1
On the Need for Professional Designations .....	2
The Argument Against.....	2
The Argument In Favour of Professional Designations .....	3
The Way Ahead .....	4
Professionalisation Categories .....	6
The Experience of Other Organizations .....	10
Levels of professional credentials .....	10
Knowledge base .....	12
PD Options .....	12
Grandparenting.....	13
Training delivery.....	13
Experience requirements – credentialing .....	13
Continuous learning .....	13
Set-up costs.....	14
Maintenance costs.....	14
System finance.....	15
Benefits .....	15
Action Plan .....	16
Framework for Professional Designations.....	16
Professional Designations.....	16
Voluntary Designation .....	17
Member – Canadian Evaluation Society.....	17
Credentialed Evaluator (CE) .....	18
Certified Professional Evaluator (CPE).....	21
The Interim Solution .....	21
The Long-term Solution .....	24
Additional CES Responsibilities .....	25
Grandparenting .....	26
Recommended Action Sequence.....	27
Evaluation Requirements.....	27
Annex A: Credentialed Evaluator .....	29
Annex B: Certification - Certified Professional Evaluator.....	31
Annex C: Core Competencies .....	35

## List of Tables

Table 1: The Plan in Overview .....	6
Table 2: Definitions of Certification, Credentialing, Licensure, and Accreditation .....	7

## Acronyms

AEA	American Evaluation Association
CEE	Centre of Excellence for Evaluation
CES	Canadian Evaluation Society
CESAB	CES Accreditation Board
CESBE	CES Board of Examiners
CE	Credentialed Evaluator
CPE	Certified Professional Evaluator

## Acknowledgements

Many people have contributed to the development of this Action Plan. Central, and key, was the role played by National Council in its decision to move forward with professional designations for Canadian evaluators. The lead for CES was taken by the Member Services Committee (named on the title page) and they were very helpful in setting the direction for the study. We thank them for their direction and support.

The Consortium members (named on the title page) have worked hard on this project because we share the vision of National Council and we want to provide the foundation for a feasible Action Plan – we want to assist progress and we hope that our work will be useful in the immediate future. We are convinced that National Council was correct when it asked for an Action Plan. We hope that we have provided a basis for moving forward. We offer a foundation.

Consultation will undoubtedly make some changes to the Action Plan. We have likely not anticipated every possible angle to the challenge of instituting professional designations. But we are confident in the key elements of the proposed Action Plan. We have extensively discussed this in Consortium conference discussions and we offer a viable Plan. We believe that that a system of professional designations for evaluators could be in place within one year if this is the goal of CES National Council.



Gerald Halpern

## Foreword

On May 19, 2006, the Canadian Evaluation Society issued a Request For Proposals (RFP) for “Fact Finding Regarding Evaluator Credentialing”. The opening section of that RFP presented the “Purpose and Objectives”: *to attract proposals to produce 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 practical 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.*

We were privileged to be awarded the contract to conduct this study. As long-term CES members practising the profession of evaluation in Canada, we welcomed the opportunity to serve our profession through our development of an Action Plan for credentialing and for other options to be considered by CES. This paper is a proposal for an Action Plan that places credentialing in the context of a ladder of professional designations. Credentialing has been maintained as a central focus, as requested, and the options have been integrated around it to provide a ‘ladder’ of professional designations.

We understand that, as a small subset of the membership of CES, we can but propose. We look forward to the next steps with optimism that the importance of the topic will continue to maintain the urgency of a short timeline. Our work on this Action Plan has made us aware of the need for CES to proceed with measured haste to retain control of this agenda.

The Action Plan, the final report of the Consortium but not of the Council, has been kept as short in length as we can manage without omitting any of the elements that must be dealt with at this stage of strategic planning. There are two research papers which were prepared as background for the development of the Action Plan. They are not appendices to the Action Plan; each is a research paper that can stand in its own right. The two research papers are not the whole input to the knowledge base for this Action Plan. The Consortium has also made use of the understandings and experiences available from individual Consortium members and of the insights gained through internal discussion and in-depth consideration of the options available.

It is regrettable that the full flavour of those fruitful discussions could not be captured but that is in the nature of such dialogue. Undoubtedly, however, much of that discussion will be renewed; first with National Council as it prepares a response to the Action Plan and then again with the full membership. Each set of discussions will bring its particular nuances; each round of discussion will likely strengthen the set of professional designations eventually adopted by the Canadian Evaluation Society. We understand and fully support the intention of National Council to present to the membership both the Action Plan and the National Council response as it engages in the process of broad consultation. We are confident that the outcome will be a path forward that best meets the needs of the Society.

## Executive Summary

The National Council of the Canadian Evaluation Society (CES or Society) recognized the increasing interest within the evaluation and client community in the development of a system of professional designations. This Action Plan is a proposal that such a system be installed and provides a plan for so doing. CES has specifically asked for an action plan on credentialing; the Consortium reviewed the options and has recommended that credentialing be situated within a larger framework of professional designations.

They anticipated that the designation of Credentialed Evaluator (an evaluator who has at the least successfully completed a program of study accredited by the Society) will be adopted. They also anticipated that this professional designation may best be seen as one rung in a ladder of designations. They anticipated the possibility of differential levels of professional credentials and asked that the characteristics of each be identified. Overall, the mandate of this study was to develop an Action Plan for consideration by the Council – a plan that could be adopted in whole or after modification. Discussion within the National Council and consultation with the full membership of CES were expected to be part of the review of this Action Plan.

The development of this Action Plan was entrusted to a Consortium of CES members who contracted with CES to do this project. Having designed a study plan, one member of the Consortium conducted an extensive literature review and others conducted detailed interviews with fifteen professional organizations. Extensive discussion within the Consortium built upon the learning from the literature and from other organizations. The result is the present paper which is presented to the CES as a foundation for further discussion. It is anticipated that the Action Plan, following consultation and possible modification, will serve as a template to guide actions to be taken by the Canadian Evaluation Society as it provides professional designations for evaluation practitioners in Canada.

Embedded within the Action Plan are a number of recommendations for action by the Society. Accepting these recommendations may result in a number of professional designations to be maintained and controlled by the Society on behalf of professional evaluation in Canada.

For the most part, the recommendations are presented in the sequence in which they may be adopted by the Canadian Evaluation Society. If the first recommendation is not accepted, there is no point in proceeding to consider any others.

There is a strong rationale for proposing three successive levels of professional designation. Should the society not accept any one of the three levels, then the recommendations associated with that level, or any of the following levels, would not be given further consideration. Within each professional designation, there are a number of recommendations.

1. CES should adopt and manage professional designations for evaluators in Canada.
  - 1 a. Any person who completes an application form for membership in the Canadian Evaluation Society has voluntarily accepted to be a Member
  - 1 b. Accession to any other of the professional designations must be requested by a Member. There is no obligation to seek such designation. The Society is obligated to assess all such requests in an equitable and timely manner.

2. There should be three levels of professional designation. None of these designations add to the work of Chapters.
  - 2 a. The Member level recognizes membership and adherence to standards and principles.
  - 2 b. The entry level is Credentialed Evaluator (CE)
  - 2 c. The senior level is Certified Professional Evaluator (CPE).
3. The designation Member should be set in a manner that formalizes the current requirement of all CES members to subscribe to CES objectives, evaluation standards and ethical guidelines.
4. Credentialed Evaluator (CE)
  - 4 a. CES should name an Accreditation Board responsible for the determination of which programs of study will be accredited and which not - accredited study and/or experience will be accepted as at least equivalent preparation.
  - 4 b. The designation Credentialed Evaluator may be awarded upon application by a Member who has successfully completed an accredited program or its equivalent.
5. Certified Professional Evaluator (CPE)
  - 5 a. CES should name a Board of Examiners (CESBE) to manage the CPE designation process.
  - 5 b. The CESBE should develop operational definitions and procedures for each of the requirements of a CPE. This includes both the procedures to be used for letters of support (initial/interim approach) and the process leading to the development of standardized examinations (longer term/targeted approach) to test core knowledge and competencies. Both the interim and the later routes to certification are valid. The interim route has the advantage of providing direct measurement of mastery as well as becoming available after a relatively short period of preparation. The longer term route of examinations has the advantages of standardization and may be the more cost-effective method.
  - 5 c. The designation Certified Professional Evaluator may be awarded upon application by a Member who meets all of the prescribed requirements.
6. Promotion and Publicity
  - 6 a. CES should advocate on behalf of the value and benefits of the professional designations.
  - 6 b. CES should maintain a publicly accessible directory of Members with their level of professional designation.
  - 6 c. CES should engage in advocacy and promote the unique competencies of those of its members who have been awarded a professional designation.

## Study Background

The National Council of the Canadian Evaluation Society (CES or Society) recognized the increasing interest within the evaluation and client community in the development of a system of professional designations. This Action Plan is a proposal that such a system be installed and provides a plan for so doing. CES has specifically asked for an action plan on credentialing; the Consortium reviewed the options and has recommended that credentialing be situated within a larger framework of professional designations. The literature review conducted for this study reports that credentialing is an option that has been selected by comparatively few other professions. It also notes that credentialing, when adopted, is usually seen as one step in a multi-level system of professional designations.

This project required the development of a concrete action plan with policy options for consideration by the Canadian Evaluation Society (CES). The Society requested that:

- The action plan be situated within a review of the evaluation literature related to professional standards and competencies.
- There be a review and/or consultation with organizations identified as currently operating a credentialing system for their members. Of key interest would be answers to eleven questions. The questions, and a synthesis of the answers from the interviews, are in the following section titled “The Experience of Other Organizations”.
- A concrete action plan be structured that would assist CES in developing, initiating and maintaining a credentialing system. Attention would be given in the proposed action plan to:
  - A The sequence of steps to be taken by CES
  - B Options for consideration and likely benefits, costs and challenges associated with each.
  - C Processes for developing criteria for credentialing members (minimum standards and/or domain specific criteria).
  - D Potential partners who should be involved in developing the system.

