

A Training Success?

The essential logic for claiming success is that:

- a) the participant applied some capability acquired from the training initiative in job performance
- b) the improved performance led to or produced some results that was
- c) of value to the organization

Here are some of the questions we pursue in a SCM interview to try to make the case that there was (or was not), beyond a reasonable doubt, a success from training:

<i>Impact Map Category</i>	Key Capability	Critical Application	Performance Result	Organization Goal
<i>Explanation</i>	Some key SKA skill, knowledge or attitude) that is important for effective job performance	An application of the skill or knowledge in some important part of the job	An immediate outcome or result of the improved job performance	A worthwhile goal to which the improved result makes an important contribution
<i>Questions to be resolved</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Was the SKA really gained from the training and not somewhere else? ○ Was the training necessary to acquiring the SKA; could it have been acquired in a different, cheaper and quicker way? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Was the SKA the reason for the job performance improvement? ○ Could the performance improvement have happened without the SKA? ○ Could something else (e.g., an incentive, a job-aid) have just as easily produced the improved performance? ○ Is there any negative consequence of the performance (e.g., is it unfair to someone, does it hurt anyone?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is the improved performance really worthwhile? ○ Was the improved performance necessary for the result to have been produced? ○ Could the result have been caused by something other than the job performance? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Did the result really make an important contribution to a goal? ○ Is that goal truly worthwhile? ○ Is there any negative impact of the result?

Table 1-1

Looking for Alternative Explanations

Basic Impact Claim	Alternative explanation questions to be resolved
<p>1) Jan learned some new skills for coping with emotional reactions that were hindering her success in making cold calls.</p>	<p>Was emotional interference really the cause of Jan's inability to make more cold calls?</p> <p>Were the skills truly new or had she already mastered them?</p> <p>Were the skills learned in the training or did she get them from somewhere else?</p>
<p>2) Jan's usage of her EmoComp skills helped her persevere and make more cold calls</p>	<p>Did Jan in fact make more cold calls?</p> <p>Did Jan use the learned skills or did she really use some other skills that did not come from her training?</p> <p>Did the use of the skills really make the difference in making more cold calls, or did something else, perhaps a job aid or an incentive, cause her to change her behavior?</p> <p>Could she have made more calls without the training, for instance if her boss had just told her to do it "or else"?</p>
<p>3) Jan's making more calls led directly to her making more appointments, which in turn led to her increase in sales.</p>	<p>Did Jan's sales performance really increase?</p> <p>Were the calls necessary to her getting more appointments?</p> <p>Did something else change that helped her get more appointments, such as better prospects on her call lists?</p> <p>Were more appointments necessary to her making more sales? Did she do anything else new that helped her get more sales?</p>