U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Corrections

NIC White Paper

Training from A to E: Analysis to Evaluation

NIC
National Institute of Corrections

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Corrections

Training from A to E: Analysis to Evaluation White Paper

Authors: Matthew Guyer

October 2016

Jim Cosby
Director

Robert Brown
Sr. Deputy Director

Jeff Hadnot
Chief, Academy

Amanda Hall
Project Manager

DISCLAIMER

This document was funded by contract number 14A6110 from the National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice. The National Institute of Corrections reserves the right to reproduce, publish, translate, or otherwise use and to authorize others to publish and use all or any part of the copyrighted material contained in this publication.

ACCESSION NUMBER

NIC Accession Number: 032740.

NIC's mission is to provide training, information and technical assistance to the nation's jails, prisons, and community corrections facilities. More information can be found at www.nicic.gov.

National Institute of Corrections

Training from A to E: Analysis to Evaluation

Executive Summary

The purpose of this paper is to provide learning performance professionals, curriculum designers, trainers, and others involved in the training profession an overview of the importance of analysis and evaluation when providing training to correctional professionals. The ADDIE model of instructional system design (Analyze, Design, Develop, Implement, Evaluate) is the foundation of this paper and will be covered briefly. Emphasis is placed on analysis and evaluation, as they are the bookends of the ADDIE model. No training is complete without proper analysis and evaluation.

There are many methods of instructional design, which share a lot of common ideas and concepts. The ADDIE model was selected for this paper based on the amount of information available, the length of time the model has been around, and its easy-to-remember acronym.

Introduction and Overview of ADDIE Model of Instructional System Design

An excellent, brief history of the ADDIE model appears in an article on the Educational Technology website. In its summary, this article notes that the concept of instructional design can be traced back to 1950s, but that the ADDIE model first appeared in 1975. It was designed by The Center for Educational Technology Department at Florida State University for the U.S. Army. The original ADDIE model included five phases made up of 19 different steps. In this original design, each step was meant to be completed

before proceeding to the next. The model has changed over the years and several revisions have been made. The current model is more interactive and dynamic. Most instructional design models today have been influenced by the ADDIE method in one way or another (Forest 2014).

Additionally, Gary Harriman states on his website that ADDIE provides a step-by-step approach to designing a course or training in an efficient, effective, and organized manner. As with other Instructional System Design (ISD) models, it also allows for implementing and improving the training. ADDIE gets its name from the five components of ISD:

Analysis: Identify needs and constraints

Design: Define learning activities, assessment, and media

Development: Produce, perform formative evaluation, and revise

Implementation: Deliver the instruction

Evaluation: Evaluate results

Harriman goes on to note that although ADDIE offers a step-by-step model, it is not designed to be so rigid that it prevents you from varying the emphasis of the steps as needed to produce effective training (2004).

Although this paper emphasizes the analysis and evaluation phases, it by no means implies the other phases are any less important. These two phases are highlighted because effective training begins with a thorough analysis and is not complete without a thorough evaluation process.

How It Applies to Corrections

Training is defined as “a formal exchange of job-related knowledge and/or skills from someone having it to someone needing it, where something is acquired and applied, resulting in something of value for the agency” (NIC Training for Agency Training Coordinators/Directors 2005: 2.4).

A number of training methods are used in corrections to provide people with the needed knowledge and skills: on-the-job training, instructor-led classroom training, computer-based training, webinars, and self-study, to name a few. Regardless of the method used, the training won’t be as effective as it could be if any of the pieces of the instructional design process are missing, particularly the analysis and evaluation portions.

To make a comparison, the first block is as important as the last block when building a prison. The prison is not structurally sound if some of the blocks are missing, which could lead to escapes or other serious consequences. The same can be said of training: the first and last pieces of the ADDIE model—analysis and evaluation—are just as important as the design, development, and implementation of the training itself. Any missing pieces might cause the training to be ineffective, lack the desired outcome, and waste valuable resources. Why build something if it is not going to be done correctly from start to finish? Why design, develop, and implement training if you aren't going to properly analyze the problem and evaluate the results of the training?

Benefits and Importance of Analysis

"Prescription without proper diagnosis is malpractice" (NIC Training for Agency Training Coordinators/Directors 2005: 8.8). While this analogy is medical in nature, it also applies to the field of corrections. Failure to properly diagnose a condition in the medical field could lead to ineffective or expensive cures, lawsuits, or even death. Failure to properly diagnose a performance issue could have the same consequences for corrections.

