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Structure of the presentation

• Aim of the workshop
• Background: IOCE & EvalPartners
• ”Engaging the Parliamentarians for EEE”
• From Evaluation Culture, to National evaluation Policies & Systems?
• Critical Systems Heuristics (CSH) Questions
• Conclusions
IOCE activities through EvalPartners
(The International Evaluation Partnership Initiative)
http://www.mymande.org/evalpartners

Purpose: To enhance the supply and demand side of evaluation, also thru EEEs?

• International EvalYear 2015
• P2P support programme (VOPE-Forum at IPEN conf. in Moldova 2013; Nese workshop in Warsaw 2014)
• Vope Toolkit
• Innovation Challenge Competition
  “Engaging the Parliamentarians for an Enabling Environment for Evaluation(EEE)”-project
http://www.mymande.org/evalpartners/evalpartners_announces_the_winners_of_the_innovation_challenge
Engaging the Parliamentarians’ strategy:

International EvalYear 2015 Events & Manifestations

Proposals for interventions

Intern. Parliamentarian Panel in EES, Dublin conf.

Interviews with Parliamentarians about EEEs (national eval. cultures; policies, systems)
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Critical questions about the Enabling Environment for Evaluation. Is it the same as:

- the National Evaluation culture? (Furubo et al. 2002; Jacob et al., 2012)

- the National Evaluation Policy? (Rosenstein, 2013)

- the National Evaluation System? (Raynolds & Williams 2013)
International Atlas on Evaluation Cultures (Furubo et al. 2002; Jacob et al. forthcoming) defined by

9 Indicators:

E. in many domains
E. in diff. Disciplines
E. discussions
National eval. society
E. by gov. institutions
E. by Parliament inst
Pluralism in policies
E. in Supreme Audit institutions
Impact not just output

OBS: No citizen voice

http://gendereval.ning.com/forum/topics/parliamentarians-forum-for-development-evaluation-publishes

• 115 countries: 20 have a legislated evaluation policy, 34 conduct evaluation routinely without a policy, 23 are developing one, 38 no indication to develop one.

• NEP is a legislated policy that serves as a basis for evaluation across government agencies

• Is a NEP necessary for every context or is evaluation readiness/culture more important?
What should the National Evaluation System be in order to function as an EEE?


- **Critical Systems Heuristics (CSH)** comprehends `reality` as comprising interrelationships whose boundaries are interpreted/judged from multiple perspectives
- **Reality is affected by sources of influence:** motivation/values; power/resources; knowledge; legitimacy/victims (12 CSH questions)
- **The ideal (National or Parliamentary) Evaluation System** could be a social construction for EEE that can be compared with the `real` situation
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The ideal evaluation system of the Finnish Parliament

Former Auditing committee (ex-post eval.) transformed into an Evaluation committee

New mechanisms of co-ordination, control & learning thru reporting to the Parliament & dealing with citizen initiatives

Finance committee (Ex-ante of future budget)

Futures committee (Forsight)

Other committees (monitor their decisions)

Old democracy tools

New democracy tools

Supreme Audit Office

Government policies, programmes, budget (accountable)
12 Critical Systems Heuristics Questions:

Sources of influence | Social roles (Stakeholders) | Specific concerns (Stakes) | Key problems (Stakeholding issues)
---|---|---|---
Motivation | 1 Beneficiary/client | 2 Purpose | 3 Measure of improvement
Control | 4 Decision maker | 5 Resources | 6 Decision environment
Knowledge | 7 Expert | 8 Expertise | 9 Guarantor
Legitimacy | 10 Witness | 11 Emancipation | 12 Worldview
CSH-Questions to the Parliamentarians

1. From what perspective will you express your views (e.g. parliamentarian, policy advisor)?
2. Why should Parliamentarians get involved with the creation of an enabling environment for evaluation (EEE)?
3. Who should be the primary beneficiaries of such an environment?
4. How might you recognize that an EEE has been achieved?
5. What resources (structures, mechanisms) are required to generate an EEE in your context?
6. What should be the role of the Parliament in this system?
7. How can the citizen voice be strengthened in an EEE,
8. What constrains an EEE in your context?
9. What kind of knowledge and expertise would be needed to support an EEE?
10. What might be the side-effects of having an EEE in Parliament (Who loses)?
11. How would an EEE be different from what exist in your own context of work?
12. What would you propose as a major improvement in the EEE within your context that should be dealt with in the International EvalYear 2015?
Conclusions: NEP is one instrument of intervention; Eval systems appr. = a tool to analyse the context for interventions. Both are embedded in & interacting with the National Evaluation Culture. The Enabling Environment for Evaluation (EEE) is a favorable context for the demand and use of evaluations which is influenced by all three.
Discussion

• Is a NEP necessary for every context or is evaluation readiness/culture more important?

• Does the ”National or Parliamentary Evaluation System” (”real” and ideal) help to understand better the EEE and the consequent policies and interventions?

• What are the implications?