The Canadian Evaluation Society (CES) anticipated an Action Plan that would establish a professional credentialing system including a member registry. By professional credentialing system was meant a mechanism or means of determining whether an applicant's educational or practical experiences and achievements warrant the award of a professional credential. The action plan was asked to identify specific benefits and risks of credentialing, as well as other approaches to professionalisation, and to provide options for consideration by CES.

The route taken for this study was to gather information using two methodologies and then to prepare an Action Plan. The two data collection methodologies were (a) literature review and (b) review of publicly available information followed by interviews

with representatives of organizations for which professional designations could appropriately be in place.

The Action Plan itself has been developed using information from four sources:

1. The findings from the literature review;
2. The findings from the consultation with organizations;
3. The knowledge and experience of Consortium members. Their understandings, although not presented in the format of a formal paper is also an important source of information for the recommended Action Plan. It includes experience with and knowledge of professionalisation efforts in similar organizations and the findings of other studies.
4. The 2005 Survey of Evaluation Practice and Issues in Canada which produced much relevant data including current estimates of the demand for a professional designation for evaluators.<sup>2</sup>

## On the Need for Professional Designations

It could be argued that the Canadian Evaluation Society (CES) has neither a need nor an obligation to develop a system of professional designations – designations by means of which CES asserts that certain people are recognized as evaluators and, by exclusion, others are not so recognized.

### The Argument Against

- Establishing a designation can be relatively expensive for the professional organization.
- Typically it is difficult to reach agreement on core competencies.
- Any form of increased barrier to entry reduces the number of persons eligible to perform evaluation work and this is of serious consequence in a field where the supply is currently inadequate to meet the demand.
- If there is a centralisation of the gate-keeper role for entry to the profession, there may be resistance by those who object to the gate-keeper decisions.

These arguments are listed here because they may be raised by CES members. This Action Plan is predicated on the position that the arguments against are fully outweighed by the arguments in favour and by the view that there is a satisfactory solution to each of the issues raised in the above arguments.

- The cost of establishing a designation can be reduced by pro bono work from members and offset in whole or in part by fees charged to the applicants for designation.
- It is difficult to reach agreement on core competencies but there are mechanisms available to deal with the time-cost of reaching agreement. The dollar cost is not seen as a significant barrier.

---

<sup>2</sup> Borys, S., Gauthier, B., Kishchuk, N., Roy, S.N. Survey of evaluation practice and issues in Canada. Paper presented at the Joint CES/AEA Conference, Toronto, October 26, 2005.

- Resistance to the gate-keeper role that will be required of CES is of concern to the professional organization only if the organization acts in a non-transparent, non-justified manner when it regulates access to the professional designations of the profession. On this point, it may be noted that, for the most part, organizations surveyed report that persons who do not hold their (non-exclusive) designation have not stopped working in the field.
- There is no necessary reduction to the number of persons working in evaluation since an evaluation designation is not a precondition for work as an evaluator. The CES does not control who does or does not perform evaluation work; application for a professional designation in the field of evaluation is voluntary.

There really is no argument against establishing a professional designation other than the cost in time and money. None of the respondents in the interview study could identify any negative impacts that the move to professional designation had on the organization or its members. Only a few organizations have had to make use of their complaints and discipline processes to deal with the relatively small number of public complaints. Although a few organizations could cite instances of client dissatisfaction with the performance of people holding the designation, these were rare and no respondent was aware of any legal action taken as a result of dissatisfaction with the performance of a designated individual.

### **The Argument In Favour of Professional Designations**

From the interviews we learned, inter alia, that:

- Employers, in general, value the quality assurance provided by the designation, give certified candidates preference when recruiting employees, and may encourage or require that current employees obtain the designation.
- Generally, organisational representatives felt that the major benefit of the designation was to impose qualification standards and improve the supply and quality of trained professionals.
- Based primarily on anecdotal evidence and/or relying on employment preferment as evidence of improved quality, most of the organisational representatives felt that the quality of work performed by those who received designations had generally improved. One informant credited the improvement to increased access to, and support for, continuing education.
- Most organisational representatives reported greater demand for the services of those with their professional designation. One informant noted that demand for an evaluation designation is likely to increase as more provincial governments require the designation for employment.

From the literature review, we learned, inter alia, that:

- There are many processes available for, and issues associated with, professional designations.
- The professional designations are not fully independent of each other.
- Credentialing is an option that has been selected by comparatively few other professions and, when used, is typically seen as one step in a multi-step process.
- There are typical requirements for credentialing.

- There are typical requirements for certification.

From the 2005 Survey of Evaluation Practice and Issues in Canada, we learned that:

- Half of all evaluation producers have encountered supply issues in the field of evaluation. A majority indicated that they have experienced difficulty finding qualified personnel in evaluation (63%) or consultants qualified for the work (49%). Similar proportions indicated that they had hired individuals (45%) or consultants (51%) who turned out not to be as qualified in evaluation as they represented.
- The frequency of supply issues may explain in part the significant demand for some type of recognition of evaluation abilities among staff and consultants. Fully 80% indicated that clients would prefer to hire certified consultants and 78% think that employers would prefer hiring certified individuals. Three-quarters of respondents (74%) wished there was a way to identify people qualified to conduct evaluation work.
- Most of the evaluation producers (65%) wished there was a way to identify themselves as a qualified evaluator and 63% indicated they would likely pursue the requirements of certification if such a designation was available to Canadian evaluators. Among those who feel close identification as an evaluator, almost three-quarters (72%) declared that they would likely pursue the requirements of the designation.
- Certification is seen as a way to improve the quality of evaluation work. Indeed, two-thirds of individuals concerned (67%) believe that certification of evaluators would improve evaluation quality. Certification is also seen as a way to protect the general public (55%), although fewer than a majority think that certification will help ensure an adequate supply of evaluators (45%). A minority of respondents held negative views about certification, such as certification as mainly serving the interests of individual evaluators (33%), certification making evaluation practices rigid (33%), certification having the effect of limiting organizations' ability to develop their evaluation capacity (28%), certification focusing on policing rather than learning (27%) and certification stifling evaluation innovation (25%). Evaluation users held more positive views of certification than evaluation producers.

## The Way Ahead

The totality of the evidence is that there is a demand for service providers to be vested with some form of evidence that they are the ones qualified to provide the service. The service purchaser typically takes at face value the label used to describe professional competence. In the federal government, this demand is being acted upon by the Centre of Excellence for Evaluation (CEE). The Centre is in the process of actively considering how best to make use of credentialing in its attempt to raise the professionalism of evaluators employed by the federal government.

Most other professional service providers have some type of professional designation that they use to set themselves apart from other service providers and which serves as a badge of competency for its members. One notable exception, and an obvious comparator for CES, is the American Evaluation Association (AEA). That Association has rebuffed several attempts at professional designations. The dominant view of why this rebuff occurs is that university academics (who form a significant portion of the AEA membership) reject such labels. In Canada, with a different membership, the same argument is not made with similar force.

Recognising that most professional service providers have some type of professional designation is also a recognition that professions tend to be inclusive in the services that they claim to be within their professional purview. Non-CES consultants who also provide services to program managers with the intention of improving performance information, enhancing program design and improving program results, offer services that overlap with the services that professional evaluators offer. If CES does not take control of its own field of expertise, it is possible that other professionals (such as management consultants, management accountants and internal auditors) will “fill the vacuum”.

The Canadian Evaluation Society (CES) is dedicated to the advancement of evaluation theory and practice. In the field of evaluation, the Society promotes leadership, knowledge, advocacy, and professional development. It provides forums for the discussion of major theoretical and practical issues in evaluation. It publishes the peer reviewed *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*. This professional journal, with a twenty-one year history to date, promotes the theory and practice of program evaluation in Canada by publishing articles, research and practice notes and book reviews on professional topics.

In addition to an annual conference with an array of workshops and leading edge paper presentations and discussions, the CES provides learning opportunities for its members with its own courses which are sanctioned for use nationally by CES Chapters. The basic, foundational course is known as the Essential Skills Series; follow-on training is currently offered in the areas of survey methodology and program logic modeling. Individual Chapters offer courses tailored to the needs of their members and some of these also are available on a national level. Local Chapters also host specialized workshops on topical issues featuring known contributors to the evaluation field, and have informal sessions to exchange ideas or solve problems.

Since 1993, the CES has been a sponsor of the Joint Committee on Standards for Evaluation and has promoted the highly respected publication, *Program Evaluation Standards*. The Society has also adopted its own *Guidelines for Ethical Conduct* which is used by many as the touchstone for good practice.

The Canadian Evaluation Society is a professional society in most, if not all, respects except that it does not offer any professional designations to its members.

We conclude that professional designations should be made available and that this will be a valuable service to the members of the Society, to the clients of its members and to society at large.

We conclude that the Canadian Evaluation Society has a need, and perhaps an obligation, to develop a system of professional designations – designations by means of which CES asserts that certain people are recognized as professional evaluators and, by exclusion, others are not so recognized.

**Table 1: The Plan in Overview**

<b>Professional Designation</b>	<b>Key Points</b>
Member	Recognises that an individual has voluntarily chosen to be associated with the Canadian professional society of evaluators. In so doing, that person has agreed to subscribe to the mission and objectives of the Society and to accept the requirements of the Program Evaluation Standards and the Guidelines for Ethical Conduct.
Credentialed Evaluator	Recognises that the person, in addition to being a Member, has successfully completed the course of study at a learning institution offering a program of study in evaluation which the Canadian Evaluation Society has accredited as appropriate preparation for the practice of evaluation in an environment that employs at least one Certified Professional Evaluator. Non-accredited or not-yet-accredited programs of study, in the judgement of the CES Accreditation Board, may be accepted as equivalent to this requirement.
Certified Professional Evaluator	Recognises that the Canadian Evaluation Society certifies that this person has (a) the appropriate formal education, (b) the necessary practical experience and (c) high levels of professional skills in a range of evaluation roles and accomplishments.

