

Index

A

- Actionable information
 - averages as failing to deliver, 17–20
 - consistent element of, 16–17
 - converting ROI analysis into, 48–50
 - credible element of, 17
 - defining, 15–17
 - on effectiveness, design, efficiency and effectiveness, 14
 - on larger talent challenges, 15
 - of LMS (learning management systems), 31
 - measurement focus on gathering, 179
 - as purpose of measurements, 13–14
 - specific element of, 15–16
 - on training compliance, 15
- See also* Information
- Adoption measure, 91–92, 103fig, 104fig
- Alignment. *See* Business alignment
- Assessment. *See* Performance assessment
- ASTD (American Society of Training and Development), 37
- AT&T Wireless, 33
- Attainment of client objectives measure.
 - See* Customer satisfaction measures
- Audience analysis, 65
- Audience targeting, 96
- Averages
 - cautions when using, 17
 - examining learner satisfaction, 18fig–20
- Aviation Industry, 32

B

- Bersin, J., 61
- Bersin model. *See* Impact Measurement Framework

- Bersin research. *See* High Impact Learning Organization research
- The Blended Learning Book, 96
- Brinkerhoff, R., 68
- Business
 - actionable information value to, 13–20, 48–50, 179
 - measuring training impact on, 140fig–151
 - performance improvement of, 13–14, 82–87, 103fig, 127–129, 128fig
 - training as support function of, 22–26, 23fig, 180fig
 - See also* Business problems; Learning business plan; Organizations
- Business alignment
 - Caterpillar's Planning and Budgeting Process example of, 154–156
 - challenge of developing, 153–154
 - CNA Insurance Training Investment model on, 156fig–157, 158fig
 - High Impact research on
 - developing, 154
 - of highest ROI programs with urgent business problems, 53
 - Kirkpatrick model's lack of, 66
 - of learning objectives with, 24fig
 - managers on critical challenge of, 153
 - as organizational performance factor, 82–84
 - performance consulting to establish, 65, 75–76, 110–112
 - problem-definition phase and process of, 74–75
 - See also* Alignment
- Business alignment measures
 - Business Impact Model on, 82–84, 103fig, 104fig

Business alignment measures (*Continued*)

- Caterpillar's approach to, 154–156
 - CNA example of, 156*fig*–157, 158*fig*
 - competency, 96–97
 - definition of, 95
 - financial, 97
 - Impact Measurement Framework on, 95–98, 153–162
 - of individual programs, 160–162
 - investment, 95
 - job role, 96
 - management, 96
 - of the overall learning organization, 158–160
 - process, 95–96
 - urgency and time, 97–98
 - See also* Performance measure; Training measurement
- Business impact measures
- integrating performance management processes with, 148–151
 - using line-of-business-specific, 141–148
 - qualitative versus quantitative, 140*fig*–141
- Business Impact Model
- individual performance improvement phase of, 78–82, 88*fig*
 - organizational performance improvement phase of, 82–84, 88*fig*
 - overview of four phases of, 73*fig*–74, 88*fig*
 - problem-definition phase of, 74–76, 88*fig*
 - training solution phase of, 76–78, 88*fig*
 - See also* Impact Measurement Framework
- Business Objects, 176
- Business problems
- alignment of highest ROI programs with urgent, 53
 - Business Impact Model on defining, 74–76, 88*fig*
 - data course used to identify, 148
 - importance of prioritizing, 76
 - performance consulting process driving identification of, 142*fig*
 - See also* Business; Performance consulting (needs analysis)
- Business unit signoff
- capturing customer satisfaction measure using, 166–167

- form used for, 99, 111, 112, 113*fig*, 130
- as program measurement process step, 109–112

Business Unit Signoff Form

- answers provided by, 99
- capturing customer satisfaction measure using, 166–167
- developing, 130
- information to be included in, 111
- Randstad's, 112, 113*fig*
- "Butts in seats," 91

