

https://dspace.org/

Opportunities and challenges for Made in Africa Evaluation Capacity Development: South African experiences

Moilwa, Matshediso

2022-10
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/38825
Moilwa, Matshediso. (2022). Opportunities and challenges for Made in Africa Evaluation Capacity Development: South African experiences [Master's dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg]. WireDSpace.

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/



Opportunities and challenges for Made in Africa Evaluation Capacity Development: South African experiences

Research Report

Matshediso Moilwa

457852

Supervisor: Dr Nedson Pophiwa

14 October 2022

Dissertation submitted to the faculty of Commerce, Law and Management, University of the Witwatersrand, in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Management in Public and Development

Declaration

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Master's degree in Public and Development Management, in the Faculty of Commerce, Law and Management at the Wits Governance School, Johannesburg, South Africa.

I Matshediso Duduzile Moilwa declare that:

1) The research reported in this thesis, is my own original work, expect where otherwise indicated
2) This thesis has not been submitted for examination for any degree at any other university.
3) The thesis does not contain other persons data, pictures, or other information, any such has specifically been acknowledged as having been sourced from other persons. Where other sources have been quoted then:
    i) Their words have been re-written but the general information attributed to them has been referenced.
    ii) Where their exact words have been used, their writing has been placed inside quotation marks, and referenced.
4) Where there are exact words that have been used, then the writing has been placed in italics and referenced

Matshediso Duduzile Moilwa	14 October 2022
Student Name	Date
Student number: 457852	
Nedson Pophiwa	14 October 2022
Name of Supervisor	Date

Abstract

Made in Africa Evaluations (MAE) is an Afrocentric approach of conducting evaluations to reformulate western approaches of conducting evaluation. Indigenised evaluations differentiate evaluation approaches, methods and tools as informed by beneficiaries. Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD), on the other hand, focuses more on strengthening the skills, abilities, processes and resources of evaluation practices. ECD's intention is to create support, that equips evaluators with the leadership support, resources and opportunities to use skills acquired to practice their skills. The aim of the study is to unpack the definition of MAE, understanding the tools, methods and approaches by interviewees. In order to gain insights on in what ways are South African evaluators incorporating Made in Africa Evaluation approaches and what are the opportunities as well as challenges for evaluation capacity development? The study used both the transformative/ emancipatory approach and indigenous paradigm to analyse the data gathered from literature review and interviews conducted. Interviewing an array of stakeholders including government, independent evaluators, private consultancies and VOPE's. From the literature review conducted, the results of the study forked in its findings. With limited visibility and relevance of MAE in South African evaluations, the discussions focus more on M&E challenges in South Africa – looking at the barriers to entry for local evaluators; what are the skills and competencies required for professionalisation of M&E and what types of ECD initiatives are required to improve the M&E practice. The findings of the research are relevant to the wider study of M&E in South Africa and broadly Africa, on understanding the correlation between what types of ECD initiatives needed to strengthening M&E by getting on the ground experiences of challenges evaluators face.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to graciously thank my supervisor, Dr Nedson Pophiwa, who came into the supervision process at the last minute and we hit the ground running. Your support throughout the process, helped in building my self-esteem and confidence to write this research paper. Furthermore, your patience was a welcomed relief, assisting me through my hiccups and difficulties. For that, I commend your efforts.

I wish to acknowledge my various friends Naledi Nkhi, Lindiwe (Chuck) Mayisela, Zanele (MaZet) Ngakane, Phenyo Manamela, Bothlale Baitsiwe, and many others; thank you for the wellness checks when I was frustrated, down and out and truly not seeing the light at the end of tunnel. You have all been amazing in being incredibly supportive and keeping me going.

My heartfelt thanks also go to my sister, mother and Ofentse. In the background, all of you have always been there for me throughout my studies. You served as a form of safety net, and comfort space. When I wanted to burst into tears from the frustrations of writing, re-writing, writing and rewriting, you were around to urge me on. Again, I thank you for your patience and constant words of encouragement.

Lastly, I am appreciative of the participants who shared important insights for this research. Many of you shared words of encouragement at the end of each interview and even offered to give support throughout the writing process. To be acknowledged by practitioners in the field, was inspiring for me, to realise my paper will add value to the field of M&E.

Dedication

This research paper is dedicated to Obaratile Joel Semenya.

You were the push I needed when I had given up, or generally could not master the courage to focus on my studies

Acronyms

AEJ	African Evaluation Journal
CE	Canadian Evaluation
CES	Canadian Evaluation Society
CLEAR-AA	Centre of Learning on Evaluation and Research Anglophone Africa
CRT	Critical Race Theory
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DPME	South African Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
ECD	Evaluation Capacity Development
EE	Emerging Evaluators
HEI	Higher Education Institutes
IKS	Indigenous Knowledge Systems
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MAE	Made in Africa Evaluation
MEL	Monitoring and Evaluation and Learning
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
SAMEA	South African Monitoring and Evaluation Association
ToR	Terms of Reference
VOPE	Voluntary Organisations for Professional Evaluations
YEE	Young and Emerging Evaluators

Table of Contents

Abstract 3
Acknowledgements 4
Dedication 5
Acronyms 6
1 Introduction 9
1.1 Background 9
1.2 Problem Statement 12
1.3 Research Questions 13
1.4 Literature review 13
1.5 Research methodology 14
1.6 Chapter layout 15
2 Literature Review and Theoretical Framework 16
2.1 The push for indigenising evaluations 16
2.2 Africanisation of Evaluation 17
2.3 The growing African evaluation landscape 19
2.4 Failures and recommendations of MAE in Africa 20
2.5 External factors in the made in Africa agenda 21
2.6 Evaluation capacity development in Africa 23
2.7 Lessons learned on what works and not working in African ECD 24
2.8 Theoretical Framework 25
2.8.1 Indigenous Evaluation Framework 25
2.8.2 Transformative Paradigm 28
3 Research Methodology 31
3.1 Research approach 31
3.2 Sampling 31
3.2.1 Sample population 31
3.2.2 Sample size 32
3.3 Data collection tools 33
3.3.1 Semi-structured Interviews 33
3.4 Data analysis 34
3.4.1 Thematic Analysis 34
3.4.2 Document Analysis 34
3.5 Validity and reliability considerations 35
3.6 Ethical considerations 35
4 Findings 37
4.1 Defining Made in Africa Evaluation 37

4.2 Ways in which South African evaluators apply 'approaches, methods and tools in their own evaluation studies 40
4.2.1 The relevance and visibility of MAE in South African evaluations 41
4.2.2 Perception on the importance of indigenised M&E tools and building of evidence 44
4.3 Shortcomings in the ECD initiatives within the South African evaluation sector 45
4.3.1 Procurement systems 45
4.3.2 Perceptions on trustworthiness and competence 47
4.3.3 Skills Development and Education Access 50
4.3.4 Is there a need for a harmonised curriculum? 52
4.3.5 Ways in which ECD could encourage the application of MAE methods 54
4.3.6 The successes and failures of ECD in South African evaluation 56
4.3.7 Professionalisation 57
4.4 ECD initiatives to support young and emerging evaluators 59
4.4.1 Current assessment of training capacity development aimed at YEE (Young and Emerging Evaluators) 59
4.4.2 Notable institutions offering 'on the job training' 60
4.4.3 The role of VOPEs 61
5 Discussion 65
5.1 Defining Made in Africa 65
5.2 Overview of spaces for incorporation of African rooted methods and tools in South African evaluations 68
5.2.1 Visibility and Relevancy of MAE in South Africa 68
5.2.2 Importance of recognizing indigenous M&E tools for data collection and building of evidence 69
5.3 ECD initiatives and shortcomings within the South African evaluation sector 71
5.3.1 Barriers limiting the inclusion of African evaluators into the field 71
5.3.2 Perception 73
5.3.3 Professionalism 73
5.3.4 Should there be a harmonised curriculum? 76
5.3.5 Successes and Failures of ECD 77
5.4 ECD Initiatives to support Young and Emerging Evaluators 78
5.4.1 Role of VOPEs 80
6 Conclusion 83
6.1 Recommendations 84
References 86
Annexure 90
Interview Schedule 90

1 Introduction

> …debates continue in the African evaluation community about the nature and relevance of Made in Africa Evaluation today. The concept remains unclear to most, and some outright reject the notion that evaluation in Africa is or should be different to that in any other place in the world.
> Zenda Ofir, independent South African evaluator (2018)

1.1 Background

Over the last two decades the Made in Africa Evaluation (MAE) concept has grown in prominence among practitioners and scholars, as evidenced by a plethora of conferences, academic reports, publications and grey literature (Chilisa, 2015 p.5). Since 1999 the African Evaluation Association (AfrEA), supported the initiation, and nurturing of advanced levels of evaluation expertise, as well as promoting training placed in African contexts (African Evaluation Association 2021). In 2007, the AfrEA Niamey Conference, hosted a strand on "Making Evaluation our own: Strengthening the Foundation for African Rooted and African Led Monitoring and Evaluation". Amongst the discussions, were concerns that much of evaluation practice in Africa was based on external values and donor driven contexts. As such accountability mechanisms tended to be directed to recipients of aid rather than both beneficiaries and providers (Chilisa, 2015)

Among the leading proponents of the MAE is Professor Bagele Chilisa, who has written extensively on the subject. Chilisa *et al* argues that evaluation has become the worst instrument of 'epistemological imperialism' for developing countries (Chilisa, Major, Goathlobogwe & Makgolodi, 2016). As seen in the literature, evaluation has become an attempt to dictate the kinds of facts, and data, to be gathered; the appropriate techniques for gathering and theorising the data, and the generation of reports based on marginalising African research processes. This argument stems from ongoing debates on the role of African culture in international development, and the cultural bias in development paradigms. Eurocentric hegemonic methods and procedures employed, have underlying cultural bias, racism, dominated by global capitalism and colonial undertones (Chilisa et al., 2016).

Despite their global dominance, evidence shows that western evaluation principles, assumptions and practices are not always a good fit in African contexts where different principles, and practices exist (Goathlobowe, et al. 2018). The 'one-size-fits-all' approach to evaluation is simply impractical. As a way to address some of these concerns, there has been a shift since the late 1990s towards 'culturally appropriate' evaluation (Goathlobowe, et al. 2018). However, the idea that one can impose a singular framework for research and evaluation studies in every situation, that does not look at the complexities of African values and experiences is erroneous (Mertens and Musyoka 2007). There is a continued practice of theories being imposed when researching on African challenges and realities. Research has been done 'on', 'for' and 'about' Africans but not often 'with' or 'by' African communities. Goathlobowe et al., 2018) stated that:

> Without considerations of power, cultural competency overlooks how knowledge of cultural 'others' is created…who exercises power to define meaning and perspective relating to the 'other' and how meanings and perspectives relating to the 'other' are often caught up in discourse that uphold whiteness as the default standard.

There have been notable strides in the African evaluation landscape. Some of the leading governments in developing countries evaluation systems have been progressive in South Africa, Benin, and Uganda. The three countries have successfully implemented national evaluation systems. Showcasing the importance of central units to drive the evaluation system, developing a national evaluation policy, and prioritising evaluations through an evaluation agenda. As a result, there is a growing sense of local innovation, reflecting local realities and adaptive management, as these systems organically grow. An exemplarily case of supporting the MAE concept rather than mimicking of the west (Goldman, et al. 2018). The role of African Voluntary Organisations for Professional Evaluation (VOPEs) has also assisted in defining the purpose of national evaluation systems, creating advocacy for MAE values that can serve as a way to ensure that the machinery driving the supply of evaluation is structured to meet the demand driven by states (Smith and Kithau-Kiwekte 2019). There are 26 recognised VOPEs recognised operating in various countries across the continent to further the professionalisation of M&E (Abrahams 2015). Despite these notable developments, Cloete (2016) cautions that the insurgence of evaluation in Africa. Cloete (2016 p.60)

proclaims that evaluation "… still needs concerted, strategic efforts to develop it further if it is to fulfil its promise as a profession that can and should help accelerate the development of the continent."

Scholars have questioned the *status quo* where African countries copy western driven development models without rethinking their applicability to local contexts and knowledge systems (Ofi, 2012). This raises a critical opportunity for Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD) to realise and assist in implementing the MAE concept. ECD, refers to strengthening evaluators' skills, abilities, processes and resources of evaluation practices (Morkel and Ramasobama 2017). It refers to the process of people, organisations, and societies strengthening, creating, adapting and maintaining evaluation capacities over time. The goal of ECD is to create sustainable evaluation practice. In order to achieve, and maintain this, evaluators should be equipped with leadership support, resources, and opportunities to put to practice their acquired skills (Smith and Morkel 2018). Comparatively, less is known about the state of ECD at a country level among African countries, particularly knowledge on ECD requirements needed for MAE approaches.

This study explores the experiences of South African practitioners in incorporating MAE approaches. This refers to the 'Africanisation' of evaluation, in developing capacities for innovation, while respecting key principles of capacity building development in the endogenous process. Naturally, this speaks of the importance of governance and accountability to the community, developing learning nations, stimulating African thought leadership in evaluation, using analytically orientated institutions (i.e., universities, think tanks), knowledge development and contributions to global knowledge (Ofir 2012).

As to what the practical application of such idea's entails, would be specific to each organisation and implementing partner(Ofir 2012). This is what the study sort to establish. The study aimed to answer questions, among others, on what are South African evaluators' understanding of MAE; whether or not the concept is relevant and visible in the South African context and whether or not it is significant to recognise indigenous practices. Parallel to this, the study investigated not only the existing ECD initiatives, but on what they lack, where they

can be improved; what would be the ECD requirements for developing local evaluators' capacities and evaluation practices in the governance and policy space.

1.2 Problem Statement

There are several scholarly debates on challenges facing African evaluation which have triggered an interest in this proposed study. Firstly, African evaluators and commissioners of evaluators who are usually funded by western donors, have limited roles in the planning of evaluation practices that are responsive to their culture, context and needs. One of the weaknesses is a perceived lower competitive edge among African evaluators. Cloete (2016) posits that evaluation cultures and institutions in African contexts remain weak, and are ill-equipped to compete effectively with more established, entrenched evaluation systems and seasoned evaluators. As a result, western evaluation approaches, norms, practices and evaluators dominate the African contexts by default (Cloete 2016). Chilisa and Mertens (2021) call this tendency to silence the voices of local indigenous voices as "harsh epistemic violence" (Chilisa, Major, et al. 2016). What is more concerning is how international evaluation capacity development funders, neglect already existing local evaluation capacities and claim to be building capacity from scratch while erroneously not reflecting the endogenous learning needs and aspirations of local contexts (Tarsilla 2014).

The second challenge concerns the lack of evaluation capacity development and how it has created a gap in local evaluators' capacities and training. Scholars have observed that "the continued donor reliance on global North consultancies and consultants begins with an absence of a comprehensive accurate African database of professional evaluators and M&E practitioners" (Blaser Mapitsa and Khumalo 2018). Moreover, local evaluators are competing with senior evaluators who have years of experience in western methods, in which local evaluators cannot match the years of experience or technical requirements in the specification of bids that are put out (Mapitsa, Tirivanhu and Pophiwa 2019). ECD initiatives in the region are still grappling to satisfy training and skills development needs of emerging evaluators. The ones who have received training, lack practical experience, as there are relatively few institutions that can absorb them as interns or in entry level M&E roles. This is

also aggravated by the absence of coordinated consensus on competencies and skills required for African evaluators (Blaser Mapitsa and Khumalo 2018).

Thus, this study identified some of these gaps and explored the two parallel areas. It sought to understand the opportunities for South African evaluators to apply 'African-rooted' tools, approaches, and methods when they conduct evaluations. Secondly, the study tried to understand local evaluators' perceptions of the types of ECD initiatives which exist, and are still lacking in the South African context.

1.3 Research Questions

This study answers the following question and sub questions with regards to Made in Africa Evaluation capacity development:

In what ways are South African evaluators incorporating Made in Africa evaluation approaches and what are the opportunities as well as challenges for evaluation capacity development?

The sub-questions are;

1. In what ways are South African evaluators applying these approaches, methods and tools in their own evaluation studies?
2. What do South African evaluators perceive as successes and shortcomings in Made in Africa Evaluation Capacity Development initiatives within the evaluation sector?
3. In what ways are state and non-state institutions implementing ECD initiatives to support young and emerging evaluators in creating, strengthening and maintaining African evaluation capacities over time? How could the findings reflect a way forward?

1.4 Literature review

The literature review lays out the relevant themes identified in situating the research title and questions. It establishes patterns of Made in Africa conceptualisation, and the quest of Africanising evaluation. This is done to showcase the origins of MAE, relating to the significance of the concept. The indigenisation of evaluations essentially speaks of shifting

away from western dominated evaluation practices, to recognising the power of culture of representing the voices of marginalised communities, who have their own empowering Indigenous Knowledge Systems (IKS) (Ofir 2012). Thus, MAE distils African rooted African led M&E, requiring the relevant methods, tools and approaches needed to realise the concept. Several published articles by leading scholars were reviewed (Mertens and Musyoka 2007; Chilisa and Kawulich 2012; Chilisa and Malunga 2012; Chilisa et al 2016; Goathlobowe et al 2018; Omosa 2019; Mbava and Chapman. 2020; Chilisa and Mertens 2021; Omosa et al 2021)

The second and related focus area of the study asks the types of Evaluation Capacity Development initiatives, that exist and/or their shortcomings. The assumption here is that the lack of ECD initiatives offered 'create a gap in local evaluators capacities and training'. From a variety of reasons and complications, there is a type of prejudice shown towards African evaluators, limiting their opportunities to practice (Smith and Morkel 2018)

In order to answer the research questions, the literature review and theoretical framework begin by providing some understanding on the push for indigenisation of evaluations in Africa. Viewing the roles of VOPES, the study pushes the relevancy of indigenisation and MAE.
Two theoretical frameworks were chosen for the study. Both the transformative/emancipatory and Indigenised paradigm. Reflecting on the power traditionally exercised, and propose measures of participation and social justice. While the indigenous framework is based on the local knowledge, experiences, cultural and historical heritage of African people, both these paradigms aim to align the research title and questions to identify patterns in the current research. Chapter 2 of this research report will discuss in greater detail the literature and the theoretical framework.