## Professionalisation Categories

It early became clear in this study that the apparently different categories of “credentialed” and “certified” when used as designations of professional competency are not as different as the use of the different labels may imply. The following paragraph from page 4<sup>3</sup> of the Literature Review makes this point:

The terms *licensure*, *credential*, *certification*, and *accreditation* are not always used consistently in the literature on professionalization, partly because of jurisdictional differences in how these issues are handled, and partly because of some overlaps in the understanding of the terms. For example, *certification* can signify that an individual has been *certified* to have a certain level of competency within a profession, including testing by a professional (typically non-government) body, *or* that a person has gained a *credential* by completing a specified set of educational, and perhaps experiential, events that do not specifically test whether the individual has reached a certain level of competency. In most cases *licensure* is seen as a form of mandatory certification of a profession; if one is not

---

<sup>3</sup> Throughout this paper, references that appear in a text taken from one of the two reference paper, Literature Review and Interview Results, are not provided. The source of the text is given to enable the reader to quickly locate the references in the source document.

licensed, one is generally not permitted to practice.<sup>4</sup> Professions needing licensure are typically ones where public health, safety, or well-being merit regulatory protection, such as dentistry, law, occupational therapy, optometry, pharmacy, and teaching.

The Literature Review provides an excellent summary of the meanings given to the several categories of professionalisation and it is extensively cited here.

Altschuld (2005) notes “There is a fairly sharp demarcation between certification and credentialing, especially in regard to legal ramifications” (p. 159). While acknowledging that distinctions among some of the terms “are not absolute, and for some, more a matter of degree than substance” (p.159).<sup>5</sup> Altschuld provides an instructive table of key terms and concepts, partially reproduced below.

**Table 2: Definitions of Certification, Credentialing, Licensure, and Accreditation**

Terms/Concepts	Meaning	Comments
<b>Credentialing</b>	A set of courses or other experiences a person must go through to receive a credential. May be done by a professional society or sometimes by trainers as in a credential for having been trained.	Does not specify the skill set attained by the person credentialed, only that they have gone through delineated experiences and courses. Tests or certification exams may be, but generally are not, used for credentialing; instead it is the courses or training experiences that the individual has taken. The legal implications for credentialing are less than for certification.
<b>Certification</b>	A process by which a person masters certain skills and competencies in a field as assessed by an external body (usually a professional society in the area of consideration).	Most often done through a formal test or set of tests (certification exams) as in law, medicine, engineering, etc. Certifying body may be legally liable for the skills that they designate as being attained by an individual. Certification may have to be periodically renewed most frequently (but not always) via continuing education.

<sup>4</sup> *Licensure* in the United States means that only when a person is licensed by the associated regulatory body is he or she allowed to practice that profession, whereas in Canada there are some cases where a person is allowed to practice in a profession that does have a licensure system, yet he or she is not licensed. The Canadian Information Centre for International Credentials does, however, define licensure as: Mandatory procedures for determining licence eligibility, granting licences, and protecting the public regarding licensed occupations.

<sup>5</sup> As an example of the various views on credentialing and certification, Perrin (2005) does not use the term *credentialing*, and defines *certification* as ranging from “being required to pass an examination or to otherwise demonstrate one’s competencies, to successful participation in an accredited course of study, to certification of attendance at a course (even if someone sleeps throughout the entire course or perhaps slips out the door after signing the attendance registry)”.

Terms/Concepts	Meaning	Comments
<b>Licensure</b>	Licenses are awarded by states, branches of government, and legal jurisdictions. One must have a license to perform services or undergo penalties if they are performed without a license. Many times the criteria for licensing are the same as certification and are determined by professional societies/groups.	One may be certified but not licensed as in the case of a physician who has passed the necessary medical examinations but is found to have defrauded patients or illegally used drugs. Legal jurisdictions set up review panels in cases where there is malfeasance or unsafe practice. Control of licensure resides outside of the professional group but is almost always highly influenced by it.
<b>Accreditation</b>	A mechanism whereby the educational program of an agency or educational institution is examined, by an external panel against established criteria for programs. The program, if it passes review, receives a formal document indicating that it is accredited.	Accreditation is for a program whereas certification, credentialing, and licensure relate to an individual. Accreditation reviews rely on the courses and experiences that comprise a program, the skills gained by those going through it, their proficiencies as determined by tests and other outcome measures, and the processes through which the program is delivered.

Note that in Table 1, *licensure* is seen as a category of certification, but *credentialing* is kept as a separate category. This is acceptable for our purposes, as a key focus is an examination of credentialing. Licensure is a very specific and high-level form of certification, involving mandatory standards typically set in legislation for public protection reasons. The legislation is typically provincial, though not always.

Cousins and Aubry (2006), too, consider licensure as a form of individual certification, and distinguish credentialing from certification: "A credentialing system does not specify the skill set attained by the person who is credentialed, only that they have gone through delineated experiences and courses" (p. 18). They further note that this view is "consistent with Love's (1994) distinction between a *professional development* approach and a *licensure* approach to certification. Credentialing aligns with the professional development approach" (Cousins and Aubry, 2006, p. 18). Worthen (1999) is another key academic writer in this area who similarly differentiates between certification and credentialing. Generally, both certification and credentialing are *non-compulsory*.

Harris and Bernhart (2001), in the U.S.-based *Guide to National Professional Certification Programs*, distinguish three types of "certification": *portfolio-based*, *competency-based*, and *curriculum-based*. Using our definitions, *curriculum-based certification* would actually be considered a *credential*, as it would not be based on confirming competencies. A university certificate program would be an example, then, of credentialing, whereas a *portfolio-based* or a *competency-based certification* program would have a process to assess a person's education, experiential background, and their current competencies, and would be considered an example of becoming *certified*.

Others, too, have definitions differing from those outlined by Altschuld. For example, the Canadian Information Centre for International Credentials (CICIC) defines a *credential* as follows: “Documented evidence of learning based on completion of a recognized program of study, training, work experience, or prior learning assessment. Degrees, diplomas, *certificates*, and *licences* are examples (CICIC, 2006b, italics added).”

The CICIC defines *certification* as “documented recognition by a governing body that a person has attained occupational proficiency”, which matches Altschuld’s focus on individually-tested proficiency, yet they define a *certificate* as “a document attesting to the successful completion of an educational course or program that is normally less than four semesters in length. A certificate may also qualify holders for entry into an occupation (e.g., Certificates of Qualification in the skilled trades)” (CICIC, 2006b)

Nevertheless, in an effort to avoid confusion we will follow Altschuld’s example, delineating between certification (as an individual-level assessment and, typically, testing of competencies) and credentialing (as a set of courses or other experiences that a person must go through, which may or may not involve examination).

Overall, then, no matter how individual authors may be using the terms, we will make it clear that when they are covering professionalization through individual-level testing of competencies they are referring to *certification*, or being *certified*, and when covering professionalization through taking courses and/or experiences, they are referring to *credentialing*. *Licensure*, again, is a specific, legally more stringent, form of individually-tested certification, normally related to the protection of the public. (Note, however, that a *certificate* may be gained through certification, credentialing, or licensing.)<sup>6</sup> And, finally, *accreditation* simply refers to the assessment of a program within an educational institution to confirm that it is meeting established criteria (CICIC, 2006b). In almost all cases of a credentialing or certification system, the professional body undertakes an accreditation process with the institutions that are offering courses or programs.

Among the points critical to an Action Plan for CES are the following:

- A. Credentialing sets criteria for an education program (typically, an education program at a recognized institution of learning) that is undertaken by individuals. It may be used by a professional society without sanction from any other authority. The bearer of a credential has received an attestation from a professional body<sup>7</sup> that, in the judgement of the professional body, the person has completed the requisite set of courses or other experiences.
- B. Certification sets criteria for an individual. It may be established by a professional society without sanction from any other authority. The bearer of a certificate has received an attestation from a professional body that, in the judgement of the

---

<sup>6</sup> For example, when Cousins and Aubry (2006), among others, speak of “graduate level university certificate programs” (p. 55), they are speaking of credentialing, not certification.

<sup>7</sup> The term “professional body” is used here somewhat loosely in view of usages such as “Certified Automobile Sales Consultant”, “Certified Records Manager”, “Certified Training Practitioner” and so forth.

professional body, the person has mastered certain skills and competencies in a field.

- C. Licensing requires authority from a political jurisdiction; typically with strong input from a professional association. Services that are licensed (e.g., medical, legal) can only be legally performed by the lawful holder of the licence.

The Action Plan proposed for the Canadian Evaluation Society deals primarily with two categories of professional designation for evaluators: credentialing and certification. The primary emphasis is on credentialing. There are two reasons for that emphasis: (1) the Society has asked for the focus to be there and (2) most of the momentum<sup>8</sup> at this time seems to favour the institutionalization of this designation.

Accreditation of educational programs is necessary for credentialing. Credentialing requires demonstration of successful completion of the specified education program(s) and/or designated experiences. Accreditation is the mechanism whereby the educational program of an agency or educational institution is examined by the professional body and judged to be adequate for the profession's requirements.

The Action Plan also gives attention to certification and will deal with it from two perspectives: (1) a letters of support approach to the attestation of mastery of skills and competencies and (2) the approach of requiring successful completion of a formal test or set of tests (i.e., certification exams).

Licensure will not be discussed in this Action Plan. It is left for a later stage in the development of the Society's professionalisation plans.

## The Experience of Other Organizations

The material in this section is a summary of the findings detailed in a research paper reporting the results of the interviews conducted with 15 organizations.<sup>9</sup>

### Levels of professional credentials

*Are differential levels of professional credential identified and maintained? On what basis are distinctions made?*

---

<sup>8</sup> Elements of this momentum include the fact that the CEE at the federal government, a major employer of evaluators, seeks to have professionally designated evaluators; several post-secondary institutions have evaluator training programs and others are in the offing; and the national Council of the Canadian Evaluation Society has recognized a need to explore professional designations.

