

# Towards non-prescriptive and emergent indicator frameworks for self-determined sustainability with a planetary conscience

Arjen E.J. Wals



[arjen.wals@wur.nl](mailto:arjen.wals@wur.nl)



WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY  
WAGENINGEN UR

# Use of indicators for ESD implementation - purposes

- To set benchmarks for assessing current and future progress;
- To promote learning from each other in and in-between countries (rather than to promote ranking and comparing)

[arjen.wals@wur.nl](mailto:arjen.wals@wur.nl)

# Issues

- Need for adaptation to local circumstances and realities
- Process leading up to the reporting is crucial
- Value of the reporting highly depends on the quality of the data
- Learning and reflexivity are more important than ranking and accountability
- The importance of meaning and meaning-making



## Indicators set

Outcome-based  
assessment

in advance  
(static)

Comparing

Ranking

Evidence

Emphasis on  
universal use

Emphasis on  
contextual use

Process-  
oriented

Collaborative  
learning

Reflexivity

Indicators are  
emerging  
(dynamic)



|                               | <b>Outcome based M&amp;E</b>   | <b>Proces-based M&amp;E</b>   |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Main goals</b>             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- realising existing policy- targets/ outcomes</li> <li>- accountability towards the funder(s) (often the government)</li> <li>- basic accountability from the government towards citizens</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- involving stakeholders</li> <li>- improving the quality of the process</li> <li>- collaborative learning</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Role of external party</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- expert role</li> <li>- external observation</li> <li>- determining indicators to be used for measurement</li> <li>- collecting, analyzing and interpreting data</li> <li>- reporting</li> </ul>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- facilitator / coach</li> <li>- participatory observation</li> <li>- co-determining desirable monitoring and evaluation system and indicators</li> <li>- increasing transparency, access and making progress visible (feedback)</li> <li>- challenging and enabling actors to engage in self evaluation and monitoring</li> </ul> |

arjen.wals@wur.nl

|  | <b>Outcome based M&amp;E</b>  | <b>Process based M&amp;E</b>   |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Role of actors within monitoring and evaluation</b> | - sources of information for the external evaluator   | - participants in conversations about perceived needs and desired changes and their experiences with the process   |
| <b>For whom?</b>                                       | - funder, government, and, ultimately, society at large   | - For all stakeholders in the process (the funder and/or government being one of them)   |
| <b>Underlying worldview</b>                            | - empirical-analytical: understanding by reducing, looking for causal explanations, striving for objectivity and neutrality | - actors can have multiple (socially constructed) perspectives<br>- holistic: looking for connections, relationships and synergies<br>- room for subjectivity but...<br>- striving for inter-subjectivity, common meaning and joint interpretations of what is happening and needs to happen |

arjen.wals@wur.nl

|                   | Outcome based M&E   | Process based M&E   |
|-------------------|---|---|
| <b>Risks</b>      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- results are snap-shots and their quality depends on the reliability and validity of instruments used.</li> <li>- M&amp;E is mainly of interest to one party: the funder/commissioner of the research</li> <li>- results are merely used for strategic reasons</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- results are not considered to be scientific or trustworthy by those who have a conventional view of research (but have a lot of power)</li> <li>- inadequate use of methods or lack of access to the research, keeps some voices from being included</li> <li>- time-consuming</li> </ul>                      |
| <b>Advantages</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- easy to plan, relatively cheap, attractive for policy-makers working with short policy-cycles</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- all participants can benefit from the M&amp;E process (the process can contribute to their (professional) development)</li> <li>- allows for the emergence of a long term perspective</li> <li>- M&amp;E stimulates learning and leads to new insights that can benefit similar processes elsewhere</li> </ul> |

arjen.wals@wur.nl

## Some questions

- How can we develop more *reflexive monitoring and evaluation* systems that can support meaningful learning?
- How can we get a better grip on the concept of '*ESD-competence*' without becoming prescriptive?
- How can *multi-stakeholder (social) learning* in the context of ESD be supported by *governance*?
- What capacities are needed and need to be developed in order to *facilitate* this kind of learning?

arjen.wals@wur.nl

# ESD-related competence

- Competence
- SD Competence
- ESD Competence
- ESD Implementation Competence...

# SD Competence

- Understanding sustainable development
  - Systems thinking
  - Adopting an integral view
- } Dynamics of SD
- Personal leadership and entrepreneurship
  - Unlocking creativity
  - Appreciating chaos & complexity
  - Fostering collective change
- } Change & Innovation

# Sustainability Competence?