1.5 Research methodology

The exploratory approach was adopted for the research. With limited literature available particularly on the ECD initiatives that exist, the approach helped investigate the problem statement which is not clearly defined. Accordingly, purposive sampling was chosen, as a form of non-probability sampling, allowed the research to make judgments in choosing the members of the population who participated in the research. 15 participants from

government, NGO's, independent practitioners, private institutions and VOPE's were selected for the sample group

1.6 Chapter layout

The report is structured into six chapters. The current chapter introduces the report by providing a background to a context of MAE, relating it to the types of existing and or limitations of ECD initiatives requirements for actualising MAE. This chapter also provides the scope of the study. The second chapter reviews the literature on the push for Africanisation or better said, the indigenisation of M&E. Elaborating on the growing African evaluation landscape, as well as the failures and counsel of MAE in Africa. Chapter three describes the methodological approach used for the report. The fourth chapter presents the findings, whilst the discussions of the findings is carried out in the fifth chapter. Lastly, this is followed by a concluding chapter, which sums up the whole report.

2 Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1 The push for indigenising evaluations

The discourse on indigenisation of evaluations in Africa emerged in the late 1990s in response to what scholars felt as the universalisation of Euro-American thought (Chilisa, 2015). As Chilisa (2015) points out, African researchers, policy analysts and evaluators, began to resist evaluation practices dominated by external western evaluators, devoid of local context and culture. This awakened the concept of making evaluation culturally appropriate (Goathlobowe, et al. 2018, 49). African researchers have seen the importance of studying evaluations 'ourselves' as one way of empowering the voice of long-silenced indigenous people (Goathlobowe, et al. 2018).

Evaluation models in Africa are a reflection of the relationship between Africa and the global north - one that has been uneven and driven by power dynamics that favour knowledge and practices developed outside of Africa (Frehiwot, 2019). There is sensitivity to evaluation, as it is heavily implicated in politics. The generation of knowledge is political, and politics represents culture and power dynamics. Africa has historically been plagued with negative narratives of being the 'doomed continent', or the 'forgotten continent' devoid of leadership and thinking leaders, when designing development programs in the eyes of European political and business leaders alike (Frehiwot, 2019). This has been grossly inaccurate, considering that African scholarship in evaluation has increased over the years, and strides have been made to develop local knowledge portals like the African Evaluation Journal (AEJ) and also growth in VOPEs which provide relevant offering for ECD (Frehiwot, 2019). South Africa has opportunities for learning, if not locally then in international institutions. More local text reflecting its contexts are being written. More local knowledge is produced. Whereas a few years ago, M&E was not offered as an academic qualification, many universities on the continent now offer a bouquet of related qualifications, including short courses (Frehiwot, 2019).

2.2 Africanisation of Evaluation

The term 'indigenisation' refers to the blending of an imported discipline with the generation of new concepts and approaches from within a culture. The Africanisation of evaluation is a process of placing African philosophy, worldviews, knowledge systems and values at the centre of the evaluation process (Ofir 2012). It is important to bear in mind how Eurocentric research paradigms and methodologies have marginalised and dismissed African evaluation thought leadership as irrelevant, with bodies of knowledge from former colonised, historically oppressed societies.

A considerable proportion of evaluations in Africa are evaluations of aid programs that do not compliment national development programs (Chilisa, et al., 2016). Though there is no consensus on a working definition of MAE, Chilisa (2015) identifies possible potential ways forward for the MAE concept in Africa. MAE should challenge the current practices of designing evaluation tools that have historically overlooked African contexts. Chilisa's definition outlines the importance of recognising challenges in current evaluation practices, accounting for African diversity, cultures, customs, languages, history and religion. Leaving stakeholders with the question of how communities benefit from evaluations. It should also account for the marginalisation of African data collection tools (Omosa, et al. 2021).

The decolonisation of knowledge involves building capacity of African policy researchers, analysts, and evaluators to carry out their own evaluations. It encompasses the promotion of African rooted tools, instruments, strategies, theories and models that ensure relevancy in an African setting (Mapitsa, Tirivanhu and Pophiwa 2019). The context and condition in which evaluations are carried out matters in that, it helps identify which evaluation approaches provide the highest quality, and most actionable evidence. MAE evaluation is based on the importance of being culturally driven and incorporating local practices. Without considering the unique African context, evaluators risk the possibility of identifying the wrong questions to frame evaluations and ignoring key stakeholders who should be the users of the evaluation or misunderstanding stakeholders' priorities (Mapitisa, Trivanhu and Pophiwa 2019). Chilisa notes that though the Made in Africa approach may fit into many evaluation models, frameworks, paradigms and theories, it does not fit all situations (Omosa 2019). It is

important to note that Made in Africa models are not monolithic either, and will have different features and practices depending on the community in which the model is operating (Omosa 2019).

There are several examples where indigenous concepts have been adapted in policy, and intellectual spaces. The first example is South Africa's use of the phrase '*lekgotla*' traditionally defined as a community gathering and deliberation on a specific agenda to reach consensus. Politically, a cabinet *lekgotla* means a democratically structured meeting where members of cabinet convene to discuss or resolve a specific agenda. The use of the term is based on an 'indigenous practice of problem resolution' (Mbava and Chapman 2020, 2). In a *lekgotla*, the community actively engages in the entire research process from initiation to its ultimate resolution. In a programme evaluation context, a *lekgotla* can build ownership, trust between the evaluator and the community, and this empowerment may enable the community to take charge and become the authors of the research project and the researcher becomes the co-author through the experiences and the eyes of the community (Porter and Goldman 2013). This is one example of the abundant room of incorporating endogenous methods into evaluation practices.

Uganda provides a second example of a traditional practice that has been incorporated into the country's decentralisation policy framework. framework. In 1992, Uganda began to introduce a decentralisation policy in which the central government cedes some of the its power to local government to carry out part of its mandates on its behalf. The implementation of the Barazas program served as a platform for technical officers and political leaders to provide evaluative information about the status of service delivery to the citizens and in turn paving the way for citizens to participate in the development cycle by monitoring the usage of public funds and resources. Uganda's decentralisation concept of a more appropriate Africa-rooted program evaluation management model, that explicitly places the evaluation agenda in the Barazas, ultimately tapping their knowledge for the achievements of for instance the SDGs. This is at the core of the Baraza initiative is in Uganda but more importantly at the centre of advancing Made in Africa evaluation approaches (Watera 2019)

A recent trigger in decolonial thinking and by extension MAE in South Africa, was the 2015 #FeesMustFall movement. It called for, amongst others, the decolonisation and transformation of the education curriculum. There is a realisation that South African universities emerged from the colonial project, therefore research was specifically focused on promoting the colonial agenda. This coupled with the push for transformation in universities acknowledged that African knowledge systems cannot exist in isolation from global systems, and that bodies of knowledge continually influence one another. The outcome of decolonised curricula provides an opportunity for indigenous African knowledge systems to gain recognition among the array of knowledge systems in the world (Constandius, et al. 2018).

2.3 The growing African evaluation landscape

Whilst the preceding subsections have appraised the growth in MAE, there needs to be thought leadership in evaluation theory and practice cutting across disciplines and sectors. The application of new knowledge, would assist in positioning Africa as a continent from which appropriate innovative frameworks and models and practices in evaluations emerge. This establishes the need for the professionalisation of the sector and the work of thought leaders (Ofir 2012).

There is an importance in professionalising the sector of M&E. It involves the development of skills, identities, norms and values associated with becoming a recognised professional group. There is doubt by evaluators, that 'evaluation will not acquire the hallmarks of a full-pledged profession within the next 20 years. It is suggested that perhaps evaluation should be viewed as a discipline, or better yet, transdisciplinary that offers services to other disciplines (Abrahams 2015). Secondly, there is still the argument that runs in circles in African and outside Africa, that evaluators need to improve their international competitiveness compared to their Northern counterparts. Cloete further argues that because evaluation in Africa is relatively new, there is room for improvement (Cloete 2016). Lastly, there is insufficient capacity (in quantity and qualifications) and stresses on the already limited evaluators. Thus,

collaboration and partnerships are the suggested ways of strengthening current evaluation education (Wildschut and Silubonde 2020).

The 2013 Bellagio Report on the '*African Thought Leaders Forum on Evaluation and Development: Expanding Leadership in Africa',* addressed the lack of, or low profile of 'thought leadership' in African evaluation'. What strongly came out of this conference is that MAE aims to combine international evaluations methods with international evaluation methods with African political, economic, social and cultural realities and values. This being said, it is not a case of contrasting a typical African view with international standards of evaluation (Modeste 2019).

Nevertheless, three distinctive components are crucial in Made in Africa models: the use of indigenous knowledge systems, the process of ensuring that evaluations are led by local actors and that evaluations are localized, considering class dynamics, and lastly that development projects are based on mutual respect (Frehiwot, 2019).

2.4 Failures and recommendations of MAE in Africa

So long as donors continue to give preference to western evaluators and consultancies over African practitioners when commissioning large scale evaluations, this is counterintuitive to the building of African capacities. If anything, it is very likely to prevent the continent's evaluators from learning and earning that experience from evaluations (Theuinnsen, et al. 2019). The following case study explains the challenges of data Monitoring and the lack of capacity efficiencies that can be found in a South African evaluation. With regards to data sharing with corporate entities in South Africa, there is an assumption that data is continuously being collected, routinely and effectively. Donors assume that within South African evaluators, there are the technical skills and knowledge to be able to produce outstanding outcomes from evaluation process. When this is not accurate and where it comes to donor projects, South African evaluators are unprepared for key stakeholder groups particularly in cooperate who tend to refuse to share their data with evaluators (Theuinnsen, et al. 2019).

The MAE agenda is able to circumvent a top-down requirement by promoting country-owned approaches through the development of NES's on the demand side and growing indigenous curriculum to feed the supply side. In order to form reviews of accountability, sustained political will is the key driving force in moving away from donor led agenda. Where evaluations are carried out in many Africa countries, it has been difficult for state officials to access data. To combat this, there should be a building of indigenous NES's that should persuade development partners to work with local partners and evaluation donors (Smith and Kithau-Kiwekte 2019). By setting guidelines and standards that establish how evaluations should be carried out, this allows for a growing number of African evaluators to be empowered, where the use of evaluation could benefit policy. NES's have a key role to play in addressing the power asymmetries with development partners to ensure that evaluations are carried by the countries' specifications. Lastly, the establishment of local capacities to commission and carry out evaluations in a manner that can be institutionalised and sustainable over time is reliant on the country's strength of the country's evaluation integration (Smith and Kithau-Kiwekte 2019).

2.5 External factors in the made in Africa agenda

In 2011, the Busan Partnership for Effective Development and Co-operation took on a new approach in measuring the execution of development efforts. Four main themes were highlighted. Firstly, is the emphasis of ownership of development priorities by developing countries. This stress developing countries' voice in defining their own development models and implementation. Secondly, is the focus on results, emphasizing creating sustainable impact as a driving force behind investments and developing policy making. Thirdly, it highlights partnerships for development, by encouraging the participation of all actors in development policy making and implementation, as well as recognising diversity and complementarity. Lasty, is the importance of transparency and shared responsibility. This pillar emphasises the importance of accountability in development practices (OECD, 2011).

The Busan Accord gave rise to a shift in global development practice. As a developing continent, there has been a focus on Africa, taking into consideration its development context that influences development theory and practice. Africa has strategic global resources in energy, military and electronics to name a few, and has a growing and demanding middle class. This has set pressure for African governments to be accountable, and employ effective strategies for stability, security, economic growth and for the use of resources.

Besides the Busan Accord, there is also Africa's own 'Agenda 2063', based on creating unity on the continent. The Agenda has seven clear objectives but the main focus is in the:

1. a politically united Africa that is based on the ideals of Africanism and the vision of Africa's Renaissance,
2. An Africa of good governance, democracy, respect for human rights, justice and the rule of law. This is an important point as it speaks to the decolonialization of the remnants of colonized for all African territories under occupation to be fully liberated. Moreover,
3. is Africa's aspiration of an Africa of good governance, democracy, respect for human rights, justice and the rule of law. This aspiration speaks to the need for capable institutions and transformed leadership in place at all levels, building strong institutions for a development state; and facilitation the emergence of development-oriented and visionary leadership in all spheres and levels.
4. (4) Lastly, An Africa whose development is people-driven, relying on the potential of African people, especially its women (Union n.d.). All these aspirations have been mentioned above as the need of growth for MAE and MAE capacities. M&E becomes crucial to monitor and evaluate interventions, and insure their efficiency (Union n.d.)

With the rapid emergence of new voices from the Global South, they have increasingly called for the full participation and contribution in the construction of evaluation theory and practices that is relevant to the lived realities of all evaluation stakeholders. To achieve Agenda 2063, there has been interest amongst participating countries for the need of more integral domestic capacity training. The AU Agenda 2063 recognised the need for established evaluation systems that gauge outcomes at the national, regional and continental level (Smith and Kithau-Kiwekte 2019). It has been argued that the credible involvement of local

evaluators should be included in more ways than in the typecast-role of practical fixers and data collectors which can result in better evaluations. As Chilisa (2015) says, “we can learn from each other and therefore, adapting Euro-Western evaluation approaches to suit local contexts is ‘a good practice that is supported by African value systems.’” Thus, drawing from the knowledge systems embedded in African cultural context, this has the potential to strengthen ways of thinking evaluation and its impact (Porter and Goldman 2013).

2.6 Evaluation capacity development in Africa

The term Evaluation Capacity Building (ECB) should not be conflated with the use of the term Evaluation Capacity Development. ECD resulted from growing demand for functional M&E systems in Africa correlating with the demand for skilled evaluators who can produce evidence for reliable informed decision making in policy and development interventions. ECB involves the design and implementation of teaching and learning strategies to help individuals, groups and organisations learn effective, useful and professional evaluation practice. This, however, has been critiqued of not catering for local trainees and organisational needs and interest (Morkel and Ramasobama 2017).

Though complimentary, ECD has different traits. It focuses on more than just strengthening evaluation capacities. ECD is the means to support more effective policies and programmes to achieve development results. There is growth in ECD strategies stressing the critical link existing between performance management and evaluation. In order to merge evaluation as a tool of compliance, rather than learning, a sort of blended approach is advised (Tarsilla 2014). ECD has its own challenges of being unsystematic and donor driven. Though noble, donor intentions have their own needs in ensuring the success and accountability interests on achieving their own development outcomes. A setback in how ECD trainings are conducted in Africa is how the actual content of training modules tend to be more theoretical than practical. Therefore, the ‘practical utility’ of what is being learnt is minimal. There have been reports of ECD programs offering no indirect support, i.e., opportunities to put into practice what was learned in training (Tarsilla 2014).

The majority of evaluation capacity funders are targeting either supply or demand of evaluation but never both. Capacity development targeting is often dictated by the organisations mandate. For instance, UN agencies primarily work with the national governments (demand), whilst foundations traditionally work with civil society and private sector organisations (supply) (Smith and Morkel 2018). Still there exists a gap between informed decision making and policy implementation. Within this gap, exists a limited understanding of the social problem and policy design, that denies adequate opportunity for implementing agents to make sense of policy (Abrahams 2015). Governments are faced with challenges of lack of resources, funding, lack of technical skills, natural and unnatural disasters (such as the COVID-19 pandemic) that impede planning and implementation of growth and development initiatives (Abrahams 2015). The flip side of international donors funding is that most capacity development consist of short-term training initiatives, presented as M&E training courses without sufficient differentiation between the two concepts. The content of evaluation training modules is more theoretical than practical.

2.7 Lessons learned on what works and not working in African ECD

Tarsilla's (2014) studies of evaluation training concentrating on short term training, draw out the deficiencies in capacity building. An embedded approach where capacity building takes on multiple forms (facilitation, coaching and mentorship) throughout capacity building provided positive results in strengthening evaluation capacity. In order to achieve such an approach to capacity development, there is need to assess organisational readiness, the importance of teaching in context, providing opportunities for reflections and maintaining a partnership stance (Morkel and Ramasobama 2017). The number of formal ECD recognition amongst international development partners with a vested interest in Africa is still too low. To address this:

(i) There should be a shift from sporadic evaluation training of questionable scopes and effectiveness to more longer-term programmes consisting of real initiatives with real practical applications of evaluation principles and theories.

(ii) Generic and scattered training focussed on a specific number of individuals within in-country organisations and institutions are not effective.

(iii) The use of unverified international experience does not enhance the development of national evaluations capacities across the continent. AfrEA has commented on the lack of a professional certification of evaluators competencies to make comparable good evaluator or evaluations or design the deliveries of ECD programmes (Tarsilla 2014).

(iv) A bad Terms of Reference can discourage ECD. The stringent conditions in evaluation ToR with respect to the composition evaluation teams and the time allowed to develop the development of and evaluation proposal is detrimental to ECD in Africa. An example of this is the limited duration of in country evaluation (often less than two weeks' notice) has been recognised as reasons for relatively weaker ECD effectiveness.

Though some donors acknowledge the importance of ECD being a long-term investment and multi-stakeholder process, it is not clear how donor funded organisations can support in-country ECD. The lack of continued dialogue and joint learning on the matter further deprives the development of ECD (Tarsilla 2014). As the Made in Africa research agenda expands, evaluation capacity developers by academics and practitioners alike in the region have faced limitations of individual trainings and skills development. Confronted with the limitations of practice without engaging with institutions, and an enabling environment, which can include coordinated consensus on competencies and skills (Blaser Mapitsa and Khumalo 2018).