<sup>9</sup> *Interview Results: Professional Designations for Evaluators*, Gerald Halpern and Bud Long, December, 2006

The names of the organizations and their professional designations, if any, are:

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Professional Designations and Membership Categories</b>
Advancing Government Accountability <sup>10</sup>	Certificate of Government Financial Management Four categories of Member: Full Government Member; Private Sector Member; Early Career Member; and Student Member
Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation	No designations
The Evaluators Institute	Four designations: Certificate in Evaluation Practice; Certificate in Advanced Evaluation Practices; Master Evaluator Certificate; Certificate in Quantitative Evaluation Methods
Canadian College of Health Services Executives	Professional designation is Certified Canadian College of Health Service Executive or Certified Health Executive. Categories of member: Active Canadian Health Executive; Active Fellowship; Active without designation; Student.
Institute of Internal Auditors	Professional designation is Certified Internal Auditor. Three specialty certification programs: Certification in Control Self-Assessment; Certified Government Auditing Professional; Certified Financial Services Auditor.
Canadian Association of Management Consultants	Professional designation is Certified Management Consultant
Certified Management Accountant Canada	Professional designation is Certified Management Accountant. Not all members have the designation.
Human Resources Professionals of Ontario	Professional designation is Certified Human Resource Professional Member categories: General; Part Time Student or Practitioner; Full Time Student.
Career Professionals of Canada	Professional designation in use: Certified Resume Strategist; Certified Interview Strategist; and Certified Career Strategist.
Financial Management Institute	No professional designation since its membership is already certified by other bodies (e.g., CAs, CGAs).
Institute of Chartered Accountants of Ontario	The professional designation is Chartered Accountant

<sup>10</sup> Also known as the Council of Government Financial Managers of the Association of Government Accountants.

Organization	Professional Designations and Membership Categories
Japan Evaluation Society	Accreditation of Evaluation Training Programs in place. Does not have professional credentials but it does issue certificates for completion of Japan Evaluation Society-accredited Evaluation Training Programs. It has classes of members: Full member; Student member; Patronage member; Associate member.
Financial Planners Standards Council	Professional designation is Certified Financial Planner
Ontario Professional Planners Institute	Professional designation is Registered Professional Planner
Ordre des psychologues du Québec	Professional designation is Psychologist.
Family Mediation Canada	Professional designation is Certified Family Mediator

## Knowledge base

*On what professional standards of practice is the system based?*

This issue was well dealt with well. Rather than speak to the issue of standards of practice, organizations spoke of their responsibilities to their profession regardless of whether the responsibility was or was not enshrined in a statute. Two organizations did speak to the use of standards when they referred to their use of advisory boards in the development of competencies and examination questions.

Federal or provincial protection has been obtained for the designation of approximately half of the organizations, although one of these cites U.S. trademark legislation. Most of the remaining organizations reported legal protection arising from provincial statute in some or all provinces and territories.

Among organizations with legally conferred statutes, several reported no legal obligations that arise directly from statute; that is, the governing statute merely provides for the organization's existence and protects the designation. Many respondents did refer to responsibilities for setting out organizational objectives, regulating admission to the organization and use of the title, establishing and maintaining standards, dispensing discipline and providing continuing education, but it is unclear if these responsibilities are set out in statute.

All of the respondents who answered this question cited the protection of the designation(s) from unauthorized use. One respondent added that the statute conferred legal authority to regulate members and dispense discipline.

## Professional Development Options

*What training and professional development options are acknowledged? Are training programs accredited by the organization?*

Many of the answers to this question referred to university programs and courses accredited by the organization. In several cases, certain academic degrees (from accredited universities or colleges) are accepted as substitutes for some or all of the

designation requirements. One organization requires that the recognized course or program have been completed within the past five years for acceptance as credit toward designation.

A few respondents referred to training courses offered by the organization or by a group certified by the organization. One organization provided a detailed description of the process they use to certify training courses in the area of evaluation.

## **Grandparenting**

*Is/was a 'grandparenting' system invoked for existing members at the time of system installation? How was grandparenting structured?*

The majority of organizations reported having some type of grandparenting arrangement whereby the designation was automatically awarded to existing members. In some cases, that occurred when multiple organizations were merged, and, for example, an old designation was accepted as the equivalent of a new designation. One organization reported that all members must complete the certification program regardless of experience.

## **Training delivery**

*Who delivers training?*

Most of the organizations rely on accredited university, college, or other post-secondary institutions to deliver the training needed to qualify for the designation. Two organizations provide some courses themselves in addition to requiring completion of certain accredited university/college programs or courses. One organization relies on trainers certified by them to deliver training courses.

## **Experience requirements – credentialing**

*Are professional experience parameters acknowledged and incorporated into the credentialing system? How?*

Most of the designating organizations require some practical experience prior to awarding the designation. Several organizations accept relevant academic credentials as a substitute for a portion of the experience requirement. As one example: if the prospective member holds a specific degree, then a minimum of two years of directly related experience is required; if the prospective member holds a degree in a related field, then a minimum of four years of directly related experience is required; and, if the prospective member hold an unrelated degree, then a minimum of six years of directly related experience is required. In this case, the prospective member's sponsor must review and endorse the documentation submitted in support of the education and practical experience requirements.

Where experience is a requirement, the most commonly accepted evidence is the verification/certification of the claimed experience by the candidate's sponsor or supervisor or current employer.

## **Continuous learning**

*Is demonstration of continuous learning required of members in order to maintain credentials? What sorts of learning experiences qualify?*

The majority of the organizations (three-quarters) require some form of ongoing professional development or continuing education. In most cases, the organizations established a minimum number of hours of continuing education within a specified time period. Some organizations use a point system to assign values to different forms of professional development, which can include courses of study, attendance at seminars or conferences, or work voluntary work for the organization, including development of exam questions.

Of the respondents who answered, all said that the content of the courses reflects the body of knowledge developed for the profession. Several organizations develop the questions in their knowledge and skills examinations through the use of members who volunteer to write questions based on the organization's professional competencies. Some organizations initially developed the questions for their knowledge and skill examinations based on the organizations' professional competencies and then engaged in member consultation to fine tune the items.

With respect to the burden imposed by monitoring and disciplining functions, respondents whose organizations monitor member activities through inspections report that the burden is significant both in terms of staff time, volunteer time and cost. One informant noted that inspections consume almost one-third of the organization's annual operating budget. Many other respondents reported the considerable time (staff and volunteer) and expense of investigations and disciplinary reviews, but noted that there are very few cases each year. At the other end of the scale, some respondents noted that monitoring of fee payment is automatic (by computer) and poses no special burden on the organization. As a result of the low frequency of cases and the effectiveness of threatening letters from lawyers when necessary, responding to false claims is not considered an onerous task by most of the respondents interviewed.

### **Set-up costs**

*What are the major set-up costs?*

Many respondents could not provide estimated costs for these tasks, which often occurred many years ago. Some respondents provided figures of between \$150,000 and \$250,000 to develop the bodies of knowledge or competencies originally. Other respondents provided estimated costs to review/revise their organizations' professional competencies ranging from \$15,000 to \$50,000, plus large amounts of volunteer time.

Respondents could not provide a dollar figure cost associated with the original selection of academic programs and courses. Many commented that this task involved a lot of volunteer and staff time. Costs to develop the organization's own examinations were also largely unknown but several respondents noted that much staff and volunteer time was devoted to this task.

### **Maintenance costs**

*What are the ongoing maintenance costs?*

Few respondents could estimate the ongoing costs to the organization of periodic review of the body of knowledge.

In relation to the costs to the organization for the periodic review and delivery of the organization's own courses, few substantive answers were given.

Where respondents provided dollar cost figures, the cost of monitoring and disciplining members ranged from a high of \$1.2 million (of which \$360,000 is for inspections and \$811,000 is for discipline) to a low of \$50,000 per year.

## **System finance**

*How would the system be financed?*

Three organizations reported that they charged academic institutions no fees for the original selection and periodic review of their programs and courses. Two organizations charge accredited institutions \$100 per year. The remaining organizations did not answer or the question was not applicable.

There was a wide range of responses regarding the cost to individuals:

- six organizations had application fees of \$50, \$97, \$400, \$500, \$775, and \$1000 for their admission or application fees.
- one organization charges (in US dollars) \$85 for members or \$110 for non-members for each of four exams in addition to initial registration fees of \$60 for members and \$75 for non-members.
- one organization states that fees are set at cost-recovery which, for it, is \$415 for the obtaining of credentials and then an annual renewal fee of \$30.
- three organizations charged \$450 for the course fee, \$650 for the exam plus additional for the cost of textbooks.
- three organizations charge no additional fees for the original designation.

Apart from annual membership dues, two organizations charge an additional fee (\$125 and \$155) for maintaining specialized designations.

Three of the five respondents who provided information about the net earnings/net losses experienced by the organization with respect to ongoing designation costs indicated that revenues from designation fees exceed the expenses for administering the designation program.

## **Benefits**

*Are tangible benefits of the credentialing system in evidence? What are they?*

Generally, respondents felt that the major benefit of the designation was to impose qualification standards and improve the supply and quality of trained professionals. Several informants reported that employers value the quality assurance provided by the designation, give certified candidates preference when recruiting employees, and may encourage or require that current employees obtain the designation. Most respondents reported greater demand for the services of those with the designation. None of the respondents could identify any negative impacts that the designation has had on the organization or its members.

For the most part respondents reported that those who do not hold the designation (who may or may not meet the requirements for designation) have not stopped working in the field. One of these organizations is currently attempting to limit the role of unlicensed practitioners by expanding the definition of services protected by the designation.

## Action Plan

### Framework for Professional Designations

The following framework of professional designations is proposed. It identifies levels of professional designation and briefly outlines the way each would be obtained from the Canadian Evaluation Society.

#### Professional Designations

It is recommended that the Canadian Evaluation Society now adopt a system of professional designation and that the system provide for three different professional designations. The three are: Member, Credentialed Evaluator and Certified Professional Evaluator.

The professional designations to be made available by CES will serve the requirements of member evaluators and of employers of evaluation services. The former will have credible attestation of their status as a professional evaluator; the latter will have access to lists provided by CES of individuals possessing each of the professional designations given by the Society.

This is a ladder of designations. The certification level is seen as the highest level. It is currently proposed to be represented by the designation Certified Professional Evaluator. Persons with this designation are judged capable of conducting and/or managing evaluation studies regardless of the particular approach to evaluation being considered;<sup>11</sup> it is also recognized that most evaluators have a preference for particular types of and/or for particular approaches to evaluation. Although capable of the full range of evaluations, most professional evaluators will refer a client who prefers an approach other than their own preference to an evaluator whose approach is concordant with the client's direction.