C

- Call Center Training (measurement example), 143–145
- Capital investments
- "hurdle rate" cost of obtaining, 39
 - ROI analysis to prioritize, 38–39
- Caterpillar University
- description of, 154–155
 - measurement journey approach used by, 181, 182*fig*
 - planning and budgeting process used at, 155*fig*–156
- CBT Committee (AICC), 32
- Circuit City, 46–47, 53
- CLO Dashboard (Zeroed-In Technologies), 175–177*fig*
- CLOs
- data sources used to identify problem areas by, 148
 - on facilitating business alignment, 161–162
 - on impact measures to cost-justify programs, 139–140
 - on lack of line management support, 161
 - measurement program interests of, 26
 - on power of manager alignment with training, 81–82
 - on prioritized list of business problems importance, 76
- CNA Insurance
- learning investment portfolio of, 156*fig*
 - sample program investment allocation, 158*fig*
 - training investment model used by, 156–157
- Cognos, 176
- Competency alignment, 96–97

Cornerstone OnDemand, 127
 Corporate University
 corporate training approach
 used by, 64
 corporate training developed by, 63
 Critical mistake analysis, 115–116
 Customer satisfaction measures
 Impact Measurement Framework on,
 98, 103*fig*, 104*fig*
 Six Sigma approach to, 68, 163–166
 two processes for capturing the, 166–167
See also “Voice of the customer”

D

Defense Acquisition University
 (DAU), 162
 Development programs. *See* Training
 DTCC (Depository Trust Clearing
 Corporation), 68, 105, 166

E

Economic efficiency measure, 105
 Efficiency measure
 as actionable information, 14
 Impact Measurement Framework,
 94–95, 103*fig*, 104*fig*
 Employee engagement benefit, 100
 Employment brand improvement, 101
 End-of-course evaluation
 developing standard, 131–132
 made mandatory, 123–124
 sample questions for, 135*fig*
 Evaluation
 avoiding use of anonymous, 124–125
 end-of-course, 123–124, 131–132, 135*fig*
 first learner, 118–121, 120*fig*
 first manager, 121–122
 follow-up learner, 122–123
 follow-up manager, 123
 follow-up questions for, 136*fig*
 Impact Measurement Framework used
 for, 31
 LMS used for, 125–126*fig*
 made easy but meaningful, 124
 measurement versus, 31
 tips for building effective, 132–137*fig*
 See also Performance assessment
 Evaluation tips
 capture indicators not measures,
 133–134

importance of consistency,
 132–133
 Executive steering committee, 158

F

FedEx Kinko, 112
 Financial alignment, 97
 First-line managers. *See* Managers
 Flexibility benefit, 101
 Follow-up evaluation
 learner, 122–123
 manager, 123
 sample questions for, 136*fig*

G

Gallup Q12 measures, 86, 100

H

Healthcare Outcome Data (measurement
 example), 147–148
 High Impact Learning Organization
 research
 on business impact of coaching,
 81–82
 on developing sound business
 alignment, 154
 on how corporate training has evolved,
 63–64
 on performance consulting as driving
 learning programs, 112
 on what is routinely measured,
 61*fig*–62
 See also WhatWorks research
 Hiring rates benefit, 101
 HP (Hewlett-Packard)
 end-of-course evaluations used
 by, 127
 measurement journey approach used by,
 181, 182*fig*
 Standard End-of-Course Survey used
 by, 119, 120*fig*
 HR vice president, measurement program
 interests of, 26
 “Hurdle rate,” 39

I

Impact Measurement Framework
 development of the, 71–72
 evaluation using, 31

Impact Measurement Framework

(Continued)

- how to use the, 72*fig*
- Kirkpatrick model extended by, 5–6
- Kirkpatrick model misses covered by, 66–67
- learning business plan integrated use of, 181
- measuring alignment using, 95–98, 153–162
- measuring business impact using, 140*fig*–151
- nine measures of, 87–103*fig*, 104*fig*
- summary of the, 103, 107*fig*
- two purposes of, 106
- See also* Business Impact Model; Seven-Step Training Measurement Process; Training measurement models

Impact Measurement Framework

measures

- adoption, 91–92, 103*fig*, 104*fig*
- alignment, 95–98, 103*fig*, 104*fig*
- attainment of client objectives (customer satisfaction), 98, 103*fig*, 104*fig*, 163–167
- efficiency, 94–95, 103*fig*, 104*fig*
- individual performance, 98–100, 103*fig*, 104*fig*
- learning, 88–89, 91, 103*fig*, 104*fig*
- organizational performance, 100–102, 103*fig*, 104*fig*
- other operational, 105–106
- satisfaction, 87–88, 103*fig*, 104*fig*
- summary of, 103*fig*, 104*fig*, 107*fig*
- utility, 92–93, 103*fig*, 104*fig*
- See also* Measurement