2.8 Theoretical Framework

2.8.1 Indigenous Evaluation Framework

The theoretical framework used to analyse, interpret and provide understanding of the process, was draws from Chilisa and Mertens' (2021) indigenous evaluation framework. Various indigenous scholars have argued for indigenous paradigms to have their own space, so that their intersection with western approaches can be critically examined. The indigenous

paradigm has four branches of evaluations that align with the big four philosophical paradigms. The first branch is the ‘methods branch’ which is aligned with the postpositivist paradigm that emphasises precision of quantitative methods (Chilisa and Mertens 2021). The postpositivist paradigm aims at discovering laws that are generalizable and govern the universe and is informed by realism, idealism and critical realism (Chilisa and Kawulich 2012).

The second is the ‘values branch’ which prioritises judgement and is aligned with the constructivist paradigm. The constructivist/interpretative paradigm aims to understand and describe human nature, and is informed by hermeneutics and phenomenology (Chilisa and Kawulich 2012). The ‘use branch’ follows and it prioritises the use of evaluation findings and is aligned with the pragmatic paradigm. The pragmatic paradigm is a multi-method research design, referring to a worldview that focusses on what works rather than what might be considered absolutely and objectively true or real (Wagner, Kawulich and Garner 2012). Then there is also the ‘social justice branch’ prioritising equity and social justice, which is aligned with the transformative paradigm. It is aimed at destroying myths and empowering people to change, the transformative/emancipatory paradigm is informed by critical theory, post-colonial discourses, feminist theories, race specific theories and neo-Marxist theories (Chilisa and Kawulich 2012).

The indigenous framework argues that evaluation should emerge from indigenous worldviews and philosophies. An evaluation methodology separated from its overarching paradigm is not sufficient or addressing the epistemic violence and decolonisation of western thought.



Figure 1: Five Branches of Evaluation Theory (Chilisa and Mertens 2021)

To better address epistemological, ecological and methodological practices, Chilisa (2015) proposes a fifth branch to ensure lower middle-income countries are included in the evaluations of SDG's. This is the 'needs and context branch', aligned with an indigenous paradigm. In this branch, the evaluator's role is to establish the extent to which a program or policy addresses the priorities and needs of the beneficiaries and is culturally, and contextually relevant for the local populations (Chilisa and Mertens 2021). The Made in Africa evaluation approach can be positioned in the indigenous paradigms' 'needs and context branch'.

The Made in Africa evaluation is a deliberate attempt to adapt evaluation tools, instruments, strategies and theory models as well as develop evaluation practice, theory and methodologies emanating from local cultures, Indigenous knowledge systems, African philosophies and African worldviews while still embracing other knowledge systems (Chilisa and Mertens 2021). Though vast in the number of communities represented in Africa, there is a similarity across African communities, sourced from the *SeTswana* proverb, '*ke motho ka batho*' (a person is because of others/I am because we are). Made in Africa evaluation also

share a common understanding of the nature of reality, ways of knowledge and values or ethics (Goathlobowe, et al. 2018, 49). Moreover, Made in Africa evaluation approaches does not isolate itself from the rest of the world, integrating other paradigmatic perspectives that Johnson and Stefurak (2013) label as a dialectical pluralism (Chilisa and Mertens 2021).

2.8.2 Transformative Paradigm

Paradigms inform the methodologies and methods, research processes, priorities, choices, actions and dissemination of evaluation findings (Chilisa and Mertens 2021). Kuhn describes the research paradigm in two ways. First, as a means to represent a particular way of thinking that is shared by a community of scientists solving problems in their field. Secondly, is to represent the commitments, beliefs, values, methods, outlooks and so forth, shared across a discipline. It is understood that a paradigm is informed by philosophical assumptions, about the nature of reality, ways of knowing and the ethics, and value system. In constructing a methodology, the epistemology finds the nature of knowledge and truth in terms of whether a belief is a true knowledge? Or is knowledge only that which can be proven using concrete data (Chilisa and Kawulich 2012).

Mshana (cited in Chilisa and Kawulich 2012) argues that “dominant paradigms have marginalised African communities’ way of thinking and have this led to the design of research-driven development projects that are irrelevant to the needs of people, a sentiment echoed by indigenous scholars in the West” (Chilisa and Kawulich 2012). The transformative/emancipatory paradigm was used to address the research question of positioning MAE in Africa, in global evaluation. The paradigm aims to destroy myths and empower people to change society radically. It originates from a family of research designs influenced by various philosophies and theories with a common theme of emancipating and transforming communities through group action (Chilisa and Kawulich 2012). The paradigm provides a framework of belief system that directly engages members of culturally diverse groups with a focus of increasing social justice (Mertens and Musyoka 2007).

It is informed by critical, post-colonial discourses, race specific theories, neo-Marxist theories and even feminist theories (Chilisa and Kawulich 2012). The theories set to challenge western

theories that view African as the 'other' in research or evaluation. Critical theory values experiential knowledge as informing thinking, research and evaluation. As a result, narrative accounts and testimonies are valued as key sources of data (Goathlobowe et al., p.50).

These philosophical underpinnings fit the topic of decolonising and indigenising, as this is based on the transformation of hegemonic discourses. The ontological assumptions of the transformative/emancipatory paradigm are based in multiple realities shaped by social, political, cultural, economic, race, ethnic, gender and disability values. It enables researchers and evaluators to study lived experiences and examine social conditions to bring hidden structures to light. The paradigm is influenced by Marxism; Karl Marx believed that those who controlled the means of production also controlled the mental production of knowledge and ideas (Chilisa and Kawulich 2012).

Being rooted in a human rights agenda, the ethical implications are derived from the conscious inclusion of a broad range of people who are generally excluded from the mainstream in society. As a result, the advantage of this paradigm is that it strives to extend the meaning of traditional ethical concepts to more directly reflect ethical considerations in culturally complex communities (Mertens and Musyoka 2007).

Although this study is informed by the transformative/emancipatory methodology, it also used the positivist or pragmatist paradigm to address the research questions of understanding Made in Africa evaluation approaches, along as reaching a consensus on what is evaluation capacity building. These paradigms seek to establish truth and objective reality, informed by realism, idealism and critical realism (Chilisa and Kawulich 2012). This methodology will help in developing a consensus definition and understanding to adequately address these research questions. The study employed a qualitative approach, heavily depending on stakeholder semi-structured interviews and desk reviews. Multiple method approaches in social research are generally used to strengthen research designs. This is because each method had both strengths and weaknesses.

The research focusses on the evaluation capacity building requirements in and for evaluators, and evaluation for Made in Africa evaluation approach. It, therefore, studies more specifically

the needs and context as well as methods branches of the indigenous framework. The study explores the requirements needed for producing evidence and research and the role of civil society, think tanks, acting as evaluators; higher education institutions and national bureau of statistics in evidence production.

3 Research Methodology

This chapter discusses the research methodology applied in this study.

3.1 Research approach

This research is based on the exploratory research approach. The approach is designed to 'illuminate how a phenomenon is manifested and is especially useful in uncovering the full nature of a little-understood phenomenon.' (Hunter, McCallum and Howes 2019). The approach allowed the researcher to explore the topic with limited coverage within the literature, and also allowed the participants of the study to contribute to the development of new knowledge in the specific area (Hunter, McCallum and Howes 2019).

The study identified a research gap in the exploring the ECD requirements that are needed for Made in Africa evaluation approaches. In order to investigate that gap, the research used data from literature reviews and data generated from semi-structured key informant interviews with academics, practitioners, and commissioners of evaluations. This research design was best suited for the study, considering the limited availability of sources on the research gap identified.

3.2 Sampling

3.2.1 Sample population

The sample population for this research focused on the profiles of M&E practitioners, experts, academics, and commissioners of evaluation to identify possible participants across universities, NGO's, CSO's, government (e.g., the Department of Planning and Monitoring and Evaluation), VOPE's (mainly the South African Monitoring and Evaluation Association - SAMEA), among others. What was challenging was securing the interviews in order to collect data from. The research did not have a clear sample population because it was difficult to quantify the exact number of professional M&E experts and commissioners in South Africa. Therefore, the study had a representative sample from the larger collection of experts in the

field. As a result, a smaller group of experts was studied to produce an accurate generalisation of the larger group.

Rin terms of sampling technique, the study adopted purposive sampling, which is a form of non-probability sampling. Purposive sample aims to capture the diversity within a population. It is an attempt to get a statically representative sample of a population in order to generalise. Paton outlines the steps for design alignment as firstly determining inquiry purpose, secondly focus inquiry questions, thirdly decide what data to collect and lastly select relevant cases (Patton 2015).

3.2.2 Sample size

A total of 15 participants were interviewed. An analysis of the various demographic characteristic of the participants is available in table 2 below

	Years of Experience	**Highest Qualification**	**Gender**
Key Informant 1	10+ years	Doctorate	Male
Key Informant 2	10+ years	Doctorate	Male
Key Informant 3	15+ years	Masters	Male
Key Informant 4	10+ years	Doctorate	Male
Key Informant 5		Masters	Male
Key Informant 6	15+ years	Masters	Female
Key Informant 7	10+ years	Masters	Male
Key Informant 8	10+ years	Doctorate	Male
Key Informant 9	20+ years	Doctorate	Male
Key Informant 10	15 years	Masters	Female
Key Informant 11	20+ years	Masters	Male
Key Informant 12	20 years	Doctorate	Male
Key Informant 13	15 years	Masters	Male
Key Informant 14	20 years	Doctorate	Female
Key Informant 15	10-15 years	Doctorate	Female

Table 2: Demographic profiles of the participants

3.3 Data collection tools

The data generated from the interviews was supplemented and complimented by a desk research study. It is important to note that documents do not stand alone, but need to be situated within a frame of reference for their content to be understood. Content analysis was used for critically examining the documents hence document analysis, which refers to the integrated and conceptually informed method, procedure and technique of identifying, and retrieving as well as analysing documents for their significance, and relevance (Wagner, Kawulich and Garner 2012).

3.3.1 Semi-structured Interviews

The study used semi-structured interviews. A semi-structured interview guide/schedule with a list of questions was developed which the researcher used during the interviews. The interview guide was based on the research questions identified, and the reviewed literature. This approach is commonly used to enable the researcher to probe and explore deeper and to corroborate data emerging from other data sources. The semi-structured interview guide was short allowing interview sessions to be less than an hour long. However, it required the researcher to be attentive to the responses in order to identify and explore new emerging lines of enquiry that were related to the study (Wagner, Kawulich and Garner 2012). With the permissions of the interviewees, the interviews were recorded and later transcribed.

The interviews were able to reveal the shared different experiences in understanding the types of barriers affecting evaluators entry to the M&E field. They also discussed whether there should be certain skills and attributes required for professionalisation, or M&E needs a harmonised curriculum for adequate formalised training. Interviews further focussed on the types of ECD initiatives that exists or perhaps are missing in the overall South African M&E framework. They also sort to reveal the role of VOPE's in advancing the importance of M&E

in the country noting areas they may influence the integration of MAE. Lastly, interviews aimed at revealing the capacity support Young Emerging Evaluators gain in their road to becoming evaluators.

3.4 Data analysis

3.4.1 Thematic Analysis

Thematic analysis is a general approach to analysing qualitative data that involves identifying themes or patterns in data. When all the semi-structured interviews for this study had been concluded, they were transcribed and then subjected to thematic analysis, which involved developing coded themes in the data. Transcribing the data assisted with familiarising oneself with the data as well as coding. The data was then labelled in segments to which coded themes gave units meanings (Kawulich and Holland 2012). Thematic codes provided the basis for development of categories by grouping codes related to the same topic together.

3.4.2 Document Analysis

Document analysis is a form of systematic procedure for reviewing qualitative research in which documents are interpreted by the researcher to give voice and meaning around an assessment topic. The analytic procedure entails findings, selecting, appraising, and synthesizing data contained in documents that are then organised into major themes, categories and case examples through content analysis (Bowen 2009). Document analysis is commonly used to represent a systematic and objective means of describing and quantifying phenomena. A prerequisite for successful content analysis is that data can be reduced concepts that describe the research phenomenon (Elo, et al. 2014). Document analysis is often used in combination with other qualitative methods as a means of triangulation. As such this study also used document analysis to achieve the aforementioned objectives.

3.5 Validity and reliability considerations

In collecting the data sources, the validity and reliability of the study was considered. Though these are more quantitative measures, both are important to measure how well the data collection tools were created. Validity is an important consideration to review because of social science research relying on human participants influences and errors. It measure the accuracy of the data collection tools. For this study, content validity was applied, to assess the degree to which the data collection supports the topic identified (Mentz and Botha 2012). To do this, the interview schedule was carefully crafted to align to the research proposal literature review, and create a platform in which the data collected would answer the research questions

The reliability of a study is just as important to measure how the data collection tools are consistent and reliable with the research. Considering that the interview data collecting answers could be subjective as they may be influenced by the interviewees' own experiences, a level of rigorous design in formulating the interview questions was applied. For that reason, the research applied inter-rated reliability, to allow the different respondents to express their own interpretation of the question (Mentz and Botha 2012). The interview guide was designed in a semi-structured design. This allowed the interviewer to probe and explore deeper into the respondents answers, and explore new and emerging lines of inquiry

3.6 Ethical considerations

Ethical considerations ensure not to cause unintentionally harm to research participants through insensitivity, intrusiveness and exploitation. Thus, four organisational codes of ethics were crucial to obey in this study. These were adhering to informed consent, meaning participation was without coercion. Full information about the purpose, duration, methods and use of the research were relayed to participants before and during their participation. The researcher made sure not to deceive participants in order to achieve the aims of the research. In this regard, privacy and confidentiality were guaranteed through for instance hiding the participants identities and research locations. Researcher reported the data

factuality to avoid fabrications, fraudulent material, omissions and contrivances (Wagner, Kawulich and Garner 2012).

This particular study does not carry intense sensitivity with regards to privacy and confidentiality. Participants were handed a consent form, outlining the following:

- Full information of the purpose of the study, duration, methods and the use for the research.
- Participation is voluntary, and participants right to withdraw from the research at any time.
- Procedures of the study – so participants understand what is expected of them.
- How the interview transcripts will be handled, sorted and maintained.
- Explanation of anonymity or confidentiality.
- Contact information for concerns or participatory rights.

If participants wished to be anonymous, that was easily included and respected. Nonetheless, the other organisational codes of ethics were all adhered (Wagner, Kawulich and Garner 2012).

4 Findings

This chapter will present findings emanating from interviews with evaluation practitioners on their experiences and perceptions of made in Africa evaluation. The findings are centred on answering the main research question namely, "In what ways are South African evaluators incorporating made in Africa evaluation approaches and what are the opportunities as well as challenges for evaluation capacity development?" In response to this question the findings are further analysed according to the sub-research questions. The first subsection will present the interviewees' understanding of the definition of made in Africa evaluation.

4.1 Defining Made in Africa Evaluation

There were similarities in responses, but a difference in the articulation in the understanding of MAE. The definitions were underpinned by the importance of contextually relevant evaluations, that relate to a community's worldviews and values, as well as African realities. Chilisa (2015) argues that as a body of literature, MAE studies can learn from other evaluation practices, possibly even adapting Euro-Western evaluation approaches to suit local contexts, so long as they do not go against African value systems. In unpacking the definition of MAE, the findings below will explain the what, why, when, who and how questions regarding MAE.

From the interviews it was noted that MAE undoes the colonial and imperialist obtruding ways of conducting evaluation and speaks to the decolonisation of evaluation, that has power in bringing in the voices of the marginalised, where the power dynamics do not favour them. It was emphasised that:

> ...Made in Africa is broadly a Pan African philosophy that seeks to advocate for African epistemologies in the field of evaluation. It is this realization that you've got Western models and philosophies driving the evaluations sector, and there was an effort to put together your thought leaders on the continent, to carve or to pave the way for a new approach (Key Informant 8).

Another participant also indicated the impetus for MAE by stating that:

> The Made in Africa Evaluation concept was born out of a need to carve and create an identity for the practice of M&E in Africa as the 'practice' or 'profession' became a more permanent feature of economic and business opportunities for Africans. However, the roots are still very much based in the West/North for sources that inform frameworks, methodologies and practices (Key Informant 9)

Another participant spoke about the importance of contextualising MAE in African realities;

> …It is very important that M&E and evaluation is based in our reality. And that means it's having to build on the reality of the multiple cultures, classes, socio economic classes, etc, that exist in South Africa, and not be limited to a Western academic model of what evaluation should be (Key Informant 4).

The generation of knowledge should be based on what Africans have always prided themselves, on largely principles of Ubuntu.

MAE helps centre African experiences in M&E, moving away from historically western driven development. So, the 'what' of MAE is the Afrocentric approach of conducting evaluation, using local processes in programme design and data collection. Similarly, the 'why' is rooted in moving away from the colonial and neo colonial development processes to better reflect cultural contexts and views, lived realities and value systems. The following quote addresses the understanding of 'why' MAE is important:

> MAE is a fundamental concept, which emphasises, the way of African knowing before colonisation. [Africa] had its own way of knowing whether things are working and what we valued and generated as knowledge. Through the process of colonisation, and even when we got independence, and the process of development; the process of knowing whether we are making progress were dictated by the colonisers. We as Africans have our way of knowing, because evaluation is the generation of knowledge. We should do evaluations based on our knowing's as Africans. The ways of knowing are Ubuntu, the way traditionally younger people would learn from older people, many ways of knowing in African culture (Key Informant 11)

As already stated in the introduction, conversations on MAE dates back the late 90s when African scholars began to clamour for African approaches to evaluation. Subsequent conferences and platforms such as AFREA were used to further articulate their vision for what was needed to move towards MAE. That answers the 'when'.