The entry level, Credentialed Evaluator, will typically work in a setting with at least one resident Certified Professional Evaluator in order to gain the full range of experiences and learning available from such contact. But that is not a necessary condition. The Credentialed Evaluator, especially if the training is coupled with appropriate experience, may be professionally prepared for many of the tasks required of the evaluator and may choose to work with sole responsibility for her or his mandates.

The Member will have a full appreciation of the ways in which evaluation can contribute to the amelioration of many challenges associated with an evaluand and may even be fully conversant with, and practiced in, some of the methodologies and other competencies required for evaluation. It is also a professional level that may be achieved by evaluation consumers who wish to have a more sophisticated appreciation of what evaluation can provide to assist them in the conduct of their primary responsibilities.

---

<sup>11</sup> Among the types of evaluation that may be brought to bear on a given evaluand are formative or summative evaluation, process or outcome evaluation, participatory/internal or external judgement and so forth. It may be that, as an enhancement to the designation of CPE and possible also to that of CE, areas of expertise may be recognized as additional recognition of knowledge, skills and experience.

## Voluntary Designation

This proposal for a ladder of professional designation in evaluation is not intended to suggest that everyone associated with the Canadian Evaluation Society need seek a professional designation. There are many persons who hold membership because they value services available from the Society but who are not evaluators. Many in this category are consumers of evaluation services and wish to increase the sophistication of their use of evaluation. They are most welcome within the Society and have no need for a professional evaluation designation. Others, even though they have the skills and competencies necessary for a professional evaluator designation, may chose not to apply for and receive such a designation.

It should be clearly understood that the application for a professional designation other than Member is to be voluntary in nature; Members of CES may apply for a professional designation. Members of CES may choose to apply for the designation of Credentialed Evaluator or that of Certified Professional Evaluator. If they do so, their application will be dealt with in an expeditious and equitable manner; if they do not make such application, they remain Members in good standing of the Society.

## Member – Canadian Evaluation Society

### Description

This is the level available to all members of the Canadian Evaluation Society.<sup>12</sup> The title “Member” is received after a signed Application to be a Member of the Society has been accepted by the Canadian Evaluation Society. The current Application Form will have to be modified to include three attestations by the individual. This is probably best done by modifying the signature line on the Application Form such that it states:

I understand that, by virtue of having become a Member of the Canadian Evaluation Society, I accept to have my behaviour governed by:

- The principles listed in the synoptic version of the *Program Evaluation Standards* that deal with the utility, feasibility, propriety and accuracy of evaluation services and which are generally accepted as standards of evaluation practice;
- The Society’s *Guidelines for Ethical Conduct* which are accepted as the touchstone for good professional behaviour.
- The understanding that the practice of the profession of evaluation is intended to meet the needs of individual clients and of society in general.

It is noted in passing that the acceptance of the synoptic version of the *Program Evaluation Standards* is a less rigorous requirement than abiding by the full set of standards.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> A distinction is made between a member and a Member. The large majority of individuals that have membership in the CES will be Members. A minority will be members in that they have paid annual dues but have not completed an application form for membership. In the category of members will be found persons who wish to take a course (such as the Essential Skills Series) which is only available to persons with a paid-up membership in the Society. These are typically persons who wish to gain a better understanding of evaluation and/or be a more informed consumer of evaluation services.

<sup>13</sup> The intention is not that a Member be fully conversant with *The Program Evaluation Standards* (1994) published by Sage. The intention is that a Member subscribes to the synopsis of the Program Evaluation Standards: the brief statement of standards classed as utility (7), feasibility (3), propriety (8) and accuracy (12). Persons with the designations CPE

### Summary of Steps

The individual seeking to be a Member completes an Application Form (new or renewal) and the Society determines if the application is to be accepted.

The Chapter is informed of the name and coordinates of persons who have been accepted to membership.

### Costs (time and dollars)

There is no cost over and above the annual membership fee and the fees charged for individual services such as course offerings, other professional development or social activities.

### Advantages to the Designation

Provides a designation to every person who has paid annual fees to be a member of the CES.

Distinguishes between members who have a peripheral interest in evaluation (perhaps as a consumer of evaluation services) and those Members who have a professional interest in the practice of evaluation.

### Disadvantages to the Designation

A Member without a higher level professional designation is not authorised to label her/himself as a Professional Evaluator (i.e., Credentialed Evaluator or Certified Professional Evaluator).

There is no warranty implied to society or to purchasers of evaluation services and there is no potential disadvantage to the ascription of the title Member.

## **Credentialed Evaluator (CE)**

### Description

Members in good standing of the Canadian Evaluation Society who have successfully completed a recognized course of study. To be a recognized course, the program must be one that has been accredited by the CES Accreditation Board (CESAB). Persons wishing to be credentialed must apply to the Canadian Evaluation Society; if their application is successful, they have the right to advertise themselves as a Credentialed Evaluator and may use the initials CE after their name.

The designation CE would be awarded by CES on the basis of the recommendation made by an academic program previously accredited by CES for the task. Accreditation of programs would be performed by CES on the basis of their curricula or course of study, qualifications of faculty who teach and supervise evaluation courses, and integration of the Program Evaluation Standards and the Guidelines for Ethical Conduct.<sup>15</sup>

---

are expected to have a deeper appreciation of the standards for program evaluation than is expected of CEs.

[Unintended gap in footnote sequence. There is not a footnote 14.]

<sup>15</sup> The course requirements would likely include at least 4 graduate half-courses or about 400 hours of relevant graduate instruction.

[Unintended gap in footnote sequence. There is not a footnote 16.]

The CESAB could consider the CE level as warranted under any of three conditions:

- 1 The candidate for designation by CES has completed a designated post-graduate study program accredited by the CESAB.
- 2 The accredited program could recommend a candidate for designation by CES on the basis of the successful completion of examination tasks and/or other criteria conducted by the program.
- 3 CESAB could award the CE on the basis of some combination of equivalent study and/or relevant and sufficient experience.<sup>17</sup>
  - 3a The candidate for designation by CES may have completed a study program judged wholly or partially equivalent at an accredited study program. (Evidence acceptable to CESAB would be required.)
  - 3b The candidate for designation by CES may have relevant and sufficient experience in evaluation. (Evidence acceptable to CESAB would be required.)

#### Action Plan

- 1 CES should accept responsibility for the development and implementation of the credentialing process;
  - 1a the credentialing process should be monitored and adapted as necessary over time;
- 2 CES should establish a CES Accreditation Board (CESAB) responsible to review teaching programs in post-secondary institutions and determine if each meets the education requirements for the designation Credentialed Evaluator;
  - 2a The CESAB will be guided by its understanding of the core competencies required of an evaluator at this level and may take into account advice from other distinguished practitioners and academic faculty;<sup>18 19</sup>
- 3 CESAB should consider the advisability of the following conditions:
  - 3a Applicants must be a Member of the CES;

---

<sup>17</sup> The CESAB will have to work out "equivalency tables" which would be updated on a regular basis as it gains experience with individual requests for designation as a CPE by persons who have not attended a program of study at an accredited program of study. It is possible that such a table will accept sufficient experience that is relevant plus courses not at the post-graduate level to be at least equivalent to a sanctioned course of study.

<sup>18</sup> The literature on this topic includes Zorzi, R., Perrin, B., McGuire, M., Long, B., & Lee, L. (2002). Defining the benefits, outputs, and knowledge elements of program evaluation. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 17(3), 143-150 and the Public Service Commission study done for Treasury Board on the competencies required of evaluators.

<sup>19</sup> The CESAB, collectively, is expected to appreciate the elements of a core body of knowledge for evaluation (CBK) or core competencies. This implicit use of the CBK will be replaced in time by a more explicit statement. See Annex C for more detail on this point.

- 3b If judged appropriate and adequate, evidence of courses and/or workshops completed and/or work experience may be accepted as equivalent to an accredited course; equivalent;
  - 3c There is no necessary experiential requirement for the CE;
  - 3d Continuing professional development is not a requirement for maintenance of the CE by an individual;<sup>20</sup>
  - 3e Compliance with the Program Evaluation Standards and the Guidelines for Ethical Conduct may be monitored;
  - 3f A procedure should be developed to treat fairly any complaints and appeals from unsuccessful candidates.
- 4 CESAB should identify the conditions under which the credential could be revoked.
    - 4a Complaints from clients and from the general public should be fairly and expeditiously dealt with by a CESAB "Professional Practices Sub-committee".
    - 4b Complaints from the public or from an employer should lead to a review of the holder of the credential and/or of the program that has been accredited.
  - 5 CES should maintain, on the CES website, a publicly accessible directory of CEs.

#### Costs (time and dollars)

The Member seeking to have the designation Credentialed Evaluator must make application to the CES using a form to be provided by the Society. This Action Plan suggests that such a form require submission of evidence of the program of studies followed; to wit, the name of the institution(s), the courses taken at the institution(s), including a detailed description of the curricula or course of study; the date of each course; name(s) of faculty teaching the course; the date of each course; and the grade received in each course together with the legend of the scale of course grades and the label for each level of the scale.

The following cost-schedule is proposed for use by CES. If the evidence relates to an accredited program, the one-time fee is \$100.00; if the evidence relates to a program not yet accredited the one-time fee will be either \$100.00 (for a program of study followed at a Canadian institution of learning) or \$200.00<sup>21</sup> (for a program of study followed at multiple Canadian institutions of learning or at a non-Canadian institution of learning).

#### Advantages to the Designation

- CES has a rapid response to its responsibility to provide an entry level professional designation.
- CE is a professional designation that is accessible to the majority of CES members.

---

<sup>20</sup> CESAB may consider such a requirement. A typical requirement in this area would be about 80 hours of professional development (course, conferences, etc.) every 2 years.

<sup>21</sup> The higher fee is in recognition of the higher processing costs required to process the application.

- CE can be administered with a relatively small financial outlay and fees can be set to make the administration revenue neutral.<sup>22</sup>
- At least two institutions<sup>23</sup> are now, or very soon will, offer programs likely to be accredited. Fortuitously, a dual language program which can be followed in English (at the University of Ottawa) and one is offered in French (at the École nationale d'administration publique).