Improvement. *See* Performance improvementIndicator Analysis, 137*fig*

Indicators

- analysis of learning, 134, 137*fig*
- considering standard sets of, 29*fig*
- definition of, 16
- using evaluations to capture, 133–134
- Gallup Q12 measurements of, 86, 100
- identifying and using business support, 25
- program versus organizational performance, 103, 105–106
- significance of data on, 16–17
- See also* Training measurement

Individual performance improvement

phase (Business Impact Model)

- description of, 78–79
- on existing skills and knowledge, 79
- on learner attitude, 80–81
- on learner motivation, 80
- on manager support, 81–82
- summary of, 88*fig*
- Individual performance measure (Impact Measurement Framework), 98–100, 103*fig*, 104*fig*

Information

- on Business Unit Signoff Form, 111
- collecting dimensional, 125
- collecting session- and time-specific, 124
- routinely tracked by organizations, 38*fig*
- See also* Actionable information

Instructional designer interests, 26–27

Internal staff meetings, 159

Investment alignment, 95

IRS (Internal Resource Service), 34

Isolating effects of training, 43, 47

J

Job role alignment, 96

K

Kirkpatrick, D., 3

Kirkpatrick model

- customer satisfaction measure missed by, 166
- four levels for measurement in, 4, 58, 59–63
- as ignoring role of training in service-delivery function, 63–66
- Impact Measurement Framework extension of, 5–6
- incorrectly positioning levels as hierarchy, 62–63
- moving beyond the, 181
- operational measures missed by, 66–68, 166
- Six-Sigma approach as alternative to, 68
- specific inadequacies of the, 65–66, 166
- summary of the, 107*fig*
- Kirkpatrick model levels
 - 1: satisfaction (reaction), 4, 58, 59, 62, 63
 - 2: learning, 4, 58, 60, 62

- 3: application or job impact (behavior), 4, 58, 60, 62
 - 4: business impact (results), 4, 58, 60–61, 62
 - 5: return on investment: ROI (Phillips), 4, 58, 61, 62
 - KnowledgeAdvisors, 134, 174–175
 - KPMG training programs, 160–161
- L**
- L&D managers. *See* Managers
 - LEADS program (Grant Thornton), 84*fig*, 85
 - Learner satisfaction ratings
 - comparing detailed scores of, 19*fig*–20
 - course I average, 18*fig*, 19
 - course II average, 18*fig*, 19
 - Learners
 - Business Impact Model on, 80–81
 - first evaluation for the, 118–121, 120*fig*
 - follow-up evaluation for the, 122–123
 - motivation and attitude of, 80–81
 - Learning
 - alignment of business objectives with, 24*fig*
 - analysis of learning indicators, 134, 137*fig*
 - Business Impact Model on, 78
 - Grant Thornton's approach to employee, 83*fig*–84*fig*
 - Randstad's integration of performance and, 127–129, 127*fig*
 - Randstad's integration of performance assessment and, 128*fig*
 - See also* Training; Training outcomes
 - Learning business plan
 - Caterpillar University example of, 154–156, 155*fig*, 181, 182*fig*
 - CNA example of, 156*fig*–157, 158*fig*
 - HP measurement journey approach by, 181, 182*fig*
 - Impact Measurement Framework used as part of, 181
 - importance of development and measuring against a, 180
 - as key to measuring alignment, 159–160
 - levels of committee governance over, 158–159
 - See also* Business
 - Learning councils, 158
 - Learning level
 - Impact Measurement Framework, 88–89, 91, 103*fig*, 104*fig*
 - Kirkpatrick model, 4, 58, 60, 62
 - Line-of-business executives. *See* Managers
 - Line-of-business measures
 - description of, 141–142
 - healthcare outcome data example of, 147–148
 - insurance call center training example of, 143–145
 - pharmaceutical sales example of, 145, 147*fig*
 - See also* Business alignment measures
 - LMS (Learning Management Systems)
 - actionable information available through, 31
 - automated performance management using, 149
 - used for evaluation, 125–126*fig*
 - included both learning and performance management, 127–129, 128*fig*
 - measurement standards used by, 170–171
 - as measurement tool, 149, 169–175
 - Metrics that Matter (Knowledge Advisors) integration with, 134, 175
 - need for data standards in the, 32–33
 - online assessment tool of, 32
 - Randstad's use of Cornerstone OnDemand, 127
 - training investment in, 94
- M**
- Management alignment, 96
 - Management support
 - Business Impact Model on training and, 81–82
 - example of facilitating poor line, 161–162
 - as organizational performance factor, 82–84
 - Managers
 - on business alignment as critical challenge, 153
 - first evaluation for the, 121–122
 - follow-up evaluation for the, 123