The 'who' is a bit of a contentious issue. Most participants raised the issue of race politics and the influence it has in acquiring qualified evaluators. Participants highlighted the importance of MAE being embedded in African cultures and worldviews. Thus, one cannot discount the importance of the power of culture, and voice around evaluation practice. One independent consultant participant, raised the fact that it would be helpful to look at race as a specific component in MAE. The kind of authority a white evaluator has in speaking of African epistemology, is not the same as a black evaluator's worldview. As one participant alluded to, many of your black evaluators may not have the same kind of past exposure in evaluation. When asked for past work history, them may not have the experience. Though some participants would speak to the importance of African (meaning to say black) evaluators conducting African evaluations, a different perspective was given that moves away from racial dynamics and focusses more on culturally and contextual appreciative evaluations:

> …. If you replace racial with context, it is not a matter of epistemology, because we all come with our own biases from where we come from. There are good evaluators from the US, that we must accept, they champion MAE. But have their own biases. Chilisa needs to treat the issue of contextual understanding and appreciation of indigenous knowledge. Evaluators need to have the contextual appreciation. Less of epistemology (Key Informant 11).

A second finding to contrast the views of race is a participant's comments on focusing of equity in M&E practices. That does not divide evaluations through a racial preference

> …A better set of question is about equity and practices. There is not necessarily a racial preference because that doesn't really exist in all M&E spaces. It is a sort of equity consideration that needs to be applied… Of course, you could link that time, institutional racism and the inability of those institutions to diversify the equity criteria needs work (Key Informant 13).

What is meant by this quote is that would should really be prioritised is the ability to conduct high quality field work and report write up. It is more about being able to gather unbiased ground truth information and being able to connect things to cultural elements. This is not dependent on race. Perhaps some institutions may want to look in working with more

anthropoidal and ethnographic or culturally rooted methods when formulating evaluation methods.

When it comes to the 'how', the practical application of MAE is still in its theoretical phase and the challenge comes in by not having a tried template of applying African rooted tools, methods and approaches. The challenge is beyond recognising the importance of context and having participatory evaluation study, there is no exact MAE approach. As an evaluating scholar spoke, it is extremely important to further establish MAE, especially in light of the prevailing corrupt practices in most African countries. There is a need to generate methods and tools that communities can trust, that provide the evidence required and enhance the confidence for all the stakeholders involved in evaluation. These tools do not have to be 'exotic', they must be practical, safe, reliable, easy to be used and verified. The following quote speaks of the need to move MAE past its theoretical phase, and start to find practical implementation strategies:

> We need to develop those tools first and a curriculum that supports those tools in terms of the key institutions producing evaluators in the African continent. If you talk about MAE, its referred be more theoretical and not in a more practical way. If I were to do a MAE approach, I should be able to identify the tools I can modify. It's a big challenge that challenges the appeal to utilising the approach. Western dominance, you don't want to upset. If you talk about it, you don't get a response (Key Informant 2).

It should be observed however, that most of the study participants did not always provide a comprehensive definition of MAE. This lack of depth in understanding the concept also tainted the question on ways in which they implement MAE approaches when conducting evaluation. This will be discussed below.

4.2 Ways in which South African evaluators apply 'approaches, methods and tools in their own evaluation studies

Before one can investigate the inclusion of African approaches in South African evaluations, one should start with noting whether or not MAE is even relevant and visible in South African evaluation. At the onset of this research, the research was convinced that MAE is understood by evaluators based in South Africa and that it is relevant, and to an extent is visible. However,

the study participants showed that there is very little wiggle room to build in any other types of evaluation methods that are not well established. As a result, little can be commented regarding the recognition of indigenous M&E tools for data collection and build evidence from such. Nevertheless, the findings will outline some of the key themes which emerged from the interviews regarding the relevance of MAE, and their perceptions of indigenous methods in evaluation.

4.2.1 The relevance and visibility of MAE in South African evaluations

When it comes to the visibility and relevancy of MAE in South African evaluations, the relevancy is there, but the visibility is not so much. In view of the fact that the South African government does not commission most evaluations as this is mainly done by donors, or multilateral organisations etc., the agenda is not moulded around local needs. This raises the importance of MAE being relevant and brought to the forefront of evaluation design. In the instances that MAE approaches have been valuable, with regards to there being a significant amount of partnership, ownership and community engagement in the evaluation process; these evaluations were commissioned and done by the work of NGO participatory initiatives that were culturally grounded. It was noted that:

> The concept makes a lot of sense that you need to embed African philosophies, epistemologies, in conducting evaluations. But I've not seen significant progress in that direction, or a very clear articulation of what that really means. Beyond the traditional methods, or what is being proposed, I've not seen in anthropological movement, where we saying, when you're evaluating, you have to rely on local voices (Key Informant 8)

More participants spoke on the relevancy, but low visibility of the concept as a result of restrictive ToR agenda's set out. It was also indicated that:

> The concept is very relevant, but little is being done. Never have I seen ToR speaking to MAE, or story telling as a form of data collection. If you grew up in the villages, you would sit around a fire and hear stories of what was happening in apartheid. We need to now bring to table the stakeholders who commission evaluations. Be it the UN agencies, commissioners of evaluations, what are they doing to propel this MAE approach? (Key Informant 8)

Contrary to other participants, an independent consultant did not see the relevancy of the concept. Referring once again to the restrictive ToR put out, it was indicated that:

> The concept is not relevant because those who pay for, and commission evaluation in South Africa do not request/demand or insist on African rooted approaches to evaluation. In Southern Africa we are still battling with institutions and organisations to HAVE evaluations, to make sure adequate funding is available for evaluation. Once this has been achieved, we need to make sure that institutions adhere to the recommendations – are accountable. Relevant to whom? (Key Informant 6).

Independent Consultant 3, further expands on the challenges of the concept's visibility:

> One of the biggest challenges with M&E come from evaluations is around utility. If you look at many studies, they talk about importance of evidence emerging from evaluations. On the other side of the coin is that the numbers of donors are spending in these evaluations. So, the question would be to whose benefits and why? What we are doing is not working. It doesn't use contextual approaches, technical understanding and tools to understand the context in which it works (Key Informant 7).

Much value is given to western approaches to knowledge, more than African approaches. The lead evaluator tends to be from the west. Local evaluators play second fiddle, using the reason of objectivity, when there is no objectivity beside influence of western worldviews. The challenge is that most western systems do not value African evaluators, they are regarded as less experienced with less knowledge and skills. What emerged from some of the interviews was a question that 'If MAE and the indigenisation of evaluation, centres ontological and epistemology knowledge and value systems that emanate from cultures, histories and philosophies of the marginalised'. How then does a western consultant who lacks those understandings, conduct a relevant and quality evaluation?'

> If there's objectivity what stops me (black respondent) to do an evaluation in England? Why are commissioners of evaluations getting someone who doesn't live in the country and lead the evaluation. In the duration of an evaluator, 20-30 days, you will not understand the values of the communities. When analysing the data, you need to have a background understanding of the communities' thinking. Hence, there is no traction in MAE space (Key Informant 2).

There is an underemphasis on fully recognising the importance of indigenous M&E tools for data collection and building evidence. MAE is meant to generate more helpful evidence, but African countries rely on, for example, DFID or the USAID frameworks, with little change in the composition of the team, which is not necessarily methodical, but the language embedded in the processes as well.

MAE is visible only in the academic spaces. It has been introduced in numerous conference platforms and webinars, time and time again, as such there is a buzz around it. The reasons why the concept may not be visible in the South African space, may have something to do with the authority that commissioners of evaluation have. As the proverb goes, 'He who pays for the piper, calls the tune.' The commissioned requirements of an evaluation leave little room for introducing MAE; it does not allow for any debate on African rooted approaches to evaluation. In most cases proposals are disqualified because there is a specific template as to how evaluations should be prepared as such followed. The lack of power in negotiating the ToR, lack of opportunities and resources, reveal the cracks of not having local government resources to support local commissioning of evaluations.

It was emphasised thus:

> I really haven't, perhaps, grasped where this is going, because you don't have a blueprint textbook or a material…. what that means, which is unlike how Made in Africa is evolved, it's evolved mostly from these conferences, people being passionate about how we ought to be represented (Key Informant 8).

There is a sense that people outside of the country are running the M&E agenda on the continent. As one participant noted:

> …for instance, working with the World Bank, developing a 5-year strategy for organisational evaluation. There are only four or five African people, out of the 15 evaluators. Where are the African people in the room? AfrEA has developed guidelines on what is a MAE approach. We have to believe that African people are qualified enough to do these evaluations. The worldview is still tainted, people think western experts are much better than the rest of us, it becomes a problem (Key Informant 9).

4.2.2 Perception on the importance of indigenised M&E tools and building of evidence

the interviews underscored the importance of incorporating indigenous tools and methods in evaluation. Take for instance the notion of cultural sensitivity was identified by a respondent as critical because an evaluator should "make sure that they follow cultural and social protocols in training the community;" (Key Informant 14). This also includes making the time to speak to the community's gatekeepers, be it the chiefs or traditional leaders. Secondly, in respecting the community's cultural sensitivity, evaluators need to make the interviewees as comfortable as possible, bearing in mind the gender and class dynamics. The following was noted:

> So, if you are interviewing younger women within the rural area around the sexual reproductive health, you should make sure that the interview is not done by male, even though there may be excellent male field workers. It's not really about what the field workers are able to do, but more, of not disrespecting those cultural boundaries (Key Informant 10).

The same respondent noted that the use of new technologies in an evaluation, sort of creates a barrier, especially when one goes into a rural area. Sitting there with a fancy laptop, or tablet, removes that sense of having a conversational interview that is more comfortable and organic to the interview.

In addition, when using indigenised M&E tools for data collecting and building of evidence, the evidence data collection should not be a liner presentation of findings, but more of a story telling or creative expression, especially on qualitative reflections of an experience of a program. With that, there needs to be an understanding of the context for effective story telling. This makes it less about extracting data from participants, but rather finding ways to better reflect, learn and grow as an evaluator and for the community. It is through understanding the context that one may be able to navigate these relationships.

There are also evaluation institutions which are playing a critical role when it comes to appropriate methods and tools. Southern Hemisphere is an example of a consultancy that structures its evaluation practices around utilisation focused evaluations that incorporate

participatory methods. Such a standpoint towards evaluation practice, has been popularised over the last ten years. The consultancy incorporates the stakeholders involved to help make sense of the data and analysis. It helps pulling out some of the key findings that help to interpret the data. Hence, it is through that lens that data is meaningfully interpreted, not just from the evaluator's own perspective, but also from the perspective of the people who are closer to the ground. This diversifies what is understood as being critical to the evaluation process, ranging from selecting who should be interviewed, the type of questions which should be asked and how the program or intervention should be judged.

The value in using localised data tools would make the evidence more 'palatable', more comprehensible, and illustrative to the intended user. MAE approaches can be very valuable where there is a huge amount of participation, ownership and community engagement in the evaluation process. Almost none of the evaluations that have done that have come from the South African government. The South African government is not geared towards inclusion and participation as a participant from the Wits School of Governance noted.

4.3 Shortcomings in the ECD initiatives within the South African evaluation sector

Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD) goes beyond training on how to conduct evaluations or methodologies to use when collecting data for monitoring, among other key skills. Rather, ECD includes mentorship, coaching, on the job practical training and more significantly, learning of soft skills needed to be culturally sensitive and appropriate. The stumbling blocks of ECD are significant and restrictive. The discussion below will unpack some of the shortcomings of such ECD initiatives.

4.3.1 Procurement systems

Procurement is a practical area in which African evaluators, who lack experience can be afforded an opportunity to gain experience. Evaluation capacity development involves offering African evaluators an opportunity to be appointed through procurement systems that have an inclusion criterion for historically disadvantaged populations. In particular,

preferential procurement has been used broadly in the South African context to create opportunities for including historically disadvantaged entrepreneurs. The same is occurring in the evaluation sector. For instance, the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation implemented a policy for inclusion of with a requirement of 40% of the evaluation team to be previously disadvantaged individuals (PDI). The PDI initiative aims at promoting the inclusion of PDIs so that they are capacitated by gaining experience as partners of more seasoned evaluators. However, despite the implementation of such initiatives as the PDI, which tries to bring equity in the sector, there are still challenges related to the way Terms of Reference are crafted in an exclusionary manner. On the latter point, the requirement of 40% of evaluation team to be PDIs forms part of the functional criteria of a bid, yet the TORs can be crafted in such a way that they expect the key roles in the evaluation team to be occupied by those who have proven experience of conducting evaluations for relatively lengthy periods of time. In essence it means the team members who are PDIs are less likely to take up any leading roles in the evaluations.

Procurement systems need to change in order to match the evaluation capacities required with local consultants with the right types of skills. Currently, the key component driving the MAE agenda continentally are being done by 'foreign' people not based in that particular country or community. Most evaluation are done by organisations based in the west, as was said by a few participants. In some cases, ToRs tend to be exclusionary to those evaluators who do not have the necessary number of years of practice to be considered for evaluation or even evaluators who have not had past exposure. Evaluation commissioners emphasise quality as being critical. Feasibly, if there could be more flexibility around requests for proposals, relaxing the experience restrictions, there can be a broad, round group of people that can bid for the call of expression. This was also echoed by one of the study participants who stated:

> To get the job, you need to have experience but you're not going to get the experience, so you will not get the job…. It is a closed system that doesn't welcome outsiders in. The big economy is very white dominated which is problematic. Those barriers to entry are about race, class, gender, practice and tradition, social networks (Key Informant 12).

Other participants on the challenges of procurement had also this to say:

> The issues all boil down to epistemological approach. To be regarded as an accomplished evaluator, you need to follow the guidelines of western epistemological approach for evaluation. If you deviate from that, people will say you're not qualified (Key Informant 15).

The manner of procurement in DPME, for instance, is said to exclude most black owned companies. The procurement system is found to be inefficient; and the delayed payment roll outs could bankrupt a small company. In South Africa, "we have very strong evaluators that exist, but not to the extent it exists in other African countries. Partly because our government does not procure evaluations"(Key Informant 6) Government is aware of these inefficiencies, but it is difficult to fix them because of their own requirements. Multilateral development partners are also aware of their limitations, but because they are such large institutions, it is a long and bureaucratic process to reform from within.

4.3.2 Perceptions on trustworthiness and competence

The issue of perception was raised as a barrier for entry into the South African M&E field. Trust amongst evaluation peers is just as much as a barrier. One of the respondents stated that when it happens that there is 'A bad experience with one evaluator from the African context, then there's a tendency to generalise that…these people cannot deliver. We penalise others in future' (Key Informant 11). A participant working in a multilateral organisation's agency shared an experience of how when commissioning an evaluation of USD$250 000, for instance, is considered a big risk to employ an African evaluator, whose fellow evaluator peers may not have a good rapport with, nor know their level of professionalism.

Western standards are used to measuring the competency for evaluators even in an African context. It revisits the contestations of colonialism and apartheid. To an extent, there is no denying the institutional racism and the inability of those institutions to diversify the equity criteria of their work. The following quote by a researcher is quoted again to reemphasise the issue of black evaluators being placed on the back burner when considering evaluators for projects.

> My worldview is a result of colonialism and most of the issues affect black people. That's the reality, and people don't want to talk about why they're in that specific challenge. People value western approaches to knowledge more than African approaches. The lead evaluator is white or from the west. As local evaluators, we play as second fiddle, using the reason of objectivity, when there's no objectivity beside influenced by own worldviews. The challenge is people don't see value in African evaluators; they are regarded as less experienced with less knowledge and skills (Key Informant 11).

There is a perception of inadequacy that debilitates South African and African evaluators from expanding their skill set and even their reach. One participant argued that one barrier for local evaluators is the lack of exposure to international experience, and learning best practices from other countries. This is, however, would not be a foreign concept. For instance, South Africa has a bilateral agreement with Cuba to send local doctors for training. When it comes to government support to send off officials overseas to learn, this is not realised. With projects that are regional and local, an international M&E expert is given first preference, leaving local evaluators employed to only deal with the local contextual setting, restricting the African evaluator opportunities to learn. One respondent, explained;

> … many black evaluators have not had the past exposure. So, when experiences asked for, they may not have the experience. And that's one of the challenges. So, in doing your request for proposals, there's an issue about how you deal with experience. So, for some evaluations, quality is really critical. So, you are asked for more experience (Key Informant 4).

A matter of barred access to opportunities, limits African frontiers. The market needs to be widened, allow sufficient feedback on performance for further learning that is constructive, opening the distribution of opportunities and access for evaluators to get those skills and experiences required. Where Africans can showcase their abilities is not to be unnerved by western/white evaluators, but to rather create a competency in terms of presentation. 'There is a slight way to mitigate this challenge. This lies in social networking, and how evaluators need to be outgoing to impel themselves in the broader M&E networks:

> There are elite white evaluators networks that support each other. Strategically include people in assignments and cover them, because they want people (their fellow western peers) to break through the profession. Africans don't have that mindset of this, is a competitive space we're getting into we

> easily expose each other and affect each other's ability to break through. So, knowing technical skills need to be supported by these soft skills (Key Informant 11).

Then there is a sort of 'elite' class of western evaluators have a bias against global south evaluators who may not be proficient in English. There is an assumption that 'good English' results in being a good evaluator. One should differentiate between content substance and presentation of evaluations from the diction of an evaluator. Non-English speakers or second language speakers of English are reported to being disqualified because they 'can't speak the English language well'. As indicated by a respondent:

> …I can be better than these people. I compare, African evaluators, and ask what is the difference. The elite ones speak well. There's a presentation, because of language orientation they can communicate better than us, when the reality is an African evaluator can be proficient in four to five local languages. That would actually be more beneficial when working in the field. There is space for those with competencies to speak several local languages to also shine. (Key Informant 11)

In a context like South Africa, where there are 11 recognised languages, having that competitive appeal in being multilingual is a great value add

The interviews brought out the challenge of racial dynamics and biases experienced by evaluators, which was not found in the reviewed literature or even included in the interview guide. The matter of race became a consistent theme in that some participants felt there is a level of racial discrimination when assessing and procuring evaluators. Race became a contested matter in a number of the interviews conducted. Some respondents discussed this issue within the context of Critical Race Theory (CRT), in which explicit racism has unfolded in the past through the policies of Apartheid. In post-apartheid South Africa, the covert nature of discrimination is compounded by racial remains of a significant problem (Conradie 2016). Evaluators have varying views on the emphasis on how CRT is just as much of a component of a social construct and persistent systematic inequality that can be equated in the penalisation in procurement opportunities of evaluators and the operationalising of MAE. Key Informant 6 said:

> If we look at the race theory, it was a way to distinction people by their depiction. Race theory informs current structures, even economic structures. The is a discrepancy in the levels which white consultants are procured in projects, as opposed to Africans (black). Many reports from the UN, were done by white people and the findings from our (independent) evaluation found that the quality was poor. It has nothing to with deliverables, then what is it then based on? (Key Informant 7).