Some of the benefits of diagnosing the problem correctly, however, include lower recidivism rates for offenders, reduced turnover for staff, reduced litigation and lawsuits by staff and offenders, increased safety and security for staff and offenders, more efficiency and productivity among staff, positive correctional culture, increased morale for staff and offenders, reduced stress for staff and offenders, and reduced call-ins.

It is important to note up front, however, that not all performance problems are a training issue. Some issues are better addressed through other channels. This is a central concept to this paper and is covered in more detail below.

Needs Analysis

Determining if a problem is a training issue begins with a Training Needs Analysis; or, more precisely, it begins with a general Needs Analysis. Bill Stetar explains this in his article, "Training: It's Not Always the Answer." He states that calling this process a Training Needs Analysis implies up front that the problem is a training problem, which may not always be the case. Stetar advocates dropping the word "training," thus only calling it a Needs Analysis to avoid causing bias when analyzing a performance

discrepancy. We don't want people to believe something is a training problem if it can be solved by a different approach (Stetar 2005: 45).

An important point to remember when analyzing need is that veteran employees have different needs than new employees. Veteran staff members have usually already been trained on the job requirements. Therefore, analysis for veteran staff should be utilized to identify deficiencies in knowledge and/or skills. On the other hand, it should be assumed that new employees don't yet have the knowledge and skills to do the job. Analysis for new employees should focus on identifying exactly what knowledge and skills are needed for them to be successful in their position. Let's look at this in a little more detail, beginning with veteran staff.

Veteran Staff: Is It a Training Problem?

Analysis for veteran employees involves looking at the gap between employees' current performance and their desired performance (ITIP Toolkit 2011: 5).

This is also known as a performance discrepancy. A performance discrepancy is the difference between what is and what should be. A proper analysis identifies the person or persons whose performance is said to be lacking, identifies what is actually happening in terms of their performance, and helps identify the best method to achieve the desired performance (Mager & Pipe 2012: 15).

In their book *Analyzing Performance Problems,* Robert Mager and Peter Pipe state that there are a variety of reasons why people don't perform as desired, including:

- They don't know the expectations

- They don't have the resources or authority needed to do the job
- They don't get feedback about their performance (good or bad)
- They are “punished” if they do good work (for instance, good employees are often given more work when they do a good job, thus causing them to sometimes stop doing good work)
- They are “rewarded” for not doing the work (as noted previously, the work is often given to the higher performers)
- They don't know how to do the work

  (Mager & Pipe 2012: 3)

Only one of the reasons listed above is clearly a training problem: They don't know how to do it. The rest of the reasons could be training issues or could be attributed to something else. For example, do employees not know the expectations because they were never trained on them, or because the expectations haven't been clearly developed for the job? If the expectations have never been developed, it is a more likely a supervisory or HR department issue. The expectations need to be developed before staff can ever be trained on them. Policy and procedure should drive training, not the other way around.

Too often, however, agencies immediately assume something is a training problem and throw training at it in hopes it will resolve the problem (a.k.a., the “training Band-Aid” approach). In the end, though, making something a training problem that isn't wastes time, money, and other valuable resources that could have been used for other means.

Essentially, it comes down to an issue of “can't do” versus “won't do.” It is most likely a training issue if staff can't do something that is expected or desired. Problems when staff won't do something expected or desired are better addressed through other channels, such as mechanisms to reward desired work or taking corrective action when work isn't up to standards. Remember, training only provides someone with the needed knowledge and/or skills to do the job. If they already have that knowledge and those skills, it may not be a training problem.

Mager and Pipe emphasize that we should not automatically assume something is a training problem when staff aren't performing at the desired level. A determination must be made about whether the performance discrepancy is due to a true lack of knowledge and/or skills before taking any action (Mager & Pipe 2012: 100).

To assist in making determinations as to whether or not something is a training problem, ask these different sets of questions:

1. Could the person do it if he or she was really required to do it?
2. Could the person do it if his or her life depended on it?
3. Are the person's current knowledge and/or skills appropriate for the desired performance?

In this first set of questions, if the employee already knows how to do what is expected, then training is not the solution. Training someone on what they already know won’t fix the performance discrepancy. Training, however, would be an appropriate solution if there is a true deficiency in the person's knowledge and/or skills (Mager & Pipe 2012: 93–100).

