

LESSON 31

EVALUATING TRAINING STAFF.

Friends,

In previous units you have been explained about the training and development procedures. In this unit you have got exposure towards evaluation of training and development, which is the last step for training procedure.

After reading this lesson you will be able to

1. explain criteria for training staff evaluation
2. Design evaluation for training staff
3. conduct evaluation for training staff
4. help in improving the key areas of training staff performance

EVALUATING EFFECTIVENESS OF TRAINING OF WORKERS, ADMINISTRATORS, TRAINERS, MANAGERS, TECHNICIANS

Evaluation of training, as has been discussed in the earlier chapters is a process which can be made simple by clearly answering the 'what', 'when', 'who' and 'how' of evaluation. The whole thing looks complex when something is measured to evaluate something else. For example we tend to evaluate the trainer whenever we talk of classroom training. But if the training manager has failed to choose the right inputs, he is looking at the wrong things by evaluating the trainer. The best trainer available cannot train employees if the inputs do not deal with their deficiency on the job (input evaluation). By the same token, we cannot expect the best trainer to help improve the organisation if the wrong set of people are selected for training (context evaluation). So part of the evaluation has to do with the training organisation's skill in selecting the inputs, setting specific objectives and getting the right set of trainees to the training. Even then, we may evaluate the wrong thing. We may watch the trainer in action and decide that he is doing a good job because there is a lot of action, movement and variety. The concerned faculty may be a good performer, he does not lean on the podium, does not talk while facing the board, and gets a lot of eye contact (good lecture skills). We have to remember that what we are looking for is not a good public speaker, but a good facilitator of learning. So the characteristics of a good learning situation are: accountability, feedback and involvement which helps us evaluate whether the trainer is doing his job properly. Whatever be the trainee group, it is important to identify the characteristics of its learning-training situation. Once this has been identified the evaluator is left to use the appropriate evaluation model. There are a few options:

1. Borrowing the model off-the-shelf from those presented in this book or other published/available literature;
2. Hire the services of consultant specialists to develop the evaluation model exclusively for your needs;

3. Train your own personnel in developing the model internally;

4. Combine the first two options by using specialists' services to develop the model while concurrently training some of your own personnel for gradual take over of the task.

Each of these has its advantages and disadvantages. While borrowing the ready model is easy it may be too general to meet the requirements of a particular situation. Unless the expertise is available within, the evaluators may not be able to adapt the available model.

But if the expertise is available it is advantageous to develop ones own model so that there is internal control on the strategy, techniques and cost of evaluation. Besides, the skills and expertise developed within become part of the resources for the organisation and can be generalized for use in other types of training and target groups.

The skeleton required for developing ones own model is provided in this chapter. The trainer has to fill in the gaps by information relevant and required for each category of trainees (Administrators or workers or managers or trainers or technicals). Depending on the availability of time, expertise and resources one can pick and choose the levels, techniques and strategies to suit ones requirements. The user should nevertheless be aware of what they are sacrificing in terms of quality of evaluation for want of resources of time, in order to optimize results. Wherever essential, examples have been used to elaborate the point. It is assumed that the reader would have carefully read and grasped the preceding chapters to enable indigenisation of the Evaluation Design with ease.

Action steps

TRAINEE GROUP (*) : (1)
Workers/ Administrators/Trainers/
(W) (A) (Tr)
Managers/T echnicians
(M) (TE)

1. What is the Training
Purpose in Focus. Is it :

i) Orientation Trg. for
inducting new recruits _____

ii) Refreshor Trg = upgrading skills,
operations, changes in products/services _____

iii) Developmental Trg = for projected
requirements and higher responsibilities _____

iv) Diagnostic Trg = to correct deficiencies
in Knowledge, skills and attitudes of trainee group _____

2. What are the training
needs in focus

Eg : For W = Safety, Trade,
Psychomotor skills
A = Policy~orientation/
Decision making skills
TR = Sensitivity, Communication
skills '
M = Human Relations, .
Decision making
TE= T echnical,psychomotof
skills

3. Job~context in Focus

i) Functions and major duties

ii) Scope of authority

W = Very limite
TR =Limited ,!

iii) Relationship between the position and
others at that level in that department!
functional group

(*) The initials used in the text are :

W = Workers

TR = Trainers

TE = Technicians

A = Administrators

M = Managers

TRG= Training

.(1) These are only a few examples and are not exhaustive

4. What is/are the statement of the training goals. Are they:

- i) Practical and realistic
- ii) Clear and Specific
- iii) Stated in unequivocal behavioural terms
- iv) Measurable
- v) Compatible with company
Boss's objectives
- vi) Compatible with
trainees objectives