To substantiate this point further, another respondent spoke to racial elements in evaluation and the importance of creating and having black evaluators

> You cannot discount the importance, the power of culture, and voice around evaluation practice. You cannot completely racialize it but cannot negated the racial experience. If you want back evaluators. You need to have black voices coming through and giving alternative ways of doing things. The kind of authority a white evaluator speaking of, is the African epistemology, is not the same cause (a white person) may not have the worldview of a black person. – (Key Informant 15)

Contrary to these views, is an interesting point focussing on cultural sensitivity. Race exists because the western is mainly 'white', African is mainly 'black'. If it is only a matter of skin colour then that would be flawed as a black Caribbean person may not understand a southern African context. Chilisa 2015 argues that it does not matter the race of the evaluator, as long as the evaluation and evaluator stay true to the epistemology of MAE. This was also substantiated by one respondent who stated that if race is replaced with context appreciation, it is not a matter of epistemology, because every evaluator comes with their own biases. They mentioned that if there are competent from the US, who subscribe to the values of MAE, then they should be offered the opportunities, that must be accepted as being champions MAE- Key Informant 14.

4.3.3 Skills Development and Education Access

With regards to the skills development and education access, a number of barriers were cited under this subsection. From the types and quality of M&E training available to what the following quote speaks on, on the lack of MEL

> Institutional or organisational cultures are still not tuned into monitoring and evaluation and learning (MEL). The results-based philosophy that is embedded in the management practices still dictate how development is articulated and practised. Our corrupt political (economic) environment adds to this process where compliance has become the benchmark for success in education, business and development generally. Mediocre monitoring exercises are used instead of robust evaluations and when there are big issues to tackle, the government sets up a commission that sucks billions out of the system with little or no consequences (Key Informant 9).

First there needs to be an interrogation of the capacity development strategies that are being used. M&E is not a new field, since 2011 all government departments in South Africa had established their own M&E units, but mostly focusing on monitoring. Since 2011 the DPME, the centralising unit under the presidency, was established. Making ECD is fairly nascent in South Africa. It goes without saying that there has been a big expansion in types of ECD offerings. DPME had published its own competency framework in 2012. The competencies did not get off the ground for a lack of validation from practicing evaluators. With that said, there is still much more in-depth work that needs to happen.

M&E courses are only offered at a postgraduate level, be it as a short course certificate, diplomas or university degree. The costs of furthering studies at a higher-level, is a low-key start to filter out the haves and have-nots. There becomes an issue of access, due to the finances needed for the studies. Post graduate fees are costly, and may not be accessible to all those who wish to study. Coupled with that, is the need for advocacy. M&E has been a discipline that people 'stumble' across later in their education years or career. Many consultancies, governmental departments and NGO's have a growing demand in the need for evaluators. It usually is only in one's career, does this realisation for M&E skills become evident. Hence, higher learning intuitions such as the Wits School of Governance, have M&E qualifications geared specifically towards mid-career professionals and government officials.

In most cases, the fees of the courses for governmental officials are covered by the departments they work for. Even so, how do individuals with no governmental or company support then carry the fees for these courses? Those mainly affected are those trying to break into the field, predominately your EE's. Then there is the quality of the education offered in

the field. Does the education offered sufficiently equip students with the sufficient skills to break into the space? Key Informant 1 attempted to answer the question as noted that:

> Universities are producing no value certificates, who aren't able to perform the task. It is now up to universities to up their game in producing quality people who are competent with the right knowledge and skills. And desist seeing M&E as a cash cow for the institutions (Key Informant 8).

Another evaluator has this to comment on regarding their education experience and whether they felt the content taught, was sufficient training for them to go into evaluation.

> I did my Masters, but a lot of what they teach you is half of what you need to know, in an actual evaluation…data analysis I found was that they teach you the minimum, and even at the masters level, it's about how to code data, but making things that they don't really get to teach you because a lot of that comes with practice… a lot of that is influenced by our own cultural context, a lot of the process skills that you need as an evaluator, not just the technical, and evaluation skills, and those process skills come a lot from who you are, as a person like facilitation skills (Key Informant 10).

The issues of skills development and education access is a relative discussion. Many of the respondents interviewed had their own types of formal training, and many would probably have different views on which curriculum was sufficient and worthwhile. This then flows into the next discussion point on whether there is need for a harmonised curriculum.

4.3.4 Is there a need for a harmonised curriculum?

Strengthening South Africa's a national systems is embedded in the capacity development initiative employed both formally and informally. For EE's they rely heavily on content and processes made available by HEI's. Currently, there are four outstanding higher institutions of learning that offer M&E at a postgraduate level namely the University of Cape Town, Stellenbosch University, University of Johannesburg and Witwatersrand University (under the School of Governance). The various postgraduate courses have their own curriculum, this could be because each university tries to have its own competitive appeal.' At postgraduate diploma level Stellenbosch University students study the principles and paradigms of evaluation studies, the focus on clarification evaluation, process evaluation

and programme monitoring, data collection methods for evaluation research as well as statistical and qualitative analysis methods for evaluation. The Master level course in programme evaluation at the University of Cape Town is a specialised degree that provides students with comprehensive knowledge and skills of evaluation theory and practice. Its aim is to produce graduates that go on to improve the quality, accountability and transparency of a wide range of social and development programmes. The applied curriculum straddles an innovative interdisciplinary space that has been influenced by the latest developments in evaluation theory and practice.' (Building evaluation capacity in South Africa: gLOCAL concerns and efforts gLOCAL Evaluation Week 2021: Sharing local & global M&E knowledge 2021)

This may not be a negative stance in having diverse offerings of M&E formal training; interdisciplinary engagement should not necessarily translate into a harmonised curriculum. A harmonised curriculum should not be the 'same' curriculum. As stated in the literature, though the growth of MAE has been appraised, there needs to be thought leadership in evaluation theory and practice cutting across disciplines and sectors. The development of such theories and practices should serve as the foundational teachings. The dialogue should generate ideas about core principles, about axiological interpretation and, epistemological preferences. The application of new knowledge, would assist in positioning Africa as a continent from which appropriate innovative frameworks and models and practices in evaluations emerge. This brings up the questions of who should direct the debate? How would it be managed? And how do we ensure learning. It through these conversations where MAE will be constructed and strengthened.

Each university has its own relative specialised focus. For instance, Stellenbosch is geared towards students who will practice, and Wits focuses on students who work in government and/or the broader evaluation government space. Also, the MAE coursework needs to move past the superficial way, for it is underplaying the strengths of the philosophical strengths of African knowledge systems. Nevertheless, institutions such as SAMEA, CLEAR-AA, and Southern Hemisphere are identified as institutions that excel in this function.

M&E pertains to many components, which need certain skill sets. Beyond understanding the theoretical underpinnings, there needs to be application understanding of programme design; having critical data analyses skills; ToC design to hypothesis the anticipated change of a programme and so on. Underemphasised skills are that of soft skills, the need to understand the politics of evaluation and applying that in the way evaluators interact with evaluation. M&E requires a strong understanding of how to engage with communities and the role evaluation plays in organisational change, governments and power dynamics.

There are various actors who sit on accountability mechanisms. From commissioners to evaluators who are the objects of evaluation participants. To develop the profession, it needs to draw on the different interests. This was also further buttressed by Key Informant 1 who emphasised that:

> We need diversity. We need innovation. I think if you look at social work, the way it's taught across South Africa, the yes, there is a framework, but they are not all learning the same thing. Even if you go to the US the MIT program itself is not the same as Harvard programme. But these programs are designed differently. They serve purposes and addressed the needs in the market. So as long as curriculum is tied to the needs in the market, I think let it be, we don't need one monotonous, boring curriculum, but I don't think that's healthy for the evaluation sector. So, I think this should be sent as of specializations focusing on these different skills, skill sets that are required (Key Informant 8)

Perhaps this is a critical distinction to make. There does not necessarily need to be a set curriculum that teaches a generic standardised teaching. It should and must speak to what skills demands are required for the different sectors. With that in mind, beyond formal educational training, are there ways for other forms of ECD initiatives could encourage the further incorporation of MAE methods? The following section looks at what has been done in this regard, and what could be done.

4.3.5 Ways in which ECD could encourage the application of MAE methods

One of the research sub questions asked In what ways can localised Evaluation Capacity training encourage the application of Made in Africa evaluation methods? A participant of the

study commented on the foundations that have been set as well as progress that has been made with regards to where education ECD has supported the growth of M&E

> South Africa is one of the first countries in Africa where M&E (ECD) was established in most Higher Education Institutions/Universities, albeit at postgraduate levels with some offering courses at undergraduate level. The success is that M&E knowledge has been shared widely and across very many disciplines. The disciplinary set up at HEIs is unfortunately very siloed and there has not been much cross disciplinary communication (Key Informant 9).

There should be more focus on community-based M&E practices. It also involves getting the buy-in of communities, consulting with them on the ground, and communicating progress and results of a project at every level. In essence, it entails adopting a bottom-up and not a top-down approach. Once government and developmental organisation begin to hire local evaluators rather than external evaluators, it means evaluation becomes about indigenous people. This is one angle MAE tries to uphold.

VOPE's can also play a role in challenging ideas of deepening the general understanding of MAE. Allowing for rigorous conversation on MAE conceptualisation and creating a platform for constructive critiquing is the panacea to contributing significantly in having MAE achieve its goal. VOPE's can challenge talks of how to support understandings of deepening what MAE looks like.

The Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results in Anglophone Africa (CLEAR-AA), have a short course training called 'Development Evaluation Training in Africa'. The programme aims to build a community of M&E professionals with skills, knowledge and tools, which are fit-for-purpose to address local and global development challenges. This is done via a combination of theory and practice-based approaches aimed at stimulating interactive participation, critical reflection and debate. This type of ECD, is an attempt of ensuring the incorporation of MAE is visible in indigenising M&E; even though the short course it is more of an awareness building initiative than an exchanging of skills

4.3.6 The successes and failures of ECD in South African evaluation

There are mixed reactions on the judgement of the scale and capacity of ECD initiatives. This too points to the judgements on the successes or failures of ECD in south African evaluation. A participant in the study concluded that:

> There was excitement at first. Globally, there's enormous interest and appreciation for the argument. But the business and work of turning it into actual methods that document and deliver a result hasn't been done. You cannot judge it as being successed or failed (Key Informant 12).

Naturally, government officials, specifically those from the DPME, report and reflect that government initiatives are put in place to encourage ECD. However, the question that arises is that are those initiatives visible on the ground? To attempt an answer, practitioners speak on what may be considered relevant and discernible on the ground. Reflections reveal Key Informant 4 submitted that:

> I think how far we (DPME) have come, from when in 2011, when I started in DPME. evaluation was done by very few departments. And to evaluation becoming much more widespread. So that so in that sense, I think ECD is definitely succeeded (Key Informant 4).

When it comes to how MAE, ECD has failed. Reactions to evaluations are such that 'specific things must be trained in a specific way', in order for practitioners acquire specific skills – Key Informant 15. Research demonstrate that gaps exist in areas of context especially for evaluators. In other words, evaluators struggle with contextual issues if development programme are initiated into a specific community where only resources are provided by the funder.

When one speaks of ECD, the conversation is limited to training or teaching in universities. To advance the conversation, one should begin to conceptualise how best can the knowledge of M&E be translated from the day-to-day activities. ECD includes coaching, mentoring, technical skills development, which all support emerging evaluators programme. Further, as reviewed studies suggest, there is scarce assessment on whether various and different ECD initiatives are eventually effective. Research evidence show that there is supply and demand

of evaluation as such supply cannot be made where there is no demand. Thus, results for the study show that most of the programmes focusing on ECD actually respond to a specific demand. Key informant 2 noted that:

> ECD does not train people to pick out social issues, social realities in a community of race, gender, culture, values and political systems. All these issues define how people respond. But when you go to an evaluation, the biggest challenge, western evaluators are now getting it. They now speak of culturally sensitive approaches. Standards have been generalisations, scientific, standardised etc of acquiring knowledge and not understanding the intricacies (Key Informant 2).

As mentioned above, there has been little recordings on the efficacy of the ECD initiatives incorporated in M&E. It is in good spirits that across government departments, M&E units have been established. To make a difference, there needs to be analytical skills that go beyond analysing data. That's what's needed in South Africa. If not, there will be evaluations that look good on paper but miss the essence of the ground experience. – Key Informant 6.

4.3.7 Professionalisation

An interesting debate coming from the interview responses, was on the question of whether M&E would benefit by professionalising the sector. By interesting, there were opposing views on the need for professionalisation. The question on professionalisation asked is what types of skills and competency training would be required to professionalise the field of M&E?

With all the components M&E has, each component requires skills. From programme design, quality assurance skills, understanding data collection instruments and methodology instruments both quantitatively and quantitively, to report writing skills. More to that, what are underemphasised skills in the competency conversations are the need for soft skills of overall evaluation, and people who understand the politics of evaluation and apply that in the way they interact in evaluation, and gain trust in organisations and communities where evaluators are seen as threats. It requires strong understanding on how to engage with communities and the role of evaluation plays in organisational change, governments, and power dynamics.

Through capacity building, this can inform the research skills needed for the profession. Professionalisation is key. Like any other profession M&E has to be professionalised regulated by a body. When training evaluators, there is a need to make sure people are not only being trained on the technical aspects. The training should focus on the soft aspects that highlight their unique African value addition. Professionalism starts with acquiring some form of accredited certificate. Truth is M&E does not have such. One researcher participant responded to say, 'Universities are producing no value certificates, that are not able to perform the task.' What is important is to rather focus on training people who are competent and able to conduct evaluations, in a way that promotes MAE. Professionalisation and competency skills are decided by the international community. If the work of AFrEA and VOPE's are premised as the new paradigm shift geared at guaranteeing a move away from the western standards, localised competence frameworks need to be established.

The real problem with the topic of professionalisation, is how to professionalise some of the elders who have been working in the M&E space for decades, but may not have any qualification in M&E - Key Informant 7 This creates the opposition against professionalisation:

> ...it will exclude certain people in favour of this. At what time will we be ready to professionalise? Who is checking the quality of this skills and professionalisation? Capacity building is used loosely. Most universities have some standard of maintaining the status quo around how knowledge is distributed, which is problematic (Key Informant 7).

The conversation of professionalism, is not linear. As the above quote states, there are many elements that need to be considered. The skills needed for evaluation are uniquely diverse and difficult to teach – Key Informant 15. Most senior evaluators do not have the necessary authenticating qualifications, but have the research skills needed in evaluation. To be an evaluator, one needs to be very analytical, and possessing critical thinking skills. Second to this, similar to the DPME competencies created but could not get off the ground because of a lack of validation by practioners, who would set these competencies. Who's values would be prioritised over others? Lastly who evaluate the evaluative competencies, who should be

authenticating these competencies? Developing competencies, is not as straight forwards as suggested

4.4 ECD initiatives to support young and emerging evaluators

4.4.1 Current assessment of training capacity development aimed at YEE (Young and Emerging Evaluators)

The heightening of evaluation internships over the years has been a welcomed training capacity initiative.. Evaluation is similar to research. It has its own different types of quantitative, qualitative and mixed research methods, or ethnographic or critical realism approaches- Key Informant 14. Meaning, there is no one way of conducting evaluation. YEEs need to grapple with the understanding of different research processes. M&E is a practice disciple with specific skills needed for research. YEEs need experience in developing research skills, and engage with evaluations practically where they have access to mentors or coaches. Institutions miss elements that exposes students to practical implementation. Learning M&E at a postgraduate level provides insufficient time for scholars to understand the field and to gain the vocational training required. Key Informant 14 indicated that:

> ...other professions (doctors, engineers, lawyers), or any area of professional practice, you don't train people and lead them into the market. Usually, learning is linked with the practice so that a young person can get the practice and experience in a safe place. Teachers have to find a way of having a strong link with industry to assist in a project… (an example) Wits should have formal links with NPO's and UN agencies to induce practice in the teaching programme. WFP has a requirement of a 3-month managed internship which is not detached from the learning itself (Key Informant 14).

The National School of Government provides training and as a leader of countrywide M&E, DPME offers its own form of training. The department takes a great deal of interns, who (in most cases) end up being employed across various departmental M&E programmes. There had been a growth of private institutions creating internal training offered to the public, such offered by Khulisa Management Services, Southern Hemisphere, the Centre for Statistical Analysis and Research, just to name a few. SAMEA has also been doing outstanding work in

this aspect, given its mentorship programme which has created a database of EEs. Further, SAMEA has also been able to influence the DPME 2-year internship programme.

4.4.2 Notable institutions offering 'on the job training'

Below is a list of widely recognised institutions who offer internships and training for recent graduates, looking for that practical exposure, as well as indicating the length of the internships. As a disclosure, by all means. these are not the only institutions that offer M&E training, but rather a few of the more recognised institutions. The listing of these organisations is to serve as a short reference list of where some EE's can look for

a.