Managers (*Continued*)

- measurement program interests of
 - first-line, 26
 - training measurement process
 - ownership by, 126–127
 - training support by, 81–84, 161–162
- See also* Training managers

Measurement

- definition of, 16
 - evaluation versus, 31
 - Gallup Q12, 86, 100
- See also* Impact Measurement Framework measures; Training measurement

Measurement programs

- actionable information gained through, 13–20
 - avoid cost-justification using, 20–22
 - computing ROI before developing, 180–181
 - dedicating organizational resources for, 33–34
 - multiple audiences of, 26–27
 - as ongoing process versus project, 27–30
- See also* Training measurement models

Measurement tools/technologies

- automated, 149
- CLO Dashboard (Zeroed-In Technologies), 175–177*fig*
- LMS role as, 149, 169–175
- Metrics that Matter (Knowledge-Advisors), 134, 174–175
- third-party, 172
- training analytics and advanced reporting, 172–174

- See also* Training measurement Metrics that Matter (Knowledge-Advisors), 134, 174–175

Mobility benefit, 101

N

NCR, 101–102

Needs analysis. *See* Performance consulting (needs analysis)

O

Operational measures, 105–106

Oracle, 173

Organizational performance improvement (Business Impact Model)

- on business alignment and support, 82–84
 - description of, 82
 - Grant Thornton LEAD program example of, 83*fig*–84*fig*
 - on talent-driven versus performance-driven, 84–87, 86*fig*
- Organizational performance measure (Impact Measurement Framework), 100–102, 103*fig*, 104*fig*
- Organizations
- actionable information on effectiveness of, 14
 - Bersin research on what is routinely measured by, 61*fig*–62
 - Business Impact Model on performance improvement by, 82–84
 - development program benefits for, 100–101
 - information routinely tracked by, 38*fig*
 - measurement focus on business goals of, 179
 - measuring business alignment of individual programs in, 160–162
 - measuring business alignment of overall learning, 158–160
 - ROI usage ranking by ASTD of, 37
 - as service-and-support function, 180
 - training as internal service delivery, 64
 - training measurement resources dedicated by, 33–34
- See also* Business

P

Performance assessment

- integration of learning and, 128*fig*
 - measurement tools used for, 169–177*fig*
 - pre- and post-assessment, 116–117*fig*
 - Randstad competency, 150*fig*
- See also* Evaluation

Performance consulting (needs analysis)

- capturing customer satisfaction measure using, 166–167
- critical mistake analysis for, 115–116
- definition of, 112–113
- establishing process of, 131
- as first step in developing a training program, 110–112
- illustrated diagram of, 114*fig*
- Kirkpatrick model's inadequacy, 65