4. Did the person previously know the desired performance?
5. Could the person do it in the past?
6. Has the person forgotten how to do what is expected?
7. How often does the person use the skill?

In this second set of questions, it is important to determine if the person never knew the skill, or whether they once knew it but have forgotten over time. Training would be an appropriate solution for both a skill that never existed and one that has been forgotten. The important thing to consider is how much training is needed for someone who has forgotten how to do something. In these situations, the person may not need the same full-blown training given to new employees. He or she may simply need a refresher training or the opportunity to practice the skill and receive feedback (Mager & Pipe 2012: 101–112).

Using the questions above, let's look at an example: A staff member is observed conducting a pat-down search inappropriately. In this situation, you would want to find out: Could the employee do the search correctly if truly required to do so? Does he or she know the correct search procedure? How often does the employee conduct pat searches? Has he or she been trained, but has forgotten the correct procedure for searches?

In asking some of these questions, you might identify that the employee conducts searches daily and conducts them correctly, but failed to do so this time because he or she was in a hurry. This would not be a training issue and would better be addressed

through other means, such as a supervisor correcting the behavior and working with the employee to ensure it doesn't happen again.

On the flip side, it might be determined that the employee was trained on the correct search procedures eight months ago during new employee training, hasn't conducted any pat searches since leaving the training class, and has forgotten some of the required steps of the search. This would be a training issue. The determination to make in this situation is to decide how much training the employee needs. Does he or she need to take the entire training again, or do they just need a refresher on the steps they've forgotten?

Remember, training only provides staff with knowledge and skills. Training can fix problems being caused by a lack of knowledge and/or skills. However, training cannot solve problems that are the result of:

- Lack of attentive supervision
- Lack of a clear policy and procedure
- Lack of leadership and direction
- Lack of correction of staff behavior and discipline
- Mistakes in hiring

(NIC Training for Agency Training Coordinators/Directors 2005: 6.6)

Determining Need for New Employees

Now let’s take a look at analyzing needs for new employees. Remember, it should be assumed that new employees don’t yet have the knowledge and skills to do the job, so

an analysis should be conducted to determine precisely what is needed. One of the best ways to do this is to perform a job analysis.

A job analysis is a process for identifying and documenting what is done for a specific job. This allows you to identify needed training topics and set priorities for new employees. To do this effectively, a job needs to be broken down into four parts:

- Job: This is also known as the "position" or title announced as part of an employment or promotional opportunity. The job is usually determined by the human resources or personnel department, union agreements, or civil service classifications.
- Duty: This is an ongoing responsibility with no discrete beginning and end. Duties are often listed in job announcements and are a general area of competence that workers must demonstrate or perform on an ongoing basis. A job is often made up of 8–12 ongoing duties.
- Task: This is a specific activity required to fulfill the duties of a job. Tasks are easily observable, have a beginning and end, and are composed of steps. Tasks sometimes have sub-tasks associated with them. A task is often referred to as "what" needs to be done on a given job. There may be as many as 200 to 500 tasks or sub-tasks for a given job.
- Activity/Steps: This is the behavior required for a job. It describes the specific steps needed to accomplish a given task. Steps are often performed in a short period of time. Activities or steps are the "how to" or implementation states for accomplishing a given task.

(NIC Training for Agency Training Coordinators/Directors 2005: 7.3)

An example of this would be:

- Job: Correctional Officer
- Duty: Maintain facility safety and security (ongoing responsibility with no beginning or end)
- Task: Conduct pat search (one of many tasks needed to maintain safety and security)
- Activity/Steps: 1) Tell the offender you are going to conduct a pat search; 2) Ask the offender to empty his or her pockets; 3) Ask the offender to turn around and let them know you are going to approach them; (additional steps would be listed as needed to accomplish task)

When conducting a job analysis, the identified tasks become the training topics for new employees. As noted, however, you could identify anywhere from 200 to 500 tasks for a given job. It would be very time-consuming to develop training around every task, so core tasks should be identified based on the frequency with which they are done, how critical they are to the mission and success of the agency, or both. Tasks that are conducted more frequently (hourly, daily, weekly, monthly) and/or are more critical to the mission of the facility would become the core tasks. It is important to consider both frequency and critical importance during this process. A task might only be conducted a few times each year, but could be very critical to the success of the agency and, therefore, should become a core task (NIC Training for Agency Training Coordinators/Directors 2005: 7.7).