Organisation	Internship durations	Description
UNDP South Africa	6 months	Internships give students and recent graduates. interns are selected on a competitive basis.
CLEAR-AA, SAMEA, WFP and UNICEF		Joint EE programme targeted at professionals with 5 years or less experience
UNICEF		internship programme targeted at undergraduates, graduates or PhD holders enrolled in, or have graduated within the past two years
DPME	6 months - 2 years	facilitates numerous cross-departmental internships ranging from 6 months to 2 years
Southern Hemisphere	6 months	6-month internship programme with possibility for renewal up to 1 year
CLEAR-AA YEE and WFP, UNICEF	1 year	
JET Education	1 year	
WFP South Africa	6 months	training programmes in either the monitoring or evaluation units
SAMEA	6 months	You will be placed in a partnering organisation with SAMEA
DNA Economics		approaches from both newly qualified/less experienced individuals

Table 1: List of institutions with YEE programmes

Despite the numerous M&E programmes being offered there is no evidence regarding documentation of the success of the trainees past the programme. Essentially, conducting an evaluation on what can be learned from the programmes to establish where the implantation of the programme can be improved is required. This will serve as a reference for any institution that wishes to introduce a M&E internship programme as there can be a plethora of evidence on different types of M&E internships. However, the internships and apprenticeships are not as many they should be. As useful as the internships are, there is a downside as to why there are not many internships offered - some organisations' hesitancy in having internship programmes is the fact that it takes a lot of work to train interns. Meaning, firstly to integrate the intern into the organisation and ongoing projects and taking time from busy schedules to mentor and coach, needs a lot of time to allocate to interns from supervisors.

There is also the challenge of lack of funding of the M&E internship programmes. As internships are often limited to six months which M&E scholars have indicated that the duration is inadequate or too short for training of this nature. Key Informant 11, pointed out that to grapple with the whole programme-cycle of an evaluation, takes considerable time. This means that by the point the intern grasps the programme cycle, their 6-month internship will be done, and the intern will not have had the opportunity to practice and really integrate themselves in a typical evaluation. Recommendation are thus made in scholarship that internships be more widespread where there should be interns in every government department's M&E unit.

4.4.3 The role of VOPEs

Convening space

At its core, SAMEA values itself at ensuring that the field of M&E is conducted with integrity and that quality evaluations are the main objectives as a result of their efforts. SAMEA engages communities that are able to support and develop the M&E as a discipline, and has become an instrument to enhance good governance. SAMEA is a convening space for bringing together like-minded stakeholders in the evaluation space, to enhance the profession by

offering a platform for collaboration, and peer learning. This is premised on the understanding that there is power in connecting people. It was indicated that:

> VOPEs in general creates a safe space for networking, because it's the only space where there are no barriers to entry. You'll find UN people, government, universities in one space. For instance, the UN evaluation group is strictly for UN agencies and no other organisations. VOPEs play that critical space. To allow a voice for everybody. Because of that we have to find out then, what role should they play in linking EEs to industry. SAMEA plays linkage to institutions – government, NGO's, UN agencies- how can they rethink their own role and own marketing (Key Informant 14).

Conferences and Training

SAMEA hosts its biannual conferences in partnership with the DPME. During such conferences, an array of workshops is offered to accommodate both participants with elementary understanding of M&E wherein mentorship is done by more advanced M&E professionals. The workshops serve as a platform for training and value-add SAMEA offers. Influential actors usually invited as keynote speakers and in the past Lumkfo Mtimde (Special Advisor to the Minister of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation), Christina Nomdo (NPC Commissioner) and Prof Patricia Rogers (BetterEvaluation), just to name a few, have graced the SAMEA conferences.

Each conference presents a new theme, relating to what worldly challenges may be relevant from time to time. In the 2019 conference, themed "Shaping M&E for a sustainable future", the conferences included strands such as:

- Better evidence for public policy and implantation
- MERL tech
- Investing for impact
- Climate change and resilience building
- M&E and non-profits
- M&E skills in a changing world.

Limitations

VOPEs are complicated institutions because they are industry bodies attempting to grow their sector as such have a lot of expectations. There is an expectation of SAMEA's role in how they can do more. For one, VOPE's can shift themselves into a space where they could administrate a programme links industry with institutions of learning – especially for EE'-then the possibilities of collaborations with other organisations in the field would widen. They don't have resources. The way SAMEA make its money is from conferences and through membership fees. With regards to the behind the scenes administrator many of the board members have full 09:00-17:00 jobs outside of their board membership duties. As a result, SAMEA does not have administrative capacity – and don't have the staffing.. One needs to have realistic expectation of VOPE's and the type of reach and change it can realistically create. It must be noted the amount that SAMEA does is remarkable. Seen as a real leader and strong VOPE continentally and globally. It is not going to be a game changer. For it to be a game changer it needs a cash injection of 2/3 million rand a year to make the VOPE run at its full potential– Key Informant 13.That kind of money is not around, there is only so much partnering institutions can financially support the VOPE in. The challenges of being funded by any donor, be it UN agencies or multilateral development partners, VOPE's become activities in a bigger log frame, and operate based off of development frameworks directed by the multilateral organisations.

SAMEA's supporting of personal capacity development is still being done at a small scale. As an example, within Zimbabwean Monitoring and Evaluation Association learning is shared in lessons where you meet for 1hour 30mins, teaching skills like this is how surveys are done, how to analyse data, creating evaluation questions and so on – Key Informant 8. This works for those who have basic understanding of the field. Continentally VOPE's have limited resources to really have fully fledge of training approaches. Beyond SAMEA, many VOPE's in southern Africa don't have that vibrant association.

Some view the role of SAMEA as being underwhelming. The VOPE represent all levels of practitioners from EE's to more advanced evaluators, academics, CSO agents and government officials. As a result, the institution needs to look at the breath of its membership, ensuring it

created training at all levels of teachings. If one of SAMEA's value add is that of networking spaces, then why charge a fee in form of membership access to those interact rations

> VOPEs are complicated institutions because they are industrial bodies trying to grow their sector. They have a lot of expectations in their operations from its members- they could do more, but unfortunately they don't have resources. - (Key Informant 12).

The programming has to focus on teaching specific indicators in the development framework which might not be the direction of the VOPE.. Unless there is a sustainable pathway for funding, submissions are that the African agenda's VOPEs will always be under the heel of donors.

5 Discussion

The previous chapter on findings provided an understanding of the 'how', what', 'where', 'why', 'when', and 'who' of MAE. The findings showed how MAE is appreciated by the South African practitioners and what opportunities they have to incorporate indigenous methods, tools and approaches. This chapter will discuss the implications of the findings in line with relevant literature and experiences in other case studies.

5.1 Defining Made in Africa

The interviews showed that participants have a general understanding of what MAE means or at least its value proposition in line with the need for contextually relevant M&E in Africa. What emerged in the interviews is in line with the arguments by Goathlobowe *et al*. (2018) that evaluations should be culturally appropriate, and seeing the importance of studying evaluations 'ourselves' as a way of empowering the voices of indigenised communities. Chilisa and Merten (2021) sum up MAE as being a deliberate attempt to adapt evaluation tools, instruments, strategies and theory models as well as develop evaluation practice, theory and methodologies emanating from local cultures, Indigenous knowledge systems, African philosophies and African worldviews while still embracing other knowledge systems. The findings were not far off with this thinking. MAE is a result of carving and creating an identity for M&E in Africa. The need for having contextually relevant evaluations that consider communities' worldview and realties as being crucial in MAE underpinnings.

One participant noted that Africans have their own ways of knowing which should therefore be respected in monitoring and evaluation of local projects and programmes. Thus, it was generally felt that evaluations should be based on African experiences. Another key finding reporting on the fundamentals of the concept, is to revert to what African Indigenous Knowledge Systems (IKS) were before colonisation even through the process of decolonisation, the measurement of development, and the process of knowing whether progress is being made, has been dictated by the colonisers. The shift away from western methodologies is thus a big essence of MAE where African evaluators can assess the ways of

progress. Whether or not evaluators can merge IKS in evaluation practices, it should be noted that this can be a bit difficult.

Some of the challenges raised by participants on realising MAE, is the lack of an MAE approach which has no required identifiable methods and tools. The 2013 Bellagio Report speaks of three distinctive components as being crucial in Made in Africa development: (i) the use of indigenous knowledge systems, (ii) the process of ensuring that evaluations are led by local actors and that evaluations are localized, considerate of class dynamics, and (iii) that development projects are based on mutual respect (Frehiwot, 2019). The point on developing IKS's was sporadically mentioned, but it is quite an important discussion, when considering there is a call for thought leadership to guide the discussions of MAE to bring its fruition. Forms of IKS contribute to the process of enhancing the creation of new knowledge, which will inevitably share insights on the tools required to interpret the world. As stated in the evaluation findings, knowledge systems that are embedded in African cultural contexts have the potential to strengthen ways of thinking evaluation and its impact.

The emphasis of using African tools, methods and approaches when conceptualising African evaluations, recognising the importance of participatory methods and techniques. The concept is still very much at a theoretical stage, the argument of decolonisation for MAE is not possible because of the lack of practicality needed for M&E. Mapitsa, Tirivanhu and Pophiwa (2019) emphasis how the decolonisation of knowledge is as important as it involves capacity building of relevant stakeholders to carry out African evaluation, encompassing African rooted tools, instruments, theories and models that ensure the relevancy of contexts in an African setting. The matters of ECD are further addressed below. Africa is not devoid of African thought leaders, think tanks and other institutions can further collaborate on progressing forms of IKS to support the creation of those tools, methods and approaches needed for MAE. There is potential for African VOPEs to set in motion these conversations on developments of IKS and through the African Evaluation Journal to record these developments.

The transformative/emancipatory paradigm was the study paradigm chosen for this research. It is an appropriate paradigm to inform ways in which MAE can be applied to wrestle the

dominance of western paradigms which continue to marginalise African communities. The agenda of the transformative/emancipatory paradigm, in a way is to rewrite African history, that speaks to the current realities relevant and seen on the ground. The necessity for an emancipatory approach of research, focuses in on values that include indigenous knowledge and people. It is understanding how 'oppressed' research paradigms can be disabled to discover new ways to challenge it (Wagner, 2012).

The Indigenous Evaluation Framework is the second paradigm that was used in the study. Similar to the transformative/emancipatory paradigm, indigenous evaluation requires reconceptualization and rethinking of evaluation (La France, 2020). In the literature, a more comprehensive discussion of the Indigenous Evaluation Framework is fleshed out. What can be emphasised is how IKS are grounded in the principles of *Ubuntu* –a philosophy that is woven through the fabric of many African cultures and communities. Accordingly, the South African M&E systems needs to base on local realities that build on the reality of multiple cultures, socio-economic classes.

Indigenous methodologies are set in the indigenous paradigms while critical and liberatory methodologies fit with the transformative paradigm. There are corelations that can be made with the two paradigms. Both share an emancipatory and critical stance in denouncing western scholars approaches of doing research as attempts to decolonise methodologies, and research as a whole. This cause a level of discomfort in the global evaluation space, as decolonising research paradigms and methodologies to include IKS's is to teach the global evaluation space to value African knowledge systems as equal to western approaches in how knowledge in created. It is said that from an overall observation, much research has been conducted on knowledge of indigenous people, but little has been published on appropriate research frameworks (Mpofu, Mushayikwa and Otuluja 2014)

The earliest indigenous research paradigms to break into the scene was in the 1990's with the Kupapa Maori approach in New Zealand. This was the advancement of Kupapa Maori methodology appropriate to contexts Australia also proposed into own Australia Indigenous Peoples. This was followed by northern America Indigenous people proclaiming their own ways of generating knowledge. All these examples of introducing transformative, indigenous

paradigms is done with the purpose of "reclaiming research, and with it knowledge, language and culture for their people (Held 2019)

What repeatedly came from the findings are frustrations of not knowing how to implement MAE and IKS, through locally conceptualised tools, methods and approaches. MAE is still very much in its conceptualization stage in South Africa. Little has been researched on regarding the actualization of the concept. Some have questioned what can be considered pan-indigenous approaches. They are critiqued to be too generic and not practical. One can appreciate the argument that a generic indigenous worldview is of little service to communities that have their own views and worldviews (Held 2019). A generic pan indigenous approach lacks the holistic nature of IKS and the metaphysical worldviews (Mpofu, Mushayikwa and Otuluja 2014). The practicality of the MAE concept makes it difficult to locate the theory in the wider and global setting of M&E.

5.2 Overview of spaces for incorporation of African rooted methods and tools in South African evaluations

5.2.1 Visibility and Relevancy of MAE in South Africa

There has been movement with regards to documenting the trends and approaches in Africa. Much of these have been captured by the *African Evaluation Journal (AEJ)*. The journal has grown its literature in the systematic promotion and practice of African scholarship and methodologies with the hope of strengthening African-centred paradigm within international evaluation discourses (Ramasobana). When it came to capturing experiences of using African rooted methods and tools in South African evaluations, the findings reflected the inaction in the overall South African M&E framework. There were mixed reactions on the relevancy of MAE. On the one hand, respondents viewed MAE as being crucial in the general sense of embedding African philosophies and epistemologies when conducting evaluations. The review of the concept was thought of as having a significant number of partnerships, ownership and community engagement in the overall evaluation process.

On the other hand, other respondents viewed the concept as not having relevancy at all, because of the red tape that commissioners of evaluations impose on evaluators. Part of the problem lies in that international development partners who fund and commission evaluations do not request any African forms of methodology be applied to evaluations. This means that there is no incentive for appointed evaluators to conceptualise MAE frameworks and methods. The findings reflect the challenges in implementing MAE are that the M&E is still western in outlook. Many ToRs and bid proposal requests are being written in restrictive ways leaving little room for innovation. Comparably, the visibility of the concept is inconspicuous and is similar to the arguments made on the relevancy of MAE. Likewise, because of the lack of identified tools, approaches and methods of the concept, there is not clear articulation of what MAE looks like on the ground. In their study of the definition of MAE, Omosa et al (2021, p9) argue that evaluators should go beyond just defining the concept to mainstreaming the concept and "make sure that it gains wider coverage, acceptability, prominence, and use in the African continent".

5.2.2 Importance of recognizing indigenous M&E tools for data collection and building of evidence

That conversations around MAE are only held in academic spaces, used as a sort of "buzz" word in conferences, seminars, and workshops, is a scenario which most respondents alluded to. MAE needs to be brought to the forefront of evaluation inception workshops, to make the concept more integral. They are often talked about rather than talked to. To this point there is a need in understanding the scope and nature of the knowledge of the community concerned in order to build on indigenous methodologies for data gathering and assessments that are rooted in the community's own values, seeking to incorporate their own ways of learning and knowing of the world. (Owusu-Anash and Mji 2013) studied ways to heighten awareness on the need of indigenous knowledge when designing and implementing research and evaluations. They cite the South African experience of how an evaluator engaged with rural indigenous women in the form of focused groups discussions from which they note that African knowledge and its methods of acquisition have their own practical, collective and social or interpersonal slant. The case study in question is shared in the findings, emphasising the importance of data collection not being extractive and not being more participatory. The

conclusions made in Owusu-Anash and Mji's (2013) study are that there should be equal and respectful mutual exchange and synthesis of information. This is the nuance of Afrocentric approaches which encourages cultural and social immersion in the fieldwork, and not just a scientific distancing of research –a tool when applying MAE. More can be said on different considerations of indigenised data collection tools

Matters like context-specific language needs to be considered in various communication patterns. Sometimes using English in the fieldwork may not be received well. One case study of a Zimbabwean evaluation of the possibility of integrating IKS data collection tools into western-oriented classroom science is illustrative (Mpofu et al 2014). The study explored appropriate strategies in gaining access to indigenous knowledge holders, for generation indigenous knowledge data collection. The authors argued;

> "Conversing in English was oriented towards official communication, curriculum and academic issues. All the participants, regardless of age or educational qualification, quickly tuned to their home language whenever the conversion turned to a cultural issue" (Mpofu, Mushayikwa and Otuluja 2014).

Language usage is dynamic and context-specific rather than fixed. Fieldwork needs to be language sensitive and be able to code switch to the participant language at any time, it helps in occurring the researcher acceptability by participant and their agreement to participate, their perceived value of the study. In essence language strongly influences the authenticity of both the data collection process and the findings of the study (Mpofu, Mushayikwa and Otuluja 2014).

It is valuable considering the ethics and being bilingual is using different conversation formats when accessing data in a single session enhances the data collected. Structured interviews do not consider the natural flow of storytelling data collection. Storytelling is considered as a commonly acceptable method of accessing indigenous knowledge data collection. The approach is more dynamic intra-conversational approach. Such an approach is shrouded by western dominated research approaches. The indigenous approach of data collection is a more complex process, but still has commonalities with classical ways of interruptive research. What the above case studies showcased is possibilities and practicalities of combing

indigenous methods of doing research with classical interpretive methods (Mpofu, Mushayikwa and Otuluja 2014).

The participatory approach of data collection allows data captures to learn with, by, and from indigenous communities in creating a working relationship which peoples priorities and values are more fully expressed in research. “indigenous communities within which research is conducted are not treated as ‘informants’ but ‘significant participants’ and as ‘equals’ in both the process of research and the decision-making processes that bring about policy changes which affect their communities” (Mpofu, Mushayikwa and Otuluja 2014)As an collaborative research methodology, it emphasises and strengthens the African value of collective responsibility, affirming the centrality of African indigenous ideals and values as legitimate frames of reference for conducting evaluation (Mpofu, Mushayikwa and Otuluja 2014)

5.3 ECD initiatives and shortcomings within the South African evaluation sector

The findings also showed that so long as preference is given to western evaluators and consultancies over African practitioners when commissioning large scale evaluations, this is counterintuitive to the building of African capacities. If anything, it is very likely to prevent the continent’s evaluators from learning and earning that experience from evaluations (Theuinnsen, et al. 2019). In comparison to what was reviewed in the literature, the responses received in the findings, showed a different viewpoint in the challenges of ECD on the ground. Interestingly, when asked of the challenges of ECD initiatives within South African evaluation sector, many of the responses were not regarded in the literature review.