5. Pre-requisites for
trainees'selection

6. Organisational climate in which
trainee has to work after training

Premissive

Constrained

7. Amount and kind of supervision, tools.
working aids and
assistance for trainee
in performing duties
and task

8. Construction, validation/ adaptation of achievement, aptitude, attitude, diagnostic tests to measure the existing level of Knowledge, skills, potential and attitude of the trainee group (Are they valid, reliable, objective)

EG

W = trade tests/

manual tests

TE = Psychomotor tests

performance test of

work samples

M.A = objective paper

IR = Pencil Test

TR = Socio-psycho test

A = Attitudinal test

9. Administration of the above test,

When?
Who?
How?

10. Criteria of acceptable Performance of the trainee group (quality, quantity, *standards*)

11. Scoring, analysis and interpretation of test data. is it left in qualified hands Yes not sure

12. Have the curriculum builders been provided with the inventory of the abilities of the trainees Yes No

13. Preparation of training curriculum

14. Are the training inputs/ competence of training staff adequate Yes No

15. Have the inputs been discussed (in the light of trg and trainee objectives) in a committee/group of trg staff Yes No

Training

16. What reaction feedback factors are most indicative of successful and efficient training

17. Are comments being taken at face value Yes No

18. Are unsupported and un~ validated observantions resulting in significant changes Yes No

19. Are reaction evaluation reports appropriate in content and format for the level which will use them

Yes No

20. Are reaction feedback reports timely, self explanatory, accurate & fairly objective

Yes No

21. Administration and analysis of achievement performance. tests (posttrg data)

Eg. W = Amount of work completed
 W = Faults recorded in work samples
 W = Number of accidents
 M&A = Problem solving and decision making skills
 TR = Communication and interpersonal skills
 TE = Psychomotor tests
 W = Versatility of workers

22. Analysis of test results (measure of central tendency, Variation, reliability)

23. Measures of job-performance

i) Are these measures reliable

Yes No

ii) What complementary methods are available?

Yes No

iii) Do these measures provide trainers with data needed to improve trg.

Yes No

iv) It helps identify groups/ individuals who need close guidance and coaching

Yes No

24. Follow-up methods to assess the outcome of training:

For All Categories

Indicators of Results

on the Job Live follow-up

Written reports of seniors
and colleagues
questionnaire survey
interview
observation

ForM

Absenteeism
Labour turnover
Number of grievances

For M & A & TR

Human Relations
financial Savings

ForTE

Output,
learning time

25. Special analysis made of cases
of Trainee failure

Yes

No

Full written evaluation and reports of the total training system including choice of tests, statistics used, conclusions and recommendations for revision and further development for next training are prepared and distributed to all concerned.

The trainer is thus provided with a checklist to choose from, and fill up the gaps on the right side of the format depending on the category for which evaluation is meant. A good evaluator does not stop there but carry out an Evaluation Audit to check how scientific is the evaluation data.

EVALUATION AUDIT

1. Are procedures established for continual evaluation and quality control of training even if you are not present on the training scene?
2. Is evaluation focussing on results rather than on the effort expended in conducting training?
3. Is evaluation comprehensive enough to cover methods, trainees progress and attitudes, degree of job behaviour change, knowledge gained and its impact on the group and the organisation as a whole?
4. Is collection of data and interpretation of results done by personnel qualified for the job?
5. Are evaluators trained in the techniques of observation and interview?
6. Is evaluation an orderly and flexible process?
7. Is evaluation specific and not vague?
8. Is evaluation an aid to future planning, is it directive and constructive and not conclusive?
9. Do trainees participate in the evaluation of their own progress?
10. Are evaluation procedures reviewed and revised periodically?
11. Are tests/examinations used derived from training objectives and are consistent with the coverage of inputs?
12. Are other methods like observation, ratings, opinion survey, interviews used to supplement tests? .
13. Are scoring, grading and reporting practices standardized, economical, practical, acceptable (SEPA).
14. Are the results used to interpret:
 - quality of instructional system;
 - to estimate effectiveness of the tests in measuring trainee achievement;
 - to provide to trainers with data needed to improve the training;
 - to identify group/individual who need close guidance and coaching.
15. Is the whole evaluation exercise worth the time, money and effort.

The chapter concludes with an elaborate summary of Evaluation of the training department.