#### Disadvantages to the Designation

- Time and effort will have to be expended to make this a reality.
- Credentialing does not usually give practitioners an exclusive right to a given field. Even if the name of a credential is protected by a provincial or state statute, persons who do not have that certificate can still practice in the field.
- There is no warranty implied to society or to purchasers of evaluation services and there is no potential disadvantage to the ascription of the title Credentialed Evaluator.

#### **Certified Professional Evaluator (CPE)**

Certification is the highest level of designation proposed in this Action Plan.<sup>24</sup> It has many advantages but it is not the highest level possible. Some form of licensure may have to be considered at a latter stage; licensure is not discussed in this paper.

#### **The Interim Solution**

##### Description

Certification systems examined by the literature review and by the discussions with organizations are based on (1) performance on examinations aimed at demonstrating knowledge and skill, (2) the accumulation of relevant experience in the field and (3) portfolios of professional production. Such verification tools are necessary to arrive at a solid judgment on the capacity of a person to act as a recognized professional in the discipline. CES, as the certification body, must specify the expectations held for professional evaluators. The set of expectations is a clear expression of the knowledge and competencies required of the evaluation professional. Testing competency through written examination requires that the knowledge universe be well developed and that it be sampled for testing by means of prepared examinations. Although CES has made progress in this direction (see Annex C), it has not yet reached the point where a program of uniform examinations can be put in place.<sup>25</sup> Since it is expected that this process may take up to eight years, the following approach to Certified Professional

---

<sup>22</sup> The fee level proposed is an educated guess. Whether it leads to a revenue neutral situation will be a function of the costs incurred by CES. The proposed fee level must therefore reviewed as experience with the costs of awarding the CE designation is gained.

<sup>23</sup> A third, Carleton University, may also soon be in a position to offer a graduate certificate in evaluation. Others as well are moving in this direction and soon will reach a stage at which they can be named. It is hoped that at least one will offer a program via distance education.

<sup>24</sup> "Certification programs are win-win-win -- the certifiers benefit; the certified benefit; and so does any customer, client or employer who relies on the certification. That should explain why, within a decade, every market leader in every global industry will offer certification programs for its key employees." Fortune Magazine, 6.26.00 [Quoted by the AGA site]

<sup>25</sup> In addition to preparing uniform examinations, it will be necessary to either create, or rent space at, a network of designated examination centres with structured testing procedures.

Evaluator (CPE) first makes use of a method that includes the judgement of highly experienced evaluators with proven competencies and then replaces this resource with formal examinations. Properly applied, either the use of experienced evaluators as assessors or the use of written examination is a sufficient method for testing knowledge. The former is likely more expensive of the time of highly experienced evaluators<sup>26</sup> (expected to also be among the first certified professional evaluators) and so the use of these professionals as assessment instruments is seen as an interim means of assessing mastery of the knowledge requirements for the designation Certified Professional Evaluators (CPE). Initially, the demand on their time will be relieved by the naming of additional CPEs and, in time, by a process of formal examinations offered at locations distributed across the country.

Initially, to secure the CPE designation, the professional must:

- Be a member of CES in good standing at all times;
- Possess a graduate degree;
- Have accumulated at least five years of experience in evaluation; and,
- Present three letters of support issued by evaluators already holding the CPE designation.<sup>27</sup>

Details of the rationale and logistics of this certification are available in Annex B.

#### Summary of Steps

To implement this approach to certification, the CES needs to take the following steps:

- 1) Create a CES Board of Examiners (CESBE) which will be responsible for the administration of the designation;
- 2) Set out the criteria that holders of the designation should use in assessing candidates for the designation before awarding them their support;
- 3) Publicize the existence of the designation and invite candidates;
- 4) Develop the software required to maintain the system;
- 5) Develop the software to make public an up-to-date list of Certified Professional Evaluators.

#### Costs (time and dollars)

The Board of Examiners will be comprised of five volunteer Certified Professional Evaluators (see Annex B on how to initiate the mechanics of the evaluator review system). Thirty hours from each member should be sufficient to lay the ground rules and develop the specifications of the software which will assist in managing the system and the public list of Certified Professional Evaluators. An additional thirty hours per year will be required of each Board of Examiners member to fulfill their duties.

---

<sup>26</sup> Although relatively few CPEs will be available, in the early years of CPE certification procedures, the number will grow in line with the numbers of persons seeking CPE status. It is expected that this growth in numbers of CPEs will at least match growth in the membership of CES.

<sup>27</sup> Annex B also provides an alternative procedure for exceptional circumstances; it is designed to ensure that all evaluators have full opportunity to apply for the professional credential.

The software required to manage the system and the public reporting of certifications could be developed based on volunteer work. Without this input, a budget of \$10,000 should be set aside.

The amount of secretarial resources required will be dependent upon the level of auditing chosen by the CESBE. An annual budget of \$10,000 will be a minimum.

There will be significant costs associated with the completion of the research work on the defined body of knowledge and the writing of standardized examinations. This cost is not estimated because so much will depend upon the services of volunteers. Many members of CES are among the most qualified to conduct this work and may be prepared to provide the service on a pro bono or honorarium basis.

The following cost-schedule is proposed for consideration by the CESBE:

- an application fee of \$100 and
- an examination fee of \$300

CESBE will want to examine the fees on a regular basis in the light of anticipated costs for the longer term approach to the CPE. It is suggested here that persons receiving certification under the interim procedure should pay the same fee anticipated for the longer-term procedure. CESBE may also want to consider a maintenance fee but this will depend upon whether it decides to add a requirement to demonstrate on-going training.

#### Advantages to the Designation

- it is flexible in its definition of what a Certified Professional Evaluator is (avoiding debates about minimum knowledge requirements or related to schools of thought in evaluation);
- it allows for this definition to evolve over time according to informal standards set among professionals;
- it is not costly for the CES;
- it structures the network of existing judgments on a professional's work;
- the system engages members of the community into the designation process.

#### Disadvantages to the Designation

- the credibility of the system will be proportional to the seriousness used by CPEs in awarding their support;
- the absence of a formal professional assessment process leaves room to vagaries in designations.

#### **The Long-term Solution**

The Certified Professional Evaluator designation of the Canadian Evaluation Society is a recognition that a person has the appropriate formal education, the necessary practical experience and has demonstrated high levels of academic learning and professional skills in a range of evaluation roles and accomplishments.

The interim solution uses letters of support issued by evaluators already holding the CPE designation to attest to an individual's mastery of the profession. The long term solution will replace letters of support with standardized assessments. This is the means typically chosen by organizations that offer a certification designation.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Literature Review: Professionalization of Evaluators. Prepared for the CES Evaluation Professionalization Project. Irene Huse and James C. McDavid, University of Victoria. October 10, 2006.

To use the examination approach, the professional organization must have all three of the following conditions:

	<b>condition</b>	<b>status</b>
1	There be agreement on the core competencies for the profession, since there will need to be a process for assessing the competence of each practitioner who applies for certification. The development of a competency profile will have significant cost. <sup>29</sup>	CES has made progress toward the establishment of a core body of knowledge but is likely at least three years away from a consensus on this issue.
2	The competencies will need to be translated into curricula for the organizations that purvey knowledge, skills and dispositions that are deemed to be appropriate for practitioners.	Without agreement on a core body of knowledge, the curricula cannot be set. Some courses are currently offered by the CES but these do not fully cover the full set of requirements. Curricula development is estimated to require about three years once the requirements have been established.
3	An examination/assessment process is typical of professions that certify their practitioners. The examinations need to be developed, validated in terms of competencies measured, and revised periodically.	This cannot be started until the core body of knowledge is agreed upon and the curricula developed. Once started, it is likely to require about two years.

It is recommended that CES initiates work to enable this second approach to certification. Once the examination route to certification has been fully developed, it may be put into effect and will supplant the letters of support approach.

## Additional CES Responsibilities

Regardless of which form of professional designation system is adopted, the Canadian Evaluation Society will have responsibilities additional to those that it currently accepts. These additional responsibilities include:

---

<sup>29</sup> In [Next Steps Towards Professional Credentialing in Informatics](#), Parker-Taillon (2005) suggests that the development of a competency profile would take about one year, and provides the following key steps (expected to cost approximately \$50,000 in Canada):

- ◆ Identification of a contractor, oversight committee and working group made up of “content experts” that are representative of the profession (i.e. represent diversity in terms of educational background, geographic location and levels of experience).
- ◆ Review of the literature to identify all existing documents relevant in the development of the profile (i.e. similar documents from other countries/professions, curriculum documents).
- ◆ Workshop with working group to develop first draft of profile.
- ◆ National validation of draft profile (either through survey, focus groups, or both).
- ◆ Revision of profile (Note: several rounds of consultation and revision usually occur).
- ◆ Final review by oversight committee and review/adoption by Board. (p. 5)

- Appoint an Accreditation Board and a Board of Examiners
  - The following are sources of Board members:
    - Fellows of the CES
    - Recipients of the CES Award for “Contribution to Evaluation in Canada”
    - Recipients of the CES Award for “Leadership in Evaluation”
    - Recipients of the CES Award “Service to the Canadian Evaluation Society”
- Charge Boards with the further development and the discharge of the responsibilities implicit in the action plan for each professional designation.
  - Credentialed Evaluator (CE) to be managed by the Accreditation Board
  - Certified Professional Evaluator to be managed by the Board of Examiners. The initial process for the CPE designation will use Letters of support; the longer-term plan for CPE is to be instituted as soon as possible but will likely take about eight years given the need to formularize the body of knowledge and core competencies and then to develop appropriate examination procedure.
- Developing new courses or training programs in consultation with post-secondary institutions and assisting candidates to achieve a professional designation.
  - Accrediting continuous education (CE) courses and training programs
  - Developing new courses or training programs in consultation with colleges and universities, tailored to teach the national standards. These courses may be mandatory and often some are prerequisite for the professional designation.
  - Cross-referencing standards (body of knowledge) to readily available text books, professional literature, and self-study materials
- Marketing and Advocacy
  - Marketing the value and benefits of the CES designations to the professional community and the public
  - Maintaining a publicly accessible directory of CES members with their level of professional designation and their areas of expertise. It was very clear from the review of web sites of the organizations interviewed for this study that publicity was an important function of the organization.
  - Public messaging typically goes well beyond simple publicity; it is often very strong in advocacy. Organizations promote the unique competencies of those of its members who have been awarded a professional designation. They promote the professional development standards of their members and make clear the benefits to clients and to society at large that derive from the services of its professional members.