5.3.1 Barriers limiting the inclusion of African evaluators into the field

Procurement

The procurement of evaluators remains debatable amongst interviewees. Government has put in place measures for appointment of teams which comprise 40% of the previously disadvantaged individuals (PDI) among the evaluation team. An inference can be made that

this refers to the inclusion of black African evaluators. A finding touched on the pickle of not having the needed experience for the proposed ToR, meaning one needs to have job experience, but, ironically, one cannot get the job experience without getting the job. It appears to be a case of the chicken and egg dilemma. Then there is the seething reality of racial, class and gender bias that play a role in the procuring of evaluators. The challenge of racial discrimination is hoped to be addressed in the sections below.

Concerted efforts by DPME of being conscious to racial dynamics of evaluators, essentially is not hiring evaluators because they may have a certain profile, the focus now is on accommodating, for capacity building, both seasoned evaluators and young people. DPME sees elitism in the evaluation space and aims to balance the scales on this point. By setting guidelines and standards that establish how evaluations should be carried out, this allows for a growing number of African evaluators to be empowered, where the use of evaluation could benefit policy. NES's have a key role to play in addressing the power asymmetries with development partners to ensure that evaluations are carried by the countries' specifications. Lastly, the establishment of local capacities to commission and carry out evaluations in a manner that can be institutionalised and sustainable over time is reliant on the country's strength of the country's evaluation integration (Smith and Kithau-Kiwekte 2019).

The PDI serves as a proactive system that tries to share equity. This has not been witnessed on the ground by practising evaluators. The procurement systems are exclusionary to evaluators who do not have the necessary number of years of practice to be considered for evaluation professional posts. As a government official gave an account to say, DPME incorporates the need for capacity building within previously disadvantage individual prioritising companies that are either 100% black owned or young people new to the field. DPME brings in consultants who may not have sufficient work experience in the field or either have not had an opportunity to be part of a major evaluation or been the lead in an evaluation. It is a factor of empowerment based on the recognition of South Africa's history and giving evaluators conducting primary data collection from South African programs by South African people (Key Informant 3)

5.3.2 Perception

Other themes that came up in the findings was the subliminal undermining and perception of African evaluators. African evaluators are not given the opportunity of practicing their skills at a local, regional and international stage because of negative discernment. There is an assumption that because of the low ECD, African evaluators do not match the skills proficiency required to carry out an evaluation of a large sum of amount of dollars, claiming they carry a risk to manage evaluations. The literature review mentions an argument that African evaluators need to improve their international competitiveness compared to their Northern counterparts, to create an appeal for themselves within global networks (Cloete 2016). Even so, without the space for applications of African skills, there is no space for them to prove themselves, as such serves as a barrier. As unfair as this viewpoint may be, it raises the matter of professionalisation to perhaps equal the playing field, in setting standardised competencies that every evaluator must comply with.

The issue of race was not initially considered in the interview guide, but seeing how common the issue came up, it was then integrated into the interview guide. What the findings insinuate are the elements of institutional racism that plague South Africa as a whole and as reported in the M&E field. The difficulty of racial dynamics in evaluation, is that it becomes a cyclical disadvantage for evaluators. Black evaluators are racially discriminated against and so they are not the first pick when commissioners of evaluations procure evaluators. This in turn means that black evaluators are side-lined for the jobs and don't get that exposure of practice and work to refine their skills. What it also means, is that black evaluators are unable to accrue the years of experience required when making bids, and this leads back to black evaluators not being procured because of their race.

5.3.3 Professionalism

The issue of professionalism has been engaged with for years. Mainly led by VOPEs the argument is for the advancement of professionalisation, as it is seen as key component to formalise the industry. Others argue the standardisation of the field, would not speak to the

individual needs of industries, and that competencies need to be led by the demand in evaluation. Before engaging whether professionalisation is needed or not, this section sets the scene for why evaluation should not be standardised. Questions that arise regard defining professionalisation. In other words, what would it take for one to be considered an experienced evaluator? Interesting points that came from the interviews is the fact that with so many varying ideas on professionalisation, who would audit or evaluate the quality of the competencies? What and who's values are considered to accommodate the different interests of M&E? Who would these values be serving given that there are many different stakeholder groups? In other words, there is need for skills of value to establish which ideas are coming to support transformation and values.

The literature review provided, speaks on how there is doubt by many African and international evaluators, that 'evaluation will not acquire the hallmarks of a full-pledged profession within the next 20 years. It is suggested that perhaps evaluation should be viewed as a discipline, or better yet, transdisciplinary that offers services to other disciplines (Abrahams 2015).

Alternatively, a resounding amount of participants vouched for the professionalisation of the field. M&E has developed into an active discipline and practice in South Africa over the years. Government, CSO;s, academic institutions, private sector consultancies and donor agencies have elements of M&E incorporated in their work. Government departments have been mandated to ensure M&E units are created in the institutions, and this was mandated by parliament and legislature, who have also incorporated M&E into their oversight . The debate stems from the challenge of anyone being considered as an evaluator – regardless of their professional competencies. The assumption is that professionalisation will lead to quality assurance of evaluations. Some saw professionalisation as a key component of regularising the field like any other profession. Professionalisation will differentiate between those who hold qualification and are legitimately working in the field and those who are unqualified, but may have gained experience. Essentially creating a divisions between professionals and amateurs (Levin 2017). AfrEA has commented on the lack of a professional certification of evaluators competencies to make comparable good evaluator or evaluations or design the deliveries of ECD programmes (Tarsilla 2014) The integrity of evaluation practice must be

protected contested by not over-regulating the field that may prejudice the historically disadvantaged and reproduce old race and university hierarchies (Levin 2017).

Their argument for pro-professionalism is importance in professionalising the sector for the development of skills, identities, norms and values associated with becoming a professional group. Through capacity building, this can inform the research skills needed for the profession. As the literature suggests, DPME and SAMEA have attempted to create these competencies by looking at international development forums for ideas, this didn't take much flight. DPME developed competencies to guide programme managers, M&E advisors and evaluators who work in the public sector. The challenge with these competencies is that they are yet to be validated by other sectors, including the private sector, NGOs and VOPEs. Its neither clear whether these competencies are viewed as legitimate by evaluators, commissioners of evaluation and/or institutions that train evaluators.

A case in point of a VOPE that has proved to be successful in creating certified competency compliance is the Canadian Evaluation Society (CES). CES has adopted a series of 36 fundamental competencies, reflecting the background, and knowledge skills needed to achieve evaluation standards. These competencies are grouped into five domains: reflective practice, technical practice, situational practice, management practice, and interpersonal practice. Fundamentally, a CES credential is that the evaluators possess both the education background and practical experience to reach the minimum competency (Stevahn, et al. 2005).The CES designation is the one of the only professional titles identifying professional evaluators. As there are no restrictions on who may declare themselves as evaluators, it became an evident challenge for evaluators to commit in upholding ethical and professional standards of evaluation, to distinguish themselves, and for the users of evaluations to work with a referential tool that would allow them to better assess those evaluators they intend to procure. The CE designation programme addresses this gap (Canadian Evaluation Society).

Relating this to the findings, African evaluators should be trained on not only on the technical aspects but also on the soft aspects too that truly highlight their unique African value add (Stevahn, et al. 2005). Similar to the CES case study, AfrEA and other VOPEs would really have to critically examine what competencies are both crucial in building qualified and capable

evaluators, maintaining evaluation standards. They also need to identify the criteria that emphasis the African experience and competencies that are globally recognised. AfrEA recently produced their 2021 African Evaluation Principles, intended to cultivate a common understanding and consistent application of the features of high-quality evaluations. These are valuable in Africa, and fit for generation of knowledge, accountability and advocacy. Naturally, the principles highlight the important of African knowledge systems needed to be strengthened, revitalised and afforded its due respect. The principles can be summarised in five key themes:

i. be powerful for Africans;
ii. be technically robust;
iii. be Africa centric yet open;
iv. be ethically sound and;
v. be connected with the world (African Evaluation Principles, 2021).

There are implementation principles for each theme, but no actual competencies stated for the themes. Thus, Africa finds itself at the outset, still yet to design agreed upon standardised principles. If the professionalisation is to be implemented, the process a transformative project, sensitive to the unintended consequence and avoids elitism (Levin 2017).

5.3.4 Should there be a harmonised curriculum?

This leads to the next theme of whether there should be harmonised curriculums for training M&E professionals. The findings reflect that from the four higher learning institutions offering M&E teachings, each university has its own niche, appealing to attract different types of M&E student bodies. There have been concerns expressed on the quality of teaching in M&E as well as the absence of a standardised M&E curriculum to adequately fill knowledge gaps. Some argue that in some cases curriculums are overly western driven; that they are not inclusive of African scholarship (Twende n.d.). At the very least, there should be a slight form of collaboration between universities on building that consensus in filling in those necessary knowledge gaps. Certainly, the four universities are not the only institutions offering training in M&E. DPME has its own accredited course offerings while SAMEA, Khulisa, Twende Mbele

and CLEAR-AA to name a few, all have their own offerings of short courses. This takes us back to the matter of an identifiable knowledge gaps that may be created because there is no harmonised training curriculum.

Perhaps it is beneficial on the other hand, to have an assortment of trainings that cater for the different levels of understandings or focus areas. As one participant pointed out that the different universities have different types curriculums because the curriculum is structured around the student body. For instance, Stellenbosch University training is geared towards a student body that will practice M&E. While the WITS curriculum is geared towards a student body that works in government and the broader evaluation government space. Independent to this, is the difficulty of creating and having a MAE teaching curriculum, because one has to work with the student body they have. The mid-level career people may not have an appreciation for the study because they do not have the background understandings of the relevancy of the subject matter.

Canada, Australia and New Zealand indigenous societies have continuously pushed for the decolonisation of evaluation curriculum, where M&E as an approach is people centred where values and culture are relevant and indigenised evaluation processes and methodologies are informed by African world views and paradigms. Despite the emergence of this academic thought, there are limitations in trying to transform methods and evaluation approaches when public institutions are entrenched in systems of planning and implementation that remain untransformed when identifying Eurocentric models of knowledge (Held 2019).

With regards to the state of ECD, there is more to training than teaching practical skills. There are also soft skills attributes needed in understanding evaluation sensitivity. In addition. So the jury on whether there should be a harmonised curriculum is still out. More investigation needs to be done on the different formal education offerings. Tabulating a comparable chart of each HEI's teachings and see where the knowledge gap lies. From there, that knowledge gap will serve as the foundational curriculum that must be covered.

5.3.5 Successes and Failures of ECD

The question of the successes and failures of ECD is a relative question, dependent on which angle you view the matter from. The participants who asked the question 'how do we define success of failure?' raised a good point. In other words, the main question would be which lens should be used in making the judgment? Government officials gave positive accounts of initiatives that have been put in place. DPME participants, for instance, drew attention to how far South Africa had grown with regards to ECD since the departments' inception in 2011. Many governmental departments did not have inhouse evaluation department. Since then, skills on how to commission and do evaluations have been incorporated. Thus, in theory, there has been a big expansion on the offerings of ECD.

Practitioners argued that these initiatives are not visible on the ground. Though South Africa is one of the first African countries to establish ECD in most universities, as one participant put it:

> *We need to familiarise ourselves with the supply and demand discussion about capacity development for evaluation. Not so long ago, there was a position that we (in Africa) did not have enough/or the capacity to do evaluation, hence, the need for capacity development for everyone. Let's say we now have the capacity but we need 'localised' training. Where will the MAE methods come from if those with capacity were trained by external people or through courses relying on knowledge created elsewhere? What kind of capacity will be developed? Or can be expected?*(Key Informant 3).

5.4 ECD Initiatives to support Young and Emerging Evaluators

Over the years, M&E internships have blossomed and have been welcomed by many supportive institutions and EEs. the internships help give that practical training to compliment the academic learning. More institutions could have internship programmes. For instance, government departments should have internships in every M&E unit. The challenges in achieving this, are the lack of resources available and capacity needed from institutions to train EEs. Again, similar to the question of whether there is documentation of the efficacy of ECD, who is scribing the value of the internships? Do the internships yield increased understanding of M&E programme cycles? Are there job prospects following the internships?

According to the findings, there has been a significant expansion in the offerings of internships, mentorships and opportunities for YEEs. The findings spell out a few of institutions that offer internships. The DPME programme is especially highlighted because of the amount of interns the department received, who were giving significant responsibilities, more than just making tea, for instance; as well as the increased likelihood that those interns would be absorbed by other government departments. In 2015, EvalParters developed an EvalYouth global network to promote the engagement, innovation and exchange on evaluations among YEE's. The initiative was created to build a pool of skilled young evaluators to be technically sound, experienced and well-networked professionals who will contribute to evaluation capacity development at national, regional and international levels. The initiative is a welcomed activity, as it 'includes the participation of young people in different roles (evaluation managers, evaluators, evaluation reference group members, and informants) in all phases of an evaluation'. EvalYouth seeks to sharpen YEE;s skills in order to influence decision makers to increase the supply and demand for youth participatory evaluations. Explore ways to build a Made in Africa Evaluation that incorporated principles of youth participatory evaluations. Then to accelerate exchange and transfer of innovative ideas between YEE networks across Africa. (Hoosen 2020)

Naturally, EEs need to have the background study qualifications in M&E, and or social sciences and or statistics. EEs are then able to engage with short courses certificated learnings. It is the onus of EEs to sort out an internship that will facilitate the growth of EE's, increasing the values as future M&E practitioners. In some cases, there are internships/mentorships that do not give the EE that crucial learning element of applying their new found skills. A portfolio of past experiences will assist in getting those opportunities as working as junior evaluators. As the findings speak, that evaluation is the ability of making judgement on policies and projects implemented because there is no direct form of applying M&E practices, EEs are expected to learn well rounded skills of qualitative and quantitative research skills.

Similar to the conversation of whether there should be a harmonised curriculum or not, there is an argument to make in regards on the practical quality of M&E training. The question addressed is whether institutions allow for practice in their studies? As one participant remarked, other professions such as engineering, medicine, law etc., have a component built

in their studies for a year of practice for instance. The argument here is that, merely equipping students with the academic learnings is not sufficient training for students to go out in the real word, so to speak. The participant goes on to make a strong recommendation that there should be a coalition between institutions of learning and industry to provide that practical learning. This is not a bad idea since accessing internships and mentorships would be much easier in this instance. That said, the findings outline a series of institutions who provide these internships ranging from offerings from UN Agencies to private institutions.

The findings make an important interpretation on the downside of having internship projects are companies reluctancy to host internships because of the amount of time required to train EEs. Integrating the YEE into the organisations and projects takes time, more time than just doing it yourself. From personal experience, I am currently completing an internship with Southern Hemisphere. The programme is well executed in combining experiences of professional and personal development. Within a short period of time, perhaps 6 weeks, I was in the field doing data collection. The integration of the internship into projects was quick, introducing myself into the fast pace of the industry. This may not be the experience of every internship offered, but I am grateful that I have the opportunity to be fully fledged in projects.

VOPE's are increasingly realising the importance of mainstreaming EE's in capacity building initiatives for sustaining the evaluation professions. As mentioned above the EvalYouth initiative designed by EvalPartners has been taken up and supported by African regional and national VOPE's. SAMEA's EE program is cut from the EvalYouth blueprint, and used it as a source to develop a SAMEA concept note, which was contextualised to the South African political and socio-economic background. The SAMEA EE programme was guided by the EE's concept note developed in 2019, acting as a platform for EE's to voluntarily participate, share information , and gain exposure, access and referrals to other evaluation platforms. Biannually, SAMEA supports 20 EE scholarships to attend conferences (Ngwabi, Mpyana and Mapatwana 2020)

5.4.1 Role of VOPEs

The spotlight that particularly the South African Monitoring and Evaluation Association (SAMEA) has shunned in South African evaluation has created growth and awareness of M&E activities, training courses, and publications in South Africa (Abrahams 2015). The findings emphasis the role of SAMEA as being a convening space, focusing on promoting the integrity and quality of the profession and evaluations. As a convening platform, the space brings together all types of stakeholders from government officials, practitioners, UN organisations and importantly YEEs who get access to such a space.

The peer learning is perhaps the biggest attraction. Beyond seminars, there a very few congregation spaces for that peer learning. The biannual conferences that have links with DPME are able to create, and produce an array of themes. The success of SAMEA has resulted in a platform for creative thinking amongst civil society actors, academics, professionals and government (Abrahams 2015). To this end, SAMEA has been a focal agent in establishing the *African Evaluation Journal*, launched in 2014 designed to capture different sectoral South African experiences. Similarly, in 2010, SAMEA initiated a Competency Open Forum aimed at engaging civil society and government in unison. This was a starting point, to be followed by a joint research venture between SAMEA and DPME looking at international developments of the professionalisation of M&E in South Africa (Abrahams 2015).

Despite the hype and glory of SAMEA, participants did mention the limitations of the VOPE in regards to its capacity. SAMEA can play a bigger and better role in catering for its memberships, across all professional advancement. Similarly, SAMEA can have a stronger positioning in connecting all M&E actors, beyond just creating networking spaces. One criticism of the VOPE is if their value add is just creating a convening space, then there is no reason to charge exorbitant membership fees. Secondly, as mentioned in the previous sections, most organisations provide learning webinar series and their own training capacity building, and the concern lies in the exorbitant fees.