Both classroom and field training officer (FTO) or on-the-job (OJT) training curriculum should be developed for the core tasks/topics you identify. Core topics should be identified as cognitive (knowledge), psychomotor (skills), or both. Training for heavy cognitive tasks could include classroom, academy, video, or computer-based training. Training for psychomotor topics are best covered by an FTO/OJT program, which includes demonstration, practice, and proficiency testing using step-by-checklists developed for the tasks (NIC Training for Agency Training Coordinators/Directors 2005: 7.9).

On a related note, one of the best processes for conducting a job analysis is the DACUM, which stands for Developing a Curriculum. The website for the National Institute of Corrections states that a DACUM is a quick, yet highly valid, job analysis technique used to determine the competencies that should be included in a training curriculum for a specific occupation. In addition to curriculum development, DACUM profiles can be used in several other ways. They are used:

1. to develop accurate job descriptions,
2. to evaluate if existing programs provide training for the competencies needed for today's jobs,
3. as a pre-test to determine the training needs of staff,
4. to develop competency-based post-tests for training,
5. to develop auxiliary components to the training program such as computer-based training and video tapes,
6. for developing performance evaluations, and

7. as the foundation for developing a complete training program for a specific job in the correctional system.

More information on the DACUM process can be found on the National Institute of Corrections website at www.nicic.gov.

ADDIE Steps: Design, Develop, Implement

After conducting an analysis and determining that training is appropriate for either veteran or new employees, we may move to the next steps in the ADDIE process: design, develop, and implement (if appropriate training doesn't already exist to address the need).

The design stage builds on the information gathered in the analysis. Some of the outcomes of this stage include developing the training outline, developing program or performance objectives, and selecting the best method to deliver the training.

The development stage is where the actual training is assembled. End products of this stage include the lesson plan(s) or cognitive behavior therapy (CBT) module, training aids (such as PowerPoint or videos), participant manuals/handouts, and program evaluation tools.

The implementation stage is where everything up to this point comes together and the actual training is conducted for the target audience. Components of this stage include scheduling the training, scheduling the participants to attend the training, and delivering the actual training itself. Participant feedback is also gathered during this stage to help determine the effectiveness of the training, which leads to the last step: evaluation.

Evaluation Introduction

The last piece of the ADDIE process is the training evaluation. On its website, www.opm.gov, the Office of Personnel Management defines training evaluation as a continual and systematic process of assessing the value or potential value of a training program, course, activity, or event. Results of the evaluation are used to guide decision-making around various components of the training (e.g. instructional design, delivery, results) and its overall continuation, modification, or elimination.

In addition to what is noted in the definition just given, training evaluation is also important to:

- Determine the effectiveness of training in order to improve future program offerings
- Determine if the program objectives were met
- See how the knowledge and skills acquired in the training are put into practice
- Assess the results and impact of the training
- Assess the training's effectiveness
- Assess whether or not the training was properly implemented
- Identify strengths and weaknesses of the training
- Determine if the training was suitable with regards to content, length, target audience, etc.
- Determine if the training appropriately solved an identified need

(Manual on Training Evaluation 2009: 6–7)

Unfortunately, many organizations misunderstand the evaluation stage. They believe that if you evaluate learning by collecting participant feedback forms, then the process is done. This is completely incorrect. "One and done" evaluations are not the only part of the evaluation process, as they do not consider the long-term impact of the training. Organizations that do the evaluation process well continually evaluate the impact the training is having on employees, the department, and the entire organization. They do this to ensure that the training is achieving the desired results. If the training is not doing this, then it is changed or replaced with something more appropriate. This sometimes means starting the ADDIE process over again because a different direction is needed (Lehman 2007: 4).

