UNIT 4 EVALUATION OF TRAINING

Structure

4.0 Introduction

4.1 Objectives

4.2 Definition of Evaluation

4.3 Reasons for Evaluation

4.4 Approaches to Evaluation of Training

- 4.4.1 Goal-based Approach
- 4.4.2 Systems Approach

4.5 The Context of a Programme

4.6 Benefits of Training

4.7 Let Us Sum Up

4.8 Check Your Progress: Possible Answers

4.9 References

4.0 INTRODUCTION

Evaluation of training programmes must become an integral part of training policies and practices. Like the general evaluation of education programmes, evaluation of training programmes too has to follow principles and procedures relevant to its purpose. Evaluation results can impact on everyone involved in training. It is, therefore, essential that it be planned and carried out appropriately and without bias. The more it is separated from the training process, the more it can become an irrelevant, a distracting, suspected, even resented intrusion. Hence, we recommend that we should be actively involved in designing a training evaluation system to be used. It should be in harmony with what we are trying to do and how we plan to do it. Our optional contribution would be in assuring that the goals and methods of instruction are covered and are in consonance with the evaluation process. Of course, the means for measuring the variables identified and analysing the data gathered can be a demanding process. There is a distinction between an evaluation that is done as thoroughly as *possible* and one that is done as thoroughly as *practical.* The former approach views as uppermost the internal consistency of the evaluation (Does it validly assess achievement of all training objectives?). The latter seeks to find out what those using the evaluation want to know by the easiest, least costly, least intrusive measures.

The term 'evaluation' commonly implies a judgement of effective versus ineffective. The connotation constricts its value. Instead, it is better viewed as a process of providing *information* to those involved in training regarding questions they genuinely want answered. In a training context, it is difficult to know what exactly is going on within participants-what works and what does not, how the trainer is being perceived, what difference the experience actually is making. Evaluation data can obviously satisfy the trainer's curiosity, sponsors of training programmes will also be anxious. They are likely to wonder whether they made wise decisions in setting up the programme, whether they sent the right people for training, if it requires follow-up, etc. They too, need evaluation data. Further, trainees themselves are curious about their own growth, about how their newly learned

behaviours would be viewed by peers and about their impact on the organisation's output. Evaluation data can yield this information, as well.

Evaluation, therefore, simply is a feedback mechanism. When done well, we can use it as a mirror through which all involved in the training process can see meaningful reflections of themselves. They can use that cybernetic information to give themselves a pat on the back, or it can be used to guide adjustments in their *modus operandi*, making them more likely to achieve desired results. Keeping all this in view, we have designed this unit to discuss various issues involved in the evaluation of a training programme. We have begun it with definition of evaluation, reasons for evaluation, then presented an overview of the important frameworks for evaluation of training programmes as proposed by various authors. We have also discussed the changes effected by a training programme at knowledge, skills and attitudinal levels of the participants.

4.1 OBJECTIVES

After reading this unit, you should be able to:

- define evaluation;
- discuss the reasons for evaluation;
- describe various approaches to evaluation of training programme;
- explain the changes effected by a training programme at knowledge, skill and attitudinal levels of the participants; and
- discuss the benefits of training.

4.2 DEFINITION OF EVALUATION

During the last three decades there have been tremendous theoretical and methodological developments within the field of evaluation (Hurteau, Houle, & Mongiat, 2009). Evaluation has been defined in various ways. One of the most popular definitions by Thorpe (1988) states: *evaluation is the collection, analysis and interpretation of information about any aspect of a programme of education and training, as part of a recognized process of judging its effectiveness, its efficiency and any other outcomes it may have.*

According to Stufflebeam (cited in, Reeve & Peerbhoy, 2007, p.122) *evaluation is a study designed to assist some audience to assess an object's merit and worth*. Reeve and Peerbhoy (2007, p. 122) stated that evaluation "is a contested term", as 'evaluators' use the term to describe as assessment, or investigation of a programme, whilst others simply understand evaluation as being synonymous with applied research.

While analyzing definitions of evaluation Marsden (1991) stated that any definition of evaluation in the context of training and development should include a number of elements: what it is, what it involves and what it leads to. Evaluation is an analytical process. It involves the collection of subjective and objective data from a number of sources using a variety of strategies or techniques about training programme and the reduction of such data. Evaluation leads to the synthesis of the data into a report containing a summary of results and recommendations, with valid rationales about the training programme. Marsden also stated that a well written report presents arguments clearly and concisely so that decision makers have the evidence

before them for consideration of the trainers' recommendations. A written report provides a permanent record of the evaluation outcomes and the reasons for modification to a programme.