Likewise, the VOPE is completely voluntary, only making their revenue from memberships and conferences. The memberships need to be renewed annually, but the conferences are only biannually, making the source of income to keep the VOPE very limited. As a result, the scope and depth of work they can achieve is also limited. As a participant clearly remarked,

that for SAMEA to make a significant change, they would need a cash injection of approximately 2 or 3 million Rands a year. Moreover, the board members also operate voluntarily, the divided attention might jeopardise the efficiency of the VOPE while the EE programme also needs some work. From personal experience as an EE, the researcher, feels that the YEE programme is inefficient in its current form. The fact that internships are only for 6 months, makes the grasping of the work content limited. By the time the EE gets the ropes of an evaluation cycle, their internship is done.

6 Conclusion

This study explored the opportunities and challenges for Made in Africa, Evaluation Capacity Development by closely engaging South African experiences. It rose from an observation that there are gaps in existing literature on the practicality of MAE methods, tools and approaches and discussions on ECD initiatives which can facilitate MAE adoption by South African evaluators. From a literature review point of view, very little has been documented on the types of ECD training available or even on the efficacy of these trainings.

The findings of the research are relevant to the wider study of M&E in South Africa and broadly Africa, on understanding the types of evaluation training that exist and may be still needed in complimenting MAE. The shift towards cultural appropriate evaluations was the starting foundation for the birth of indigenous evaluations. Indigenous evaluations carry their own forms of IKS woven through evaluation thinking, to form as a reference base towards defining MAE. As the discussion section maps out, IKS play a role in promoting the creation of new knowledge. In its own way, contributing to the types of African tools needed to interpret the world.

Another point that arose from the study is that Made in Africa Evaluation should be about ways of decolonising imperialist impositions, and providing Africans ways of going back to their own ways of thinking. The essence of MAE is to highlight the importance of contextually relevant evaluations that speak to the communities' theories of values, appreciating African phenomenology.

The matter of professionalisation of MAE was discussed in the report. The call for professionalism is based on the importance of quality assurance of both evaluators and evaluations. Professionalism will aid in the development of skills, identities, norms and values associated with belonging to a professional group. Similar to other professions of who have professional bodies, M&E professionalisation would distinguish between professionals and amateurs.

With regards to whether there should be a harmonised curriculum, the backing for this is that evaluation training should sufficiently fill knowledge gaps that equips students with the basic fundamentals of the field. There should be ways of incorporating MAE teachings into M&E curriculums. The study showed that when it comes to training of evaluators most universities offer different types of training for different types of professionals. Their training curricular are not similar as there are many approaches to teaching M&E.

Though much can be done, the study has shown that, over the years there has been an expansion on the training initiatives available to YEEs. Within most organisational internships, the YEEs are complimented by a mentor, to guide their learning process and invited to be in platforms such as SAMEA or EvalYouth, which both look at increasing the supply and demand for youth participation in evaluations. When referring to how much can be done by most organisations offering in house training, the challenge is that it takes time to train EEs, requiring mentors to allow more time for them, as opposed to mentors doing the work themselves.

6.1 Recommendations

Despite the varying understandings of MAE by the literature review and participants, a common challenge that was evident is the challenge of MAE not having clearly articulated methods and tools among the interviewed evaluators. The lack of tools and approaches was the main reason interviewees responded to say there is little to no visibility of MAE on the ground. Various evaluators may not, or cannot incorporate MAE foundations in their evaluations, but may be using special aspects of MAE in various ways. The following recommendations are made;

i. The evaluation community in South Africa, comprising practitioners, government officials, SAMEA and academic institutions, should dedicate resources and time to researching and document ting methods which can be used in local contexts to conduct evaluations.

ii. The same stakeholders mentioned above, are urged to consider a similar approach on IKS to develop tools and methods of MAE, could benefit the study. IKS has the ability to create those tools, perhaps more in-depth research should be invested in systems to develop IKS to new ventures.

iii. Lastly, little was commented on the efficacy of ECD initiatives available. There should be a catalogue of documented case studies where the initiatives have succeeded or failed. To create a sort of directory of best practices and lessons learned.

iv. In the same breath, YEEs should also document their experiences from the types of internships completed, to share insights on the effectiveness of the internships. More financial and capacity resources need to be invested in the internships.

v. For organisations that run YEE programmes should consider restructuring some of their programmes. For example, YEE internships only last six months as a result of financial limitations. Where possible, internships should last the time of at least three evaluation cycles, to adequately give YEE sufficient practical experience.

It is hoped that the research has made a contribution to literature on MAE through its findings and recommendations.

References

Abrahams. 2015. “A review of growth of monitoring and evaluation in South Africa: Monitoring and Evaluation as a profession, an industru an a governance tool.” *African Evaluation Journal* 1-10.

AFREA. 2021. *African Evaluation Association.* 5 November . https://afrea.org/about-us/.

African National Congress. 2021. *ANC to host NEC Lekgotla.* 21 January. https://www.anc1912.org.za/statements-2021/anc-to-host-nec-lekgotla/.

Anguko, A. 1-10. “Applicationn of Contextual Analysis to Evaluation: Methodologies in Africa the case of contribution analysis.” *eVALUATION Mattera* 2018.

Bellagio Conference Report. 2012. *African Thought Leaders Forum on Evaluation and Development: Expanding Thought Leadership in Africa .* 1-57.

Blaser Mapitsa, C, and L Khumalo. 2018. “Diagnosing monitoring and evaluation capacity in Africa.” *African Evaluation Journal* 1-10.

Bowen, G. 2009. “Document Analysis is a Qualitative Research Method.” *Qualitative Research Journal* 29-40.

Chilisa, and Kawulich. 2012. “Selecting a Research Approach: Paradigm, Methodology and Methods.” In *Doing Research Social Research: A Global Context*, by C Wagner, B Kawulich and M Garner, 51-61. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

Chilisa, B, and D Mertens. 2021. “Indigenous Made in Africa Evaluation Frameworks: Addressing Epistemic Violence and Contributing to Social Transformation.” *American Journal of Evaluation* 241-253.

Chilisa, B, and Malunga. 2012. “Africa rooted evaluation for development: the core concept.” *Made in Africa evaluation: Uncovering African roots in evaluation theory and practice: paper presented at African thought leaders forum on evaluation leaders in Africa.* Bellagio. 1-53.

Chilisa, B, TE Major, M Gaothlobogwe, and H Mokgolodi. 2016. “Decolonizing and Indigenizing Evaluation Practice in Africa: Toward African Relational Evaluaion Approaches .” 313-328.

Chilisa. 2015. “A Synthesis Paper on the Made of Africa Evaluation Concept.” African Evaluation Association. 1-38.

Cloete, F. 2016. “Developing an African-rooted programme evaluation approach.” *African Journal of Public Affairs* 55-70.

Conradie. 2016. “Critical Race Theory and the question of safety in dialogues on race.” *SUN MeDIA* 1-150.

Constandius, Nell, Alexandra, Blackie, Malgas, Setati, and McKay. 2018. “#Feesmustfall and decolonising the curriculum.” *South African Journal of Higher Education* 65-85.

DPME. 2011. *National Evaluation Policy Framework.* 23 November. https://www.dpme.gov.za/publications/Policy%20Framework/National%20Evaluation%20Policy%20Framework.pdf.

DPME. 2011. *National Evaluation Policy Framework.* Pretoria: The Presidency Republic of South Africa.

Elo, Satu, M Kaarianen, O Kantse, T Polkki, and K' Kyngas, H Utriainen. 2014. “Qualitative Content Analysis: A focus on Trusworthiness.” *SAGE* 1-10.

Evaluation, Department of Planning Monitoring and. 2021. *Chied Directorate: Capacity Developement Coordination.* 20 September. https://www.dpme.gov.za/keyfocusareas/gwmeSite/Pages/default.aspx.

Fortin. 2021. *Critical Race Theory: A brief history.* 8 November. Accessed February 1, 2022. https://www.nytimes.com/article/what-is-critical-race-theory.html?auth=link-dismiss-google1tap.

Frehiwot, M. 2019. “Made in Africa Evaluation: Decolonizing Evaluation in Africa.” *Evaluation Matters* 22-31.

Freudman, A. 2019. *Remebering the "forgotten continet".* 10 July. https://www.dandc.eu/en/article/there-are-reasons-why-european-investors-are-shying-away-africa.

Goathlobowe, M, T,E Major, S Koloi-Keaikitse, and B Chilisa. 2018. “Conceptualizing Evaluation in African Contexts.” *Wiley Online Library* 47-62.

Goldman, Byamugish, Gounou, and et al. 2018. “The emergence of government evaluation systems in Africa: The case of Benin, Uganda and South Africa.” *African Evaluation Journal.*

Goldman, I, A Byamugugisha, and A, Smith, LR et al Gounou. 2018. “The emergence of govrnment evaluation systems in Africa: the case of Benin, Uganda and South Africa.” *WireDSpace* 1-11.

Held, MBE. 2019. “ International Institute for Qualitative Methodology 2.767 Impact Factor 5-Year Impact Factor 5.817 Journal Indexing & Metrics » Contents Full Article Content List Abstract Introduction Positionality and Background Philosophical Orientations of Social In.” *SAGE Journals.*

Hoosen, F. 2020. “A new generation of advocates: young and emerging evaluators and the promotion of a global youth-participatory evaluation culture .” *eVALUation Matters* 1-10.

Hunter, D, J McCallum, and D Howes. 2019. “Defining Exploratory-Descriptive Qualitative (EDQ) research and considering its application to healthcare.” *Journal of Nursing and Health Care* 1-9.

Hurworth, R, and G Harvey. 2012. “Indigenous evaluaton: an editorial review.” *Evaluation Journal of Australasia* 1-4.

Jet Education Services. 2021. *Building evaluation capacity in South Africa: gLOCAL concerns and efforts gLOCAL Evaluation Week 2021: Sharing local & global M&E knowledge.* 31 May. Accessed March 29, 2022. https://www.jet.org.za/news/glocal-seminar-1-building-evaluation-capacity-in-south-africa-glocal-concerns-and-efforts.

Kawulich, B, and L Holland. 2012. “Qualitative Data Analysis.” In *Doing Social Research: A global context*, by C Wagner, B Kawulich and M Garner, 228-245. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Education.

Kimaro, JR, and D Fourie. 2017. “Moving Towards Sustainable Development Goals and Agenda 2063: Ethical considerations for Public Service M&E practioners.” *African Journal of Public Affairs* 1-10.

Levin, RM. 2017. “Professionalising monitoring and evaluation for improved performance and integrity : opportunities and unintended consequences.” *SABINET African Journals* .

Mapitisa, C, P Trivanhu, and N Pophiwa. 2019. “Evaluation Landscape in Africa - Context, Methods and Capacity.” *African Sun MeDIA* 1-225.

Mapitsa, CB, P Tirivanhu, and N Pophiwa. 2019. “Evaluation Landscape in Africa - Context, Methods and Capacity.” *African Sun Media* 1-225.

Mbava, and Chapman. 2020. “Adapting realist evaluation for Made in Africa evaluation criteria.” *African Evaluation Journal* 1-12.

Mentz, M, and A Botha. 2012. “Measurement.” In *Doing social research: a global context*, by C Wager, B Kawulich and M Garner, 74-85. Bershire: McGrae-Hill Higher Education.

Mertens, and Musyoka. 2007. “Making research and evaluation our own: ethical implications for strengthening the foundation for Africa-rooted and Africa-led inquiry.” *Gallaudet University* 5-16.

Modeste, YR. 2019. “Orality and the particpattory approach for 'Made in Africa Evaluation'.” *eVALUation Matters* 1-10.

Morkel, C, and M Ramasobama. 2017. “Measuring the effect of Evaluation Capacity Building Initiatives in Africa: A review.” *African Evaluation Journal.*

Mpofu, V, E Mushayikwa, and FS Otuluja. 2014. “Exploring Methodologies for Researching Indigenous Knowledge of Plant Healing for Integration into Classroom Science: Insights Related to the Data Collection Phase.” *African Journal of Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education* 1-14.

Musamba, Jayne. 2018. *Building supply and demand for evaluation in Africa.* African Development Bank Group.

Ngwabi, NT, OG Mpyana, and A Mapatwana. 2020. “Reflections from emerging evaluators in shaping Voluntary Organizations for Professional Evaluation capacity-building initiatives.” *African Evaluation Journal.*

OECD. 2011. Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation: Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, Busan, Republic of Korea, 29 November - 1 December 2011, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/54de7baa-en.

Ofir, Z. 2012. “Africa Thought Leaders Forum on Evalution for Development: Expanding Thought Leasership in Africa.” Ballagio. 1-57.

Omosa, A, T Archibald, K Niewolny, M Stephenson, and J Anderson. 2021. “Towards defining and advancing Made in Africa Evaluation.” *Orginal Research* 1-10.

Omosa. 2019. “Towards Defining "Made in Africa Evaluation".” *Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University* 1-143.

Owusu-Anash, E.E, and G Mji. 2013. “African indigenous knowledge and research’,.” *African Journal of Disability* 1-5.

Patton, MQ. 2015. *Qualtitative Research & Evaluation Methods.* United States of America: SAGE Publications.

Porter, S, and I Goldman. 2013. “A growing demand for Montoring and Evaluation in Africa.” *African Evaluation Journal* 1-9.

Smith, and Morkel. 2018. “Trends in supply and demand for evalaution in Africa: a view from CLEAR AA.” *ResearchGate* 40-49.

Smith, and Morkel. 2018. “Trends in supply and demand for evalaution in Africa: a view from CLEAR AA.” *ResearchGate* 40-49.

Smith, L, and A Kithau-Kiwekte. 2019. “National Evaluation Systems and Voluntary National Reviews: An African Approach.” *eVALuation Matters* 55-60.

Stevahn, L, J King, G Ghere, Minnema, and J. 2005. “Competencies for Canadian Evaluators.” *American Journal of Evaluation,* 43-59. https://evaluationcanada.ca/competencies-canadian-evaluators.

Tarsilla, M. 2014. “Evaluation capacity development in Africa: Current landscape of international partners' initiatives, lessons learned and the way forward.” *African Evaluation Journal* 1-13.

Thamm, M. 2021. *Spark to a flame: Protest a sign of growing resentment to an unresponsive government says ISS.* 13 July. https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2021-07-13-spark-to-a-flame-protests-a-sign-of-growing-resentment-to-an-unresponsive-government-says-iss/.

Theuinnsen, N, J Bisgard, F Muramutsa, Z Njomemi, and A Aboucacrine. 2019. "Made In Africa Evaluation Failures: Case studies from the continent." *eVALUATIONS Matters* 62-70.

Twende, Mbele. n.d. *Changing the Game for Evaluation Education in Africa: The Collaborative Curriculum Development Project.* Accessed March 15, 2022. https://twendembele.org/changing-the-game-for-evaluation-education-in-africa-the-collaborative-curriculum-development-project/.

Union, African. n.d. "Our Aspirations for the Africa we wany."

Wagner, C, B Kawulich, and M Garner. 2012. *Doing Social Research: A Global Context.* Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Education.

Watera, J. 2019. "Indenizing Citzen-Bases M&E Mechanisms in Africa: Lessons from Uganda's Barazas." *eVALuation Matters* 1-10.

Wildschut, L, and T.R Silubonde. 2020. "Evaluation education in South Africa: Charateristics and challenges in a changing world." *African Evaluation Journal* 1-11.

Annexure

Interview Schedule

Section 1: Introduction

Hello my name is Tshidi Moilwa, a Masters student at the University of the Witwatersrand. I am conducting research for my degree. The topic for my research is "Opportunities and challenges for Made in Africa Evaluation Capacity Development: South African experiences." To gather the information, I am interested in asking you some questions.

Please note that:

- Your confidentiality is guaranteed as your inputs will not be attributed to you in person, but reported only as a population member opinion.
- The interview may last for about 1 hour and may be split depending on your preference.
- Any information given by you cannot be used against you, and the collected data will be used for purposes of this research only.
- Data will be stored in secure storage and destroyed after 5 years.
- You have a choice to participate, not participate or stop participating in the research. You will not be penalized for taking such an action.
- The research aims at knowing the challenges of your community relating to resource scarcity, peoples' movement, and effects on peace.
- Your involvement is purely for academic purposes only, and there are no financial benefits involved.
- If you are willing to be interviewed, please indicate whether or not you are willing to allow the interview to be recorded?

Section 2: Questions for structured key-informant interviews

1. Tell me a bit about your professional background in the field of M&E? For example, your qualifications, sector, and position in your organization, senior/junior
    a. Working at CLEAR-AA, M&E specialist

2. Are you familiar with the Made in Africa (MAE) concept, what is your understanding/views on the concept?

1. Incorporation of 'African-rooted' tools, approaches, and methods in their own evaluation studies

a. In what ways is the Made in Africa concept relevant and visible in South African evaluations?
b. What is your experience with incorporating indigenisation methods in your own M&E practices?
c. In your view, what more could be done to further incorporate the concept in evaluation practices in South African evaluations?
d. What do you feel is the importance of recognising indigenous M&E tools for data collection and building of evidence?

2. **Evaluators' challenges and experiences on the types of Evaluation Capacity Development initiatives that exist, and are still lacking in South African evaluation**

a. What do you feel are the main barriers to entry for local evaluators into the field?
b. What evaluations methods, tools and approaches in the South Africa context that requires certain types of skills and competency training to professionalize the field of evaluation?
c. In what ways can localised Evaluation Capacity training encourage the application of Made in Africa evaluation methods?
d. In what ways do you think ECD has succeeded or failed in the South African context? What success or failed stories can you share?
e. Should there be a harmonised curriculum that provides the foundations of MAE evaluation that is based in the axiology, and epistemological preference?

3. **In what ways are state and non-state institutions in South Africa implementing ECD initiatives to support young and emerging evaluators in strengthening, creating and maintaining African evaluation capacities over time**
    b. What is your assessment of training and capacity development aimed at YEE? Which institutions are you aware of?
    c. What opportunities are there in your organisation where young evaluators can get on the job experiences
    d. How do you ensure that YEE's get practical experience when they are recruited in your organisation?
    e. Are you a part of any VOPE's
        a. If yes which ones
        b. if no, do you recognise their importance