Kirkpatrick's Levels of Evaluation

According to the businessballs website at www.businessballs.com, Donald Kirkpatrick, professor emeritus at the University of Wisconsin, has identified four levels of learning evaluation. These were covered in his book, *Evaluating Training Programs,* which was originally published in 1994 (and is now in its third edition). The four levels identified by Kirkpatrick include:

- Level 1, Reaction: Measures what the participant thought about the training or learning experience; the degree to which participants react favorably to the training
- Level 2, Learning: Measures the increase of intended knowledge, skills, and attitudes as a result of participating in the training

- Level 3, Behavior: Measures if the learning was transferred from the training environment to the job; the extent to which the new knowledge, skills, and attitudes are applied back on the job
- Level 4, Results: Measures the impact of the training on the organization as a whole; the final results that occurred because of the training

The first two levels (Reaction and Learning) can be measured immediately, either during the training or at its conclusion. The third and fourth levels (Behavior and Results) require measurement many weeks or months after the training has ended, and involve a larger investment of time, energy, and resources. Because of this, many agencies only focus on the first two levels and often ignore the last two.

If organizations are only doing the first two levels of evaluation, they aren't getting the complete picture. Yes, they're getting an idea of whether or not people liked the training or learned something during the process, but they're not finding out if the training is being applied back on the job, nor if the training is helping the agency fulfill its vision and mission. Clearly, training must be evaluated at all four levels to truly determine the effectiveness.

As mentioned, measuring training at all four levels of evaluation can involve considerable time and resources. We are not suggesting that every single training program be evaluated at each level, but it is important that mission-critical programs be evaluated at all four Kirkpatrick levels. For the best results, formative evaluation and summative evaluation tools should be used. Formative evaluations are intended to

collect data during the learning event; summative evaluations are intended to collect data after the training (Training Evaluation Field Guide: 31).

Evaluation Methods

Different methods should be used to evaluate the training at each different level. There is no one-size-fits-all approach and the method (or methods) used will be determined by the information needed, and by the training program itself. The following are some of the more common methods used to evaluate training, which be referenced in the next sections with regard to which level they work best at:

- Survey/Questionnaire: Allows participants to answer open- and closed-ended questions about their experiences. Surveys are generally more closed-ended and questionnaires are more open-ended.
- Knowledge Test: A test of knowledge before, during, and/or after the training.
- Skill/Behavior Observation: An expert, peer, or supervisor observes and documents if an employee is performing the appropriate skills on the job completely and correctly (a checklist is generally used).
- Work Review: An expert, peer, or supervisor reviews the employee's work on the job and documents if the work is being performed correctly (generally using a checklist or template).
- Request for Validation: A letter is sent to supervisors or managers asking for quantitative evidence that training is being applied on the job; in other words, it seeks evidence of results.

- Pulse Check: A facilitator determines the level of engagement or knowledge of participants during the training by observing, questioning, or conducting any number of large- or small-group activities.
- Individual or Group Interview: Individual or group sessions are conducted in which participants are asked open-ended questions by the interviewer to gather data.
- Presentation or Teach-Back: A presentation is prepared and delivered to others to demonstrate the employee's knowledge or skill. This can be done in the training itself or to peers back on the job.
- Action Planning: Participants create a plan they commit to carry out when the training is over. Ideally, a supervisor would follow up on the plan, and provide coaching and reinforcement.
- Action Learning: Participants perform a project after the training in which their work is monitored, coached, and measured with the purpose of building and practicing skills while providing a deliverable for the organization. (Field Guide to Training Evaluation: 31–32)

Many of the methods above may be used at more than one Kirkpatrick level. This allows for the creation of hybrid tools, which are tools designed to evaluate more than one level and maximize resources used (Field Guide to Training Evaluation: 33).

Evaluating Levels 1 and 2

Kirkpatrick Level 1, Reaction, involves gathering information such as: Did the participants enjoy the training? Did they consider the training relevant? Was the

training worth the time spent away from work? Was the training environment conducive to learning? What was the level of participation? Did they feel at ease and were they comfortable with the training? What was the perceived potential for applying the training in the workplace? (Kirkpatrick's Learning and Training Evaluation Theory, businessballs.com)

Level 1 evaluation is relevant and practical for several reasons: it can be done immediately after the training, it is easy to obtain feedback, it is not expensive to gather feedback, it lets you know whether or not people were upset or disappointed with the training, and it suggests whether or not people will promote the training to others who may be attending in the future (Kirkpatrick's Learning and Training Evaluation Theory, businessballs.com).

Reaction at Level 1 can be evaluated by pulse checks, surveys, questionnaires, or individual or group interviews, as detailed earlier. The instructor should take pulse checks during the training, while surveys, questionnaires, and interviews should be conducted immediately after the training (Field Guide to Training Evaluation: 33).