4.3 REASONS FOR EVALUATION

There are various reasons to conduct evaluation, such as,

- To determine the effectiveness of programme for participants;
- To report that programme objectives have been met;
- To provide information about service delivery that will be useful to programme staff and others;
- To enable programme staff to make changes that improve programme effectiveness.

Evaluation helps to foster accountability, determine whether programmes "make a difference", and give staff the information they need to improve service delivery (Muraskin, 1998).

Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, (2006) identified three specific reasons for evaluation of the training programmes.

i) To justify the existence and budget of the training department by showing how it contributes to the organization's objectives and goals.

ii) To decide whether to continue or discontinue training programmes.

iii) To gain information on how to improve future training programmes.

As compared to other functions of human resources training is considered to be the least important function by some of the organizations. In this sense training becomes optional, and its effectiveness to the organization depends on how the top executives' view training as a function of human resources. As a trainer in any organization you should earn trust and respect of the top management if you want to make it an important department that the organization will ever want to retain. In other words, you must justify the existence of your department.

The second reason for evaluating is to determine whether you should continue with the same training programme that you have been offering or you want to change it or you want to discontinue it. The contents and materials of some programmes may become obsolete. Some programmes, as those related with computers are constantly subject to change. Some programmes are offered on a pilot basis or some programmes are dry runs to see whether they can bring the results desired. These programmes should be evaluated to determine whether they should be continued. You have to take the cost benefit analysis of such programmes. If the cost incurred is more than the benefits generated, then the programme should be discontinued or modified.

To determine the effectiveness of a programme and ways in which it can be improved is the most common reason for evaluation. Usually, the decision to continue and discontinue is already been made, but to improve the training programme you need to be attentive. Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006) have given eight factors in question forms that are required to improve training programs:

1) To what extent does the subject content meet the needs of those attending?

2) Is the leader the one best qualified to teach?

3) Does the leader use the most effective methods for maintaining interest and teaching the desired attitudes, knowledge, and skills?

4) Are the facilities satisfactory?

5) Is the schedule appropriate for the participants?

6) Are the aids effective in improving communication and maintaining interest?

7) Was the coordination of the program satisfactory?

8) What else can be done to improve the program?

Check Your Progress 1

Answer the following questions in your own words. The questions are based on the previous sections. No answer has been provided at the end of the unit.

i) Define evaluation.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

ii) Point out three reasons of evaluation.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

4.4 APPROACHES TO EVALUATION OF TRAINING

Evaluation of training is a very complex process. When you think about evaluation many questions may come to your mind. What we should evaluate? Shall we evaluate content of training progrmme, strategies used, trainer's skills, technology used, attitudes of the trainees, time duration, cost, or other components of the training programme? According to this definition, we should gauge the effectiveness and efficiency of the training programme and other outcomes like change in knowledge, skills, attitude level of the trainee, increase in quality and quantity of production, and other benefits of the organisation.

Nickols (2010) stated that to evaluate training is to determine its value. However, value is relative. What is of great value to Mr 'X' is of little or no value to another. So, while evaluating training, you should know your target groups- the persons for whom the determination of value is to be made.

Nickols (2002) commented that there is no "cookbook" approach to the evaluation of training. If you want to evaluate your training properly, you should think about the purposes of the training, the purposes of evaluation, the audience for the results of the evaluation, the spans of points of which measurements will be taken, time span, and the overall framework to be utilized.

Eseryel (2002) noted that commonly used approaches to educational evaluation are typified by the instructional system development methodologies, which emerged in the USA in the 1950s and 1960s and are later represented in the works of Gagne and Briggs (1974), Goldstein (1993), and Mager (1962) and others. Evaluation is the final stage in a systematic approach, however, instructional system development models incorporate evaluation throughout the process (Tennyson, 1999).

Various approaches to educational evaluation have been reported (Bramley, 1991; Worthern & sanders, 1987). Some approaches are the followings:

- Goal-based evaluation
- Goal-free evaluation
- Responsive evaluation
- Systems evaluation
- Professional review
- Quasi-legal (Eseryel, 2002).

Various frameworks for evaluation of training programmes have been proposed by the authors under the influence of goal-based and systems-based approaches. One of the best known model of evaluation is Kirkpatrick's model (1959, 2006) that follows the goal-based evaluation approach and is based on simple questions that translate into four levels of evaluation: reaction, learning, behaviour, and results. Under systems approach the most well known models are: Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) model (Worthern & Sanders, 1987); Training Validation System (TVS) approach (Fitz-Enz, 1994); and Input, Process, Output, Outcome (IPO) model (Bushnell, 1990; cited in Eseryel, 2002).

4.4.1 Goal-based Approach

Kirkpatrick's Framework

Let us briefly discuss the four levels of evaluation stated by Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006).