- measurement as part of, 115*fig*
 - problem-definition phase on process of, 75–76
 - as program measurement process step, 112–116
 - step-by-step process for, 146*fig*
 - See also* Business problems
 - Performance improvement
 - actionable information for, 13–14
 - Business Impact Model on measuring, 82–84, 103*fig*
 - integrating training results with management of, 127–129, 128*fig*
 - organizational, 82–84
 - talent-driven learning programs and, 84–87
 - Performance management processes
 - integrating business impact measure with, 148–151
 - integrating training results with, 127–129, 128*fig*
 - Randstad competency assessment during, 150*fig*
 - seven steps of, 149
 - software for automating, 149
 - Performance measure
 - differentiating between utility and, 93
 - individual, 98–100, 103*fig*, 104*fig*
 - organizational, 100–102, 103*fig*, 104*fig*
 - risks of using ROI as, 42–43, 101–102
 - TTR (time to repair), 102
 - See also* Business alignment measures
 - Performance-driven training
 - comparing talent-driven and, 51*fig*, 86*fig*
 - description of, 50–52, 84–85
 - Pharmaceutical Sales (measurement example), 145, 147*fig*
 - Phillips, J., 3, 41, 57, 58
 - Planning. *See* Learning business plan
 - Plateau, 173
 - Post-assessment process, 117*fig*
 - Potential ROI analysis
 - formula for, 49
 - making ROI actionable using, 48
 - used during performance consulting, 48–50
 - See also* ROI analysis
 - Pre-assessment
 - description of, 116
 - post-assessment versus, 117*fig*
 - Randstad's onboarding program, 116–117*fig*
 - Prioritization
 - of business problems, 76
 - Kirkpatrick model's poor approach to, 66
 - Problem-definition phase (Business Impact Model)
 - business alignment process of, 74–75
 - description of, 74
 - performance consulting process of, 75–76
 - summary of, 88*fig*
 - Problems. *See* Business problems
 - Process alignment, 95–96
 - Process owners
 - assigning a, 29–30
 - functions of, 30
- Q**
- Quality measures, 105
 - Questionmark, 172
- R**
- Randstad
 - Business Unit Signoff Form used by, 112, 113*fig*
 - Cornerstone OnDemand platform used by, 127
 - Randstad onboarding program
 - as business impact measure example, 149–151
 - competency assessment during performance management, 150*fig*
 - measurement process used for, 99
 - pre-assessment of, 116–117*fig*
 - Retention benefit, 101
 - “Return on insecurity” trap, 53–54
 - ROI analysis
 - capital investments prioritized using, 38–39
 - converted into actionable information, 48–50
 - difficulty of correlating outcomes to training, 46–48
 - “hurdle rate” concept of, 39
 - for justifying expenses, 41
 - keys to, 39–40
 - NCR example of, 101–102
 - of performance-driven versus talent-driven training, 50–53, 51*fig*

ROI analysis (*Continued*)

- Phillips formula for, 41
- “return on insecurity” trap of, 53–54
- risks of using, 42–43, 101–102
- training treated as investment in, 38–42
- See also* Potential ROI analysis

ROI computation

- for determining ROI level, 43
- highest ROI alignment with most urgent business problems, 53
- isolating effects for accurate, 43, 47
- of potential ROI, 48–50
- prior to developing a program, 180–181
- theoretical high ROI of training, 44–46*fig*
- of true cost of training, 42–43

ROI (return on investment)

- definition of, 61
- as training measurement level, 4, 58, 61, 62

ROI (Return on Investment) model

- examining practicality of using, 44–46
- information routinely tracked by, 38*fig*
- low level of usage of, 37
- pros and cons of using, 37–54
- training measurement using, 4
- training treated as investment by, 38–42

Root-cause analysis tree, 114*fig*

- See also* Performance consulting (needs analysis)

S

Saba, 173

Saks Fifth Avenue, 54

Satisfaction level

- Impact Measurement Framework, 87–88, 103*fig*, 104*fig*
- Kirkpatrick model, 4, 58, 59, 62, 63

SCM (Success Case Method) model, 68, 70

SCORM (Sharable Content Object Reference Model), 32

Scottrade, 100

Seven-Step Training Measurement Process

- best practices in implementing, 123–129
- seven steps in, 109–123, 110*fig*
- steps for starting the, 129–132

- tips for building effective evaluations, 132–137*fig*

See also Impact Measurement Framework

Seven-Step Training Measurement

- Process best practices
- avoiding anonymous evaluations, 124–125
- collect session- and time-specific information, 124
- collecting dimensional information, 125
- LMS used for evaluation, 125–126*fig*
- make end-of-course evaluations mandatory, 123–124
- making evaluations easy but meaningful, 124

Seven-Step Training Measurement

- Process start steps
- 1: establish measurement goals, 129–130
- 2: review impact framework and select key measures, 130
- 3: develop business unit signoff form, 130