## Grandparenting

As stated earlier, the majority of organizations consulted as part of this study reported having some type of grandparenting arrangement whereby the designation was more or less automatically awarded to existing members. Typically, such grandparenting process is set up so that existing practitioners can avoid the burden of complying with

study requirements (in programs which did not exist when they joined the profession) or examination requirements (in a profession they have practiced for many years).

Such grandparenting processes are not required as part of this action plan. This is because the CE designation process already comprises provisions for the recognition of courses taken outside of an accredited program and because the CPE designation process is initiated with a low-burden letter of support system which is accessible to anyone with sufficient experience in evaluation. Adding a supplemental grandparenting process would only complicate the system.<sup>30</sup>

## Recommended Action Sequence

1. Accept a set of professional designations. For the moment, the three designations: Member, Credentialed Evaluator, and Certified Professional Evaluator are taken as the only designations to be recognized by the Society.
2. Immediately accept the designation Member.
3. Develop a plan for the use of the designation Credentialed Evaluator.
  - 3 a. Determine a procedure by which specific courses of study will be recognized as evidence of having met the requirements for the designation Credentialed Evaluator.
  - 3 b. Determine a procedure by which Members may submit their qualifications for the designation Credentialed Evaluator .
  - 3 c. Determine the fee to charged, in addition to the Member fee, for the review of submitted qualifications for the designation Credentialed Evaluator.
  - 3 d. Determine the fee to charged, on an on-going basis and in addition to the Member fee, for the maintenance of the designation Credentialed Evaluator.
4. Begin the process for the designation Certified Professional Evaluator using the interim procedure.
5. Once the interim procedures for the designation Certified Professional Evaluator have been determined and are at least underway to implementation, begin the process for the longer-term process for the designation Certified Professional Evaluator. This should not be unduly delayed for it will be a multi-year process.

## Evaluation Requirements

CES National Council plans to engage in discussion of the proposed Action Plan and to seek views and suggestions from the membership of the Society. Once the shape of the Action Plan has been determined by CES, it is recommended that a performance measurement system be designed and implemented. Concurrent with the performance

---

<sup>30</sup> Even though not logically required by the recommended Action Plan, grandparenting may become necessary change following review and possible modification. Should there be explicit grandparenting, it is suggested that there be a three year maximum 'window' with staggered and rising fees as the time passes.

<sup>33</sup> Irene Huse and James C. McDavid, Literature Review: Professionalisation of Evaluators. University of Victoria, October 10, 2006

measurement plan, advance preparation for a formative evaluation should be completed. That formative evaluation should be scheduled for about three years after the institution of professional designations. A summative evaluation should be scheduled for about three years after that. The monitoring of performance will include uptake statistics and system costs and, possibly, unsolicited evaluative judgements offered by members and by clients. The formative evaluation will provide an initial reading of strengths and weaknesses and is expected to provide suggestions for system improvement. The formative evaluation should consider, *inter alia*, the timeframe and progress for work toward the examination approach to certification. By then, CES will have had three years of experience with the letters of support approach to the Certified Professional Evaluator designation and with specification of the knowledge and competencies needed for the preparation for an examination approach. CES should then be a position to weight the likely costs and benefits of the two approaches to certification and carefully consider the route best suited to the achievement of its objectives.

## Annex A: Credentialed Evaluator

Based on the literature review<sup>33</sup>, the following are generally seen as steps to successfully designing and implementing a credentialing system for a profession. The full set of steps are provided here as additional background information for the Accreditation Board that will be responsible for the fuller development of the proposed action plan presented in the body of the report.

- ❖ Obtain agreement by the governing body for the professional association/society that credentialing is an appropriate way to begin professionalizing the discipline.
- ❖ Consult with the membership of the professional association to ascertain/confirm the need/demand for a credential.
- ❖ Consult with/enlist the support of the organizations/institutions that would be providing formal education or training as part of obtaining a credential.<sup>34</sup>
- ❖ Assign staff resources in the professional association to the credentialing process.
- ❖ Develop volunteer committees to assist with the process. Their tasks will depend on the range of ways by which practitioners can become credentialed. If experience, for example, is included as an option for credentialing, assessing experience will necessitate committees of practitioners who review portfolios or other evidence of practice.
- ❖ With the aid of academics and practitioners, identify credentialing requirements and options. These may include formal education, training, professional development, experience and various combinations of these options. One important distinction is between education and training for which persons have been granted formal post-graduate credit, and other training or professional development for which no credit has been granted.
- ❖ Although it is not essential that core competencies be defined to credential practitioners, it is essential that the Program Evaluation Standards and Guidelines for Ethical Conduct have been designated.
- ❖ A self-evaluation/self-reporting process that is intended to detail relevant experience, may also be required. Criteria for relevant experience will need to be developed. If portfolios are deemed to be necessary for the credential, they are prepared by practitioners will need to be assessed by committees or persons designated for this task. Criteria for the assessment process will need to be developed and validated.
- ❖ There may be a formal examination process as part of a credentialing process, but this is more typical of a certification process. Developing, validating and periodically revising such an examination is a significant undertaking. The examination may be a part of assessing the experience of practitioners who

---

<sup>34</sup> Although accrediting institutions that provide education or training is an option, that process would entail establishing the content and delivery modalities of curricula that would need to be offered. Establishing whether core competencies are being taught can be a part of the accreditation process but is not essential.

- apply for the credential outside the ambit of formal education or training channels.
- ❖ If a grandparenting system is developed to credential existing practitioners, criteria will have to be developed to decide who gets grandparented, how long such a privilege is extended to the practice community, and what evidence is required to be granted a credential in this way.
  - ❖ Requirements for continuing professional development can be established. The professional association needs to decide whether the credential is granted for a fixed period of time, subject to maintenance and/or renewal.
  - ❖ There has to be a capacity in the professional association to monitor the credentialing process, and to modify it as needed.
  - ❖ There has to be a capacity to handle complaints and appeals from persons who have been unsuccessful in the credentialing process.
  - ❖ Once a plan for the design and implementation of the credentialing system has been established, a business plan must be developed. The business plan will need to estimate the costs of credentialing, and the revenues that will be needed to offset those costs. Allocating the costs among stakeholders (principally, those persons seeking the credential, costs to governments, costs to the society/professional association, costs to organizations providing education/training, costs to organizations assessing experience) will be a part of the business plan. The business plan will need to be approved by the governing body of the professional association.
  - ❖ A newly-developed credentialing system will need to be marketed to current and future members of the professional association.

## **Annex B: Certification - Certified Professional Evaluator**

Certification systems described as part of the literature review and of the organization analysis are based on (1) exams aimed at demonstrating mastery of the trade, (2) the accumulation of experience in the field and (3) portfolios of professional production. Such verification tools are necessary to pose a solid judgment on the capacity of a person to act as a recognized professional in the discipline.

Such mechanisms require that the certification body (here, CES) articulate with precision the expectations put on professionals in evaluation. In turn, stating these expectations necessitates a clear expression of the knowledge and competencies required of the professional. CES has not reached that point yet. Elsewhere, this report highlights the need for the development of a body of knowledge for evaluators and proposes a path to that result. Since it is expected that this process will take several years, we propose an interim process to certify evaluators as Certified Professional Evaluators (CPE). It is intended that the letters of support in this interim process be replaced by examinations at examination centres across the country once the ability to do so has been developed.

In this interim process, to secure the CPE designation, the professional must:

- be a Member of CES in good standing at all times;
- possess a graduate degree;
- have accumulated at least five years of experience in evaluation; and,
- present three letters of support issued by evaluators already holding the CPE designation.

As described in more detail below, the proposed CPE certification process will be streamlined to make its administration as simple as possible and to contain its cost including the in-kind cost of volunteer time. The Consortium has reviewed the possibility of a fuller process which would entail the development of individualized portfolios, the preparation of custom letters of support, and so forth. Following that review, the Consortium recommends the use of the streamlined version described here. The two key reasons for this approach are the interim nature of the process and to need to make the system feasible within the constraints and limitations under which it will work.

Because the proposed system requires letters of support from CPEs, it was felt that evaluators working outside of established evaluation networks could find it difficult to secure this sort of support. For these professionals, one possibility would be to use existing chapter and national network opportunities (e.g., training sessions, conferences) to make the necessary contacts. In recognition of the limitations of this approach, the Consortium proposes that an alternative process be available to acquire the CPE designation: in lieu of the letters of support from CPEs, candidates could present a portfolio of evaluation reports (maybe accompanied with commendation letters from evaluation client organizations) along with a letter describing how this portfolio supports their candidacy for the designation. A satisfactory portfolio would have to be presented to the CES Board of Examiners (CESBE). The Consortium seeks to have paths to the CPE that enable all evaluators, regardless of their geographical location, to have an equal opportunity to apply for the designation.

## Operations

### *Obtaining the designation.*

To secure the CPE designation, the professional must fill out an electronic form to pose their candidacy for the designation. In this form, the candidate declares that she or he:

- is a Member of CES in good standing (verified by the CES secretariat);
- possess a graduate degree (self-declaration, subject to verification);
- has accumulated at least five years of experience in evaluation (self-declaration supported by a list of employments, subject to verification); and
- has the support of three CPEs). Letters of support cannot be requested from someone in a subordinate position, such as a superior asking support from a subordinate or a contract manager from a person to whom they award contracts.
- A maximum of one letter of support can be garnered from the place of employment of the applicant for CPE.

### *Letters of Support.*

A standardized electronic form will be available for CPEs preparing a Letter of Support. Each such letter will attest to at least the following considerations:

- the supporter will have to indicate that he or she has read and understood a statement from CES that describes level of expertise expected of CPEs;
- the supporter will have to indicate that the candidate possesses the required level of competency in each of a selection of areas of competency (selected from a list provided by CES);
- the supporter will have to affirm that he or she vouches for the professionalism of the candidate.