Kirkpatrick Level 2, Learning, involves measuring the increase of a participant's knowledge or skills from before the training to after it, including: Did the participant learn what was intended? Did the participant experience what was intended? Was the desired change in knowledge/skills of the participant achieved as intended? (Kirkpatrick's Learning and Training Evaluation Theory, businessballs.com).

Level 2 evaluation is: relatively simple to set up but does involve more thought and investment than Level 1; highly relevant for measuring an increase in knowledge and/or

skills; less easy to measure, particularly for changes in attitude, which are naturally difficult to measure; more expensive if not designed and utilized appropriately (Kirkpatrick's Learning and Training Evaluation Theory, businessballs.com).

Learning, or Level 2, can be evaluated by a variety of means including pulse checks, surveys, questionnaires, individual or group interviews, action plans, work review, skill observations, behavior observation, case studies, presentations, teach-backs, and pre- and post-tests as detailed earlier (Field Guide to Training Evaluation: 33).

A few common pitfalls must be avoided when measuring both Level 1 and Level 2, such as: seeking instructor validation instead of program improvement ideas (did the participants like the instructor, as opposed to using feedback to improve training in the future); failing to look at data objectively; overreacting to one-off comments that were either negative or positive and making or not making adjustments based on that; constantly modifying programs based on Level 1 feedback at the expense of using resources to evaluate Level 3 Behavior; and only using pre- and post-tests to determine an increase in knowledge (Field Guide to Training Evaluation: 51).

Evaluating Levels 3 and 4

Kirkpatrick Level 3, Behavior, includes gathering information to evaluate: Did the participant put his or her learning into effect when back on the job? Are the relevant knowledge and skills being used? Has there been a noticeable change in performance when the employee is back on the job? Has the participant continued to use the new knowledge/skills over the long haul or did he or she fall back into old ways? Is the

participant able to pass on the knowledge/skills to another person? (Kirkpatrick's Learning and Training Evaluation Theory, businessballs.com).

When conducting Level 3 evaluation, keep in mind that: measuring behavior change is not as easy as measuring reaction and learning; simple and quick response evaluations are unlikely to be adequate; it is difficult ot control the cooperation and skills of the observers of on-the-job performance (usually supervisors or managers); it is hard to manage and maintain an ongoing method of evaluation if it is not well designed and implemented from the beginning; evaluation at this stage is extremely important—there is little point in good reaction and learning evaluations if nothing changes back on the job; and behavior change evaluation is possible with good support and involvement from line managers, so it is important to involve them from the start and to identify the benefits to them (Kirkpatrick's Learning and Training Evaluation Theory, businessballs.com).

Level 3 can be evaluated by surveys, questionnaires, individual or group interviews, action planning, work review, skill observation, behavior observation, action learning, or requests for validation as detailed earlier (Field Guide to Training Evaluation: 33).

Kirkpatrick Level 4, Result, involves looking at the training's impact on the organization or environment. Measures are typically key performance indicators such as: volumes being met, increase in output, reduction in time it takes to do something, reduction in number of complaints, decrease in staff turnover, achievement of standards or accreditations, cost savings as a result of the training, improvement in conditions for

employees or offenders, or evidence that the organization has changed (Kirkpatrick's Learning and Training Evaluation Theory, businessballs.com).

When conducting Level 4 evaluation, note that it can be challenging to measure results across an organization based on the reliability of staff and the frequency of which things change. Remember, too, that external factors greatly affect organizational performance, which may cloud the true cause of good or bad results (Kirkpatrick's Learning and Training Evaluation Theory, businessballs.com).

Level 4 can be evaluated by surveys, questionnaires, individual/group interviews, action planning, request for validation, and key business and HR metrics as detailed earlier (Field Guide to Training Evaluation: 33).

A few common pitfalls must be avoided when measuring both Level 3 and Level 4. These include: allowing participants or supervisors to ignore post-training evaluation activities; failing to look at data objectively; and overreacting to one-off comments that were either negative or positive (Field Guide to Training Evaluation, 51).

Immediate, Intermediate, and Ultimate Impact

To summarize and simplify the evaluation process outlined above, the National Institute of Corrections notes that the key to good training evaluation is to assess performance beyond the instruction environment, including behavior on the job and the resulting benefit to the agency. This is also referred to as Immediate Impact, Intermediate Impact, and Ultimate Impact (NIC Training for Agency Training Directors/Coordinators 2005: 16.2–16.3).