Reaction

Evaluation of this level measures how those who participate in the programme react to it. Kirkpatrick calls it a measure of customer satisfaction. Organizations incur huge costs to send their staff for training. It is obvious that the reaction of participants was a measure of customer satisfaction; here the customers are the trainees who have been sent to take the trainings.

Reaction to in-house programmes is also a measure of customer satisfaction. Many in-house programs are mandatory for the employees i.e. participants are required to attend. Even their reaction is important as it can also help managers and trainers in deciding future training programme. So, positive reactions are just as important for trainers who run in-house programmes as they are for those who offer training programmes outside organizations.

Learning

The extent to which participants change attitudes, improve knowledge, and/or enhance skill as a result of attending the program is learning.

These are the three things that a training programme can accomplish. The specific objectives must be determined to evaluate training programmes. Skills can be improved by technical programmes. Training topics like leadership, motivation, and communication can aim at all three objectives.

Behaviour

Evaluation at this level measures the extent to which change in behaviour (job performance) has occurred because the participant attended the training programme. This is most important to assess whether the training objectives have been achieved.

In order for change to occur, four conditions are necessary:

- The person must have a desire to change.
- The person must know what to do and how to do.
- The person must work in the right climate.
- The person must be rewarded for changing.

Results

Results can be defined as the final results that occurred because the participants have attended the training programme. Increased production, improved quality, decreased costs, increased sales, etc. are all the results of training programmes. The final objectives of the training programme need to be stated in these terms.

This is the most difficult form of training evaluation. It is complex, time consuming and expensive. Many a cases (both educational and other organisations) the trainers or the organisers do not use the entire model. The training comes to an end by evaluating only at the reaction level and some cases the learning level.

Return-on-Investment

Return-on-investment (ROI) is the ultimate level of evaluation (Phillips, 1998).

This is a performance measure used to evaluate the efficiency of an investment. To calculate ROI, the benefit or return of an investment is divided by the const of the investment. The result is expressed as a percentage or a ratio. The ROI formula is:

$$ROI = \frac{\text{(Gain from investment- Cost of investment)}}{\text{Cost of Investment}}$$

4.4.2 Systems Approach

The CIPP model

In the 1960's Daniel L. Stufflebeam recognized the shortcomings of evaluation methods available in the literature and developed the Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP) model. The CIPP model is a comprehensive framework for guiding formative and summative

evaluations of programmes, projects, personnel, products, institutions and systems (Stufflebeam, 1968). Stufflebeam (1999) claimed that the model has been used by many around the world in short-term and long-term investigations.

The CIPP framework aims to provide an analytic and rational basis from programmed decision making, based on a cycle of planning, structuring, implementing and revising decisions examined through a different aspect of evaluation such as context, input, process and product. Context evaluation provides information for the development of and evaluation of mission, vision, values, goals and objectives, and priorities. It defines the characteristics of the environment, determines the goals and specific objectives, identifies and diagnoses the problems or barriers which might inhibit achieving the goals and objectives. Input evaluation provides information for the development of programmes, designs through evaluation of data bases, internal and external stakeholders' interests. It designs a training programme to meet the objectives, determines the resources needed to deliver the programme, determines whether staff and available resources are adequate to implement the progamme.

Process evaluation develops ongoing evaluation of the implementation of major strategies through various tactical programmes to accept, refine or modify the programme design. It provides decision makers with information necessary to determine if the programme needs to be accepted, amended or terminated. Product evaluation identify and assess outcomes, short-term and long-term to help staff keep an enterprise focused on achieving important outcomes and ultimately to help the broader group of users gauge the effort's success in meeting target needs (Stufflebeam, 1999).

IPO model

The Input, Process, Output (IPO) model given by Bushnell (1990) is a comprehensive view on evaluation. The first stage indicates the evaluation of system performance indicators such as trainee qualifications, availability of materials, appropriateness of training, and so on. Process embraces planning, design, development and delivery of training programmes. Output indicates gathering data resulting from the training interventions, whereas, the last stage outcomes indicates longer-term results associated with improvement in the corporation's bottom line- its profitability, competitiveness, etc.

An integrated evaluation model

Brinkerhoff (1988, p 67) provides six stages of HRD programme development and operation. These stages are:

- To determine that an identified problem represents a traianing need and to determine what the real goals are.
- To determine the most appropriate training strategy.
- To determine if the chosen strategy is successfully implemented.
- To determine if learning occurred and to what extent.
- To determine usage outcomes (at individual level).
- To determine impacts and worth (at organizational level).

This model is integrated to include instructional activities in the planning, design and implementation stages of the instructional process.

Check Your Progress 2

Answer the following question within 80 words. Compare your answer with the one given at the end of the unit.