Seven-Step Training Measurement

- Process steps
- 1: business unit signoff, 99, 109–112, 113*fig*
- 2: performance consulting, 112–116
- 3: pre-assessment, 116–118
- 4: evaluation 1 for the learner, 118–121
- 5: evaluation 1 for the manager, 121–122
- 6: follow-up evaluation for the learner (optional), 122–123
- 7: follow-up evaluation for the manager (optional), 123

Six Sigma methodology

- customer satisfaction measured using, 163–166
- description of, 68
- DTCC application of, 68, 69*fig*, 105
- “Voice of the Customer” concept of, 68, 163, 166
- website resource on, 167n.1
- SMEs (subject-matter experts), 67
- Sprint University, 33
- SumTotal, 173

T

Talent-driven training

- comparing performance-driven and, 51*fig*, 86*fig*
- description of, 51–53, 85–87

- “Target adoption rate,” 91
 - Team satisfaction measures, 106
 - Time alignment, 97–98
 - Time-based measures, 105
 - Tools. *See* Measurement tools/technologies
 - Trainer interests, 26–27
 - Training
 - actionable information on compliance with, 15
 - financial leverage of, 45*fig*
 - as internal service delivery organizations, 64
 - organizational benefits of, 100–101
 - performance-driven versus talent-driven, 50–53, 51*fig*
 - pros and cons of using ROI to measure, 37–54
 - as support function, 22–26, 23*fig*, 180*fig*
 - treated as investment by ROI analysis, 38–42
 - See also* Learning; Training outcomes
 - Training analytics
 - advanced features available for, 173–174
 - description of, 172–173
 - Training managers
 - measurement program interests of, 26
 - ROI analysis use by, 53–54
 - See also* Managers
 - Training measurement
 - actionable information as purpose of, 13
 - Bersin research on what is routinely included in, 61*fig*–62
 - business impact, 140*fig*–151
 - challenges of, 1–3
 - computation of reasonable ROI, 44–46
 - conservative ROI, 46*fig*
 - customer satisfaction, 98, 103*fig*, 104*fig*, 163–167
 - dedicating organizational resources for, 33–34
 - difficulty of correlating outcomes to, 46–48
 - isolating effects to compute return of, 43, 47
 - as journey and not a destination, 181
 - operational, 105–106
 - patience elements of, 34
 - ROI analysis and total cost of training, 42–43
 - of training as support function, 22–26, 23*fig*, 180*fig*
 - See also* Business alignment measure; Indicators; Measurement; Measurement tools/technologies
 - Training measurement models
 - Business Impact Model, 73*fig*–84, 88*fig*
 - Kirkpatrick model, 4, 5–6, 57–70, 166, 181
 - need for new, 3–6
 - Phillips ROI (Return on Investment), 4, 37–54
 - Six Sigma, 68, 69*fig*, 105, 163–166
 - Success Case Method (SCM), 68, 70
 - See also* Impact Measurement Framework; Measurement programs
 - Training measurement principles
 - 1: measurement should deliver actionable information, 13–20
 - 2: measurement program should not be designed to cost-justify training, 20–22
 - 3: measure training as a support function, 22–26, 23*fig*, 180*fig*
 - 4: measurement program must meet needs of multiple audiences, 26–27
 - 5: measurement should be process not project, 27–31
 - 6: LMS is foundation for measurement, 31–33
 - 7: dedicate resources, 33–34
 - 8: start simply and evolve over time, 34
 - Training outcomes
 - difficulty of correlating training to, 46–48
 - integrating employee performance management with, 127–129, 128*fig*
 - organizational benefits of, 100–101
 - See also* Learning; Training
 - Training solution phase (Business Impact Model)
 - on delivered learning experience, 78
 - description of, 76
 - summary of, 88*fig*
 - on targeting and marketing program, 77
 - on training program design, 76–77
 - TTR (time to repair), 102
- U
- United Airlines, 33
 - Urgency alignment, 97–98

Utility measure
differentiating between performance
and, 93
Impact Measurement Framework,
92–93, 103fig, 104fig
Utilization measures, 105

V

“Voice of the Customer,” 68, 163, 166
See also Customer satisfaction measures
Volume measure, 105

W

WhatWorks research, 3
See also High Impact Learning Organi-
zation research

Z

Zeroed-In Technologies, 175
Zoomerang, 172