This form is completed on-line and submitted to the CESBE for review. CESBE will confirm that the CPEs attesting support are providing independent views by verifying that the three letters of support are supplied by CPEs who have knowledge of the applicant that is differently sourced. The CPEs providing support must continue to be CPEs in good standing for the maintenance of the CPE designation by the person supported.<sup>35</sup>

### *Publication.*

A list of individuals having presented their candidacy for the designation is published on the CES Web site for a period of two months. Members of CES are invited to check that list and to convey any concerns they may have about a candidate not meeting the level of professionalism called for by the CPE designation.

The CESBE makes the final decision regarding the award of the designation.

---

<sup>35</sup> In the event that a CPE who wrote a Letter of Support is stripped from the designation by decision of the CESBE, those professionals who obtained their designation on the basis of a letter of support from that CPE will be asked to acquire the support of another, authorized, CPE.

*Audits.*

The CESBE selects the level of auditing that is appropriate for the system to run reliably and feasibly. The following types of audits could be performed:

- copies of documents attesting of the possession of a graduate degree could be requested;
- employers listed in employment lists could be contacted to confirm the information supplied;
- supporting CPEs could be contacted to confirm that they completed a letter of support for a candidate.

*Kick starting the system.*

A system which is based on professionals possessing the designation awarding support to professionals seeking the designation clearly needs a certain number of professionals to be awarded the designation initially so that the chain of recognition can be initiated. These initially “grandparented” professionals could be those who have already been recognized by the CES for their past achievements. This could include Fellows of the CES<sup>36</sup> as well as recipients of CES Outstanding Contribution Awards<sup>37</sup> or anyone else chosen by the CES National Council via a motion to that effect.

*Public availability of information.*

An important aspect of the system is that up-to-date information on who possesses the designation is available publicly; this allows third parties to verify claims of Certified Professional Evaluator status. Moreover, the list of individuals who supported an evaluator in their quest for the designation should also be public so that individuals know that their support is on the public record reinforcing the requirement that supporters take seriously the award of their support.<sup>38</sup>

Responsibilities

Responsibility for the integrity of the CPE designation system rests with three entities:

- the professional seeking the designation is responsible for presenting their candidacy and completing all requirements in this regard;
- the designated CPEs on a list prepared by the CESBE are responsible for awarding their support with care and for ensuring that the individuals whose designation they support have demonstrated their ability to carry out evaluation work according to the expectations of the CES; they are also responsible for maintaining their membership in CES;
- the CES is responsible for
  - publicizing a list of criteria that holders of the designation should use in assessing candidates for the designation;

---

<sup>36</sup> See <http://evaluationcanada.ca/site.cgi?s=2&ss=6>

<sup>37</sup> See <http://evaluationcanada.ca/site.cgi?s=4&ss=4> for recipients of the Award for Contribution to Evaluation in Canada and the Award for Service to the Canadian Evaluation Society

<sup>38</sup> This list of supporters will be removed once the interim process is replaced by the examination procedure. In effect, CPEs awarded under the interim process will be grandfathered into the status received under the examination process.

- giving credibility to the designation;
- maintaining the designation system;
- making an up-to-date list of Certified Professional Evaluators public.

The CES could charge annual fees to Certified Professional Evaluators to defray the costs of system maintenance and to contribute to its operations. Assuming that an appropriate disclaimer is used by CES, the system would create no liability for the Society.

#### Pros and cons

The interim procedure has the following advantages:

- it directly assesses the knowledge and competence of the applicant;<sup>39</sup>
- it is supple in its definition of what is a Certified Evaluation Professional
- it allows CES to vest existing experts (those who will eventually define the content of examination) with assessment responsibility prior to the conduct of formal debate and consensus seeking about minimum knowledge requirements and schools of thought on the range of topics that an evaluator must have mastered;
- it allows for the specification of the body of knowledge to continue to evolve and to be shaped by additional research;
- it is not costly for the CES;
- it structures the network of existing judgments on a professional's work;
- the system engages members of the community into the designation process.

The disadvantages of this system include:

- there is a risk that the supporters of individual applications will not be uniformly rigorous in their assessments
- the credibility of the system will be proportional to the validity of the information provided by the applicant and accepted by CES;

---

<sup>39</sup> This is a significant advantage. The history of formal examination is one in which "pencil and paper" tests replaced actual observation of performance. In doing so, the most direct form of measurement was sacrificed for efficiency and replicability considerations.

## Annex C: Core Competencies

The Action Plan presented in this paper has been prepared with the clear understanding that a body of knowledge, including core competencies,<sup>40</sup> is a prerequisite to the establishment of any professional designation.

For the higher levels of CE and CPE, a body of knowledge must be agreed upon; training tools must be devised; training must be organized; and reliable examinations must be created and made available. It is estimated that a minimum of five years will be required to do this and, more probably, the time line will be closer to 8 years. Professional resources must be devoted to these several activities and legal ramifications, if any, of the designation must be confirmed (it is currently intended that the certification not be binding and that legal risks not be incurred).

The professional evaluator must demonstrate a defined level of competency with the requisite body of knowledge. The awarding of a professional designation is an attestation that a person possesses the type and amount of knowledge required to competently perform certain functions.

There is today available a great deal of information regarding the type of knowledge that a professional evaluator is expected to have mastered. The list of references (only a brief listing is provided from the much larger literature that is available) at the end of this Annex attests to the progress that has been made in defining a body of knowledge. However, there is not yet sufficient agreement on the sets of knowledge that are necessary for evaluators at different competency levels and with different professional orientations.

Two realities must be faced. First is that the exercise of achieving consensus around that knowledge base has not yet taken place. Even though there is agreement on the bulk of the content, there remains much scope for discussion on the margins and a consensus seeking exercise must still take place within the Canadian Evaluation Society. Second, the resultant body of knowledge will be large both in scope of topics and depth of treatment. Few evaluators will be expected to be proficient with all aspects of evaluation but all are expected to both know in-depth some portion of it and to be aware of the areas in which they do not have in-depth knowledge. The specification of the evaluation body of knowledge and core competencies is still to be agreed upon. The extent to which any given professional evaluator is expected to be proficient across the topics of the knowledge base has still to be considered. These tasks are likely to require a minimum of five years and will require about eight years. These tasks must be satisfactorily completed before formal examinations can be constructed for the designation Certified Professional Evaluator (CPE).

Fortunately it is not necessary to wait that many years. Highly trained and experienced evaluators today can reach agreement of the knowledge and other competencies required to be taught in a program by which successful completion merits the designation Credentialed Evaluator (CE). Similarly, a Board of Examiners can reach agreement on the appropriate amount of formal education, the necessary practical

---

<sup>40</sup> Body of Knowledge is used here in a most general sense. For the designation Member, the individual is not required to demonstrate knowledge of the theories, methodologies, conceptual approaches and so forth that are expected of a practicing professional evaluator. Rather, the Member acknowledges that such exists and accepts that agreed upon standards and ethical principals must guide the work of the evaluator.

experience and the types of professional skills in a range of evaluation roles and accomplishments that are required to be an Certified Professional Evaluator (CPE).

We have enough of a base to enable us to go forward. The procedure for determining who may be a Credentialed Evaluator can be vested with the Canadian Evaluation Society Accreditation Board; the procedure for determining who may be an Certified Professional Evaluators can be vested with the Canadian Evaluation Society Board of Examiners. The use of the Certification Board and of the Board of Examiners allows CES to proceed with professional designations on the basis of the judgments of recognized professionals who embody the core body of knowledge.

### Core Competencies References

The following references will be of interest both to the Accreditation Board and to the Board of Examiners.

Borys, S., Gauthier, B., Kishchuk, N., Roy, S.N. Survey of evaluation practice and issues in Canada. Paper presented at the Joint CES/AEA Conference, Toronto, October 26, 2005.

Cousins, J. B., & Aubry, T. *Roles for government in evaluation quality assurance: Discussion paper*. Ottawa: Centre of Excellence for Evaluation, Treasury Board Secretariat of Canada. 2006

Gussman, T. K. Improving the professionalism of evaluation. Ottawa: Centre of Excellence for Evaluation, Treasury Board Secretariat of Canada. 2005

King, J. A., Stevahn, L., Ghere, G., & Minnema, J. Toward a taxonomy of essential evaluator competencies. *The American Journal of Evaluation*, 22(2), 229-247. 2001

Long, Bud. and Kishchuk, Natalie. Professional Certification. A report to the National Council of the Canadian Evaluation Society on the experience of other organizations. CES, October. 1997.

Parker-Taillon, D. White paper on professional credentialing in health informatics. Retrieved Sep. 1, 2006, from

<http://www.coachorg.com/%5Cdownloads%5Ccoach%20White%20Paper%202303%20Final.pdf>, 2005

Stevahn, L., King, J. A., Ghere, G., & Minnema, J. Establishing essential competencies for program evaluators. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 26(1), 43-59. 2005a

Stevahn, L., King, J. A., Ghere, G., & Minnema, J. Evaluator competencies in university-based training programs. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 20(2), 101-123. 2005b

Stierhoff, Karen A. The Certification of Program Evaluators. A Pilot Survey of Clients and Employers, September. 1999.

Personnel Psychology Centre, Building community capacity: Competency profile for federal public service evaluation professionals. The Centre of Excellence for Evaluation, Treasury Board of Canada. 2002 See [http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/eval/stud\\_etud/capa-pote02\\_e.asp](http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/eval/stud_etud/capa-pote02_e.asp)

Zorzi, R., Perrin, B., McGuire, M., Long, B., & Lee, L. Defining the benefits, outputs, and knowledge elements of program evaluation. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 17(3), 143-150. 2002

Zorzi, R., McGuire, M., & Perrin, B. Evaluation benefits, outputs, and knowledge elements: Canadian Evaluation Society project in support of advocacy and professional development. 2002 <http://consultation.evaluationcanada.ca/pdf/ZorziCESReport.pdf>