EVALUATING TRAINING-STAFF PERFORMANCE

It is necessary to make a distinction between evaluating the performance of an individual trainer and evaluating the total performance of the staff and the training department. The reputation of the department will be established in part by the contributions of individual members, but the means of evaluation employed will be different.

1. Evaluating the Individual

There are several ways to measure a trainer's performance and contributions. These are based on Various factors: the trainer's performance, economic impact on the organization, and internal and external reputation.

(a) Job descriptions of the trainer should contain accountabilities as standards of effective performance :The total of all accountabilities should be the umbrella under which specific responsibilities of the role fall. When responsibilities are grouped under a common accountability and standards are identified for satisfactory performance, the measurement of performance against accountabilities becomes the first means of evaluation.

(b) Ideally, the training function could be managed under some version of management by objectives. All staff members and supervisors set Key Result Areas against which performance is measured. objectives should include the standards of acceptable accomplishment. By reviewing performance throughout the time frame of the objectives and appraising performance at the end, a very objective evaluation of the trainer's contribution can be made.

(c) A third basis of measurement is the economic impact the trainer makes on the organization, Is the value of the training solutions designed and implemented greater than the cost? This evaluation is possible only if the trainer is making decisions about expending time and other resources on

the basis of economic payoff for the organisation. One would hope that this will be true the majority of the time.

(d) The impact of the trainer's activities on solving human performance problems also provides a means of evaluation. Here again change brought about through the trainer's interventions would be the measurement of his or her contribution. Even though a change may not be measurable in economic terms , there should be few trainer activities performed that cannot be measured in terms of some quantifiable change they have brought about: for example new skills learned, a problem solved, a new system set up and running efficiently, fewer grievances, less scrap, or fewer errors or orders entering the

system.

(e) A fifth basis of measurement is the reputation the trainer has earned within the organization. Elements of this reputation include comments by line managers about the trainer or the results of training. The frequency and volume of requests for the trainer's services are a measure of worth, particularly if requests for solutions to different problems come repeatedly from the same part of the organization.

(f) Last, external reputation is a measure of trainer performance. Has the trainer been asked to hold office, chair committees, or appear on programs for professional organizations? Is he or she asked to speak, conduct seminars, or write articles? Does he continuously engage in research to improve his performance? Do people volunteer comments about the individual's innovations or worth? Admittedly, these are more a measure of the trainer's visibility and marketability than of performance on the job, but there is usually a definite, positive correlation.

2. Evaluating the Total Staff

There are four distinct elements that can be measured when evaluating the performance of a department. The first is the accomplishment of departmental objectives. Were they achieved? Within the budget? Using appropriate response time? If specific projects and objectives have been planned, departmental performance in relation to them is a very objective means of evaluation. The source of such information could be the upper management that training reports to, the line organization it serves, or both. This evaluation is activity-based only.

A second basis of evaluation is the economic accomplishment of the department. In much the same manner as was suggested for individual trainer measurement, the value of training is compared with the cost. If the department approaches projects with an eye to payoff, it determines the worth of a project before embarking on it. Ideally, the payoff will be measurable in economic terms; if it is not certainly some measurable change in the organization should be apparent. Keeping a record of the results of each project, program, or activity and making comparisons with the department's total training budget will yield the department's evaluation; Training should not cost an organization anything. The results of its activities should be worth more than the cost of staffing and running it.

How effectively the department uses its resources is a third basis of evaluation. One method of measuring this is to have a system for establishing priorities of departmental activities. First, criteria for accepting projects would be identified. Each criterion would be given a value. A minimum value for a project would be determined as acceptable for the department's use of its resources. Reviewing the work of the department against these criteria and values would result in the evaluation. For example, a department could establish the criteria as (1) economic payoff of a project (2) the probability of its success, (3) staff time required to complete it, (4) its cost, and (5) its relevance to the accountabilities of the department. Assigning values (numbers) to the criteria enables the administrator values weigh each for a given request or project, multiply by the value, and

thus determine priority. Analyzing departmental performance at the end of the year, against this system would result in a very objective look at contribution.

Fourth, the department's reputation and the budget request trend can be evaluated. Does top management think the department is performing a valuable role? Is the training department asked for opinions about solutions to specific problems? Is it brought in at the discussion stage, or is it told what solution it should implement? Are the training department's staffing requests approved? Is the requested budget approved? Are facilities and location adequate? These are all indicators of the organization's evaluation of the worth of the department's performance.