Immediate impact corresponds with Kirkpatrick's Level 1 and Level 2 evaluation. Immediate impact involves measuring what the participants know or are able to do as a result of the training. This should be measured immediately at the end of the training. Intermediate impact corresponds with Kirkpatrick's Level 3 evaluation and involves looking at whether or not the participants applied the new knowledge or skill on the job. This should be measured four to six months after the training event. Ultimate impact corresponds with Kirkpatrick's Level 4 evaluation; it involves looking at the impact the training had on the overall operation of the agency. This should be measured 12 to 18 months after the training event (NIC Training for Agency Training Directors/Coordinators 2005: 16.2–16.3).

Next Steps and Call to Action

Properly designed training utilizes all the steps of the ADDIE process. The assessment and evaluation pieces are the bookends of this process and should not be overlooked. Failure to properly identify a training problem or evaluate the outcome could result in wasted time, energy, resources, or even more serious consequences.

Remember, “Prescription without proper diagnosis is malpractice.” To ensure that training is being developed around identified needs, you must take the time to up front to assess what the need is and design the training around that.

If the knowledge and skills covered during the training are not being used on the job *and* are not having a positive impact on the agency, why do the training in the first place? (Training for Agency Training Coordinators/Directors 2005:16.5). Moreover, after a necessary training has been completed, you must take the time to evaluate mission-

critical training beyond the classroom and into the workplace to ensure it's being utilized and is helping the agency achieve its vision, mission, and goals.

To conclude, think about it as this: Can do, will do, yahoo! That is, the employees *can* do the job because proper assessments have been conducted up front, the employee *will* do the job because the knowledge and skills covered in the training are being evaluated in the workplace to ensure they are being utilized, and you'll all shout *yahoo* because the agency is seeing positive results of the properly designed and implemented training.

References

Businessballs.com. (2014). Kirkpatrick's learning and training evaluation theory. *Businessballs*. Retrieved from http://www.businessballs.com/kirkpatricklearningevaluationmodel.htm.

Eighmy, M. A. (2007) *Evaluating training programs: The four levels.* 2007 Fall Extension Conference. Retrieved from http://www.powershow.com/view/3bbeb5-NzA3Y/Evaluating_Training_Programs_The_Four_Levels_powerpoint_ppt_presentation

Forest, E. (2014, January). Frameworks and theories. *Educational Technology.* Retrieved from http://educationaltechnology.net/category/frameworks-and-theories/

Harriman, G. (2004). ADDIE. Retrieved from http://www.grayharriman.com/ADDIE.htm.

Japan International Cooperation Agency. (n.d.) Project on improvement of local administration in Cambodia: Manual on training evaluation. Retrieved from http://www.jica.go.jp/project/cambodia/0601331/pdf/english/5_TrainingEvaluation.pdf.

Lehman, B. & Lynn, M. (Eds.) (2007). *A.D.D.I.E.: A proactive approach to employee and training development.* Harrisburg, PA: Rising Sun Consultants.

Mager, R. F. & Pipe, P. (2012). *Analyzing performance problems or...you really oughta wanna figure out why people aren't doing what they should be, and what to do about it.* Carefree, AZ: Mager Associates, Inc.

Stetar, B. (2005). Training: It's not always the answer, *ASQ.org*. Retrieved from http://www.asq.org.

United States Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections. (2005) NIC Training for agency training coordinators/directors.

United States Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections. (2011, March). *ITIP Toolkit: A guide for working with curriculum developers.* NIC Accession Number 024773.

United States Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections. (2014). DACUM Profiles can help your training. Retrieved from http://community.nicic.gov/blogs/training/archive/2006/09/25/DACUM-Profiles-Do-You-Know-What-a-DACUM-is_3F00_.aspx.

United States Office of Personnel Management. (2011, January). *Training evaluation field guide: Demonstrating the value of training at every level*. Retrieved from http://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/training-and-development/reference-materials/training_evaluation.pdf.

United States Office of Personnel Management. (2014). Training and development policy wiki. Retrieved from http://www.opm.gov/wiki/training/Training-Evaluation.ashx.

United States Office of Personnel Management. (2014) *Training evaluation field guide supplement*. Retrieved from https://www.opm.gov/wiki/uploads/docs/Wiki/OPM/training/2014 07 02 Training Evaluation Field Guide Supplement.pdf.