Fill in the blanks:

i) CIPP stands for .....

ii) IPO stands for .....

iii) The four levels of evaluation as proposed by Kirkpatrick are:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Instructional System Development Model

This training model was developed to answer the training problems. This is popular in various organisation because it is concerned with the training need on the job performance. Training objectives are very clear, narrow and specific. Objectives are formulated on the basis of job responsibilities. Individual performance is measured on the basis of the defined objectives. This model comprised of five stages:

i) Analysis of training needs: Organisational, job and individual need analysis are made at this stage.

ii) Planning: In this stage objectives are set, materials (contents) and media are selected, methods of evaluation are identified.

iii) Development: Materials are developed. These include handbooks, handouts, workbooks, visual aids, models for demonstrations, and so on.

iv) Execution: Logistics are arranged. These include equipments, hall arrangements, food, travel, training accessories, etc. and the training takes place.

v) Evaluation: To ensure that the training has achieved all objectives. Strengths and weakness, if any, are identified for improvement in the future.

Training Evaluation Quintet

The Training Evaluation Quintet advocated by Rae (2002) consists of senior management, the trainer, line management, the trainer manager and the trainee. Each member of the Quintet has roles and responsibilities (see Rae, 2002).

However, if there is no Quintet support a full evaluation process may be followed which is summarized below (source: Lesli Rae content main workplace learning evaluation content and tools 2004-10; Alan Chapman edit and contextual materials 2004-10; online).

- Training needs identification and setting of objectives by the organisation;
- Planning, design and preparation of the training programmes against the objectives;
- Pre-course identification of people with needs and completion of the preparation required by the training programme;
- Provision of the agreed training programmes;
- Pre-course briefing meeting between the learner and the line manager;
- Pre-course or start of programme identification of learners' existing knowledge, skills and attitudes;
- Interim validation as programme proceeds;
- Assessment of terminal knowledge, skills etc., and completion of perceptions/change assessment;
- Completioin of end-of-programme reactionnaire;
- Completion of end-of-programme learning questionnaire or key objectives learning questionnaire;
- Completion of action plan;
- Post-course debriefing meeting between learner and line manager;
- Line manager observation of implementation progress;
- Review meetings to discuss progress or implementation;
- Final implementation review meeting; and
- Assessment of Return-on-Investment.

4.5 THE CONTEXT OF A PROGRAMME

The context of a programme or an event refers, naturally, to the circumstances outside and beyond the programme itself. Evaluation of this context might include investigation into why the programme is being funded/run and what different aims and objectives of various stakeholders might be in this process. Depending on the overall purpose of evaluation, any data gathered from various stakeholders about aims and objectives might be used to confront other stakeholders with different perceptions and values as a way of checking that the programme really is representative of different views about its purpose. Data gathered about the context may also include a consideration of why the evaluation itself is being done since, particularly when extra funding and resources are involved, it is often even more political than the establishment of training and development itself.

Leaving aside political considerations for the time being, there are two basic orientations to identifying training and developmental needs for the work force. The first is concerned with the *maintenance* of the present functioning of the organisation and may sometimes have a remedial flavor to it. In practice this may be done by collating developmental recommendations from the workforce after performance appraisals have taken place, or by the 'template' method of identifying the ideal skills for the workforce in the current organisation and hence designing training programmes to close the

gap between this ideal state and the actual abilities and skills of personnel as presently identified. Another approach is to concentrate on the nature of work performed by each one of them and to ask them individually about those aspects of their work that they find more or less difficult.

Yet another way of considering the context of training and development is to evaluate *organisational cultures,* both as experienced and as desired. Cultures may also be examined in more everyday terms. A result that frequently crops up is that major decisions are heavily influenced by technical considerations and by professional groupings within an organisation. For example, in modern industrial organisations there are increasing pressures to emphasise commercial and business considerations in making decisions (thus affecting the wider culture of the organisation itself) and in many public service organisations, there is an increasing emphasis placed upon *managerial* considerations.

Since training aims at effecting changes at the levels of knowledge, skills, and attitudes, evaluation of a training programme also should appropriately be designed to measure the impact of training at these levels.

Knowledge levels:

i) the basic level is that of isolated pieces of information, i.e., ability to recall simple lists or state simple rules, knowing a range of simple facts about the job area.

ii) a higher level is to be able to arrange a good many of the pieces of information into procedures, how to do things, how to order sets of actions, etc.

iii) higher still is the knowledge with which to analyse any particular situation for its key elements and thus to make a decision about whether procedure 'S' is more likely to be successful than, for example, procedure 'M'. This is essentially the skill, i.e., informed judgement, to be able to select the most appropriate procedures or method of doing something, given the nature of the problem, the organisational context, etc.

The implications of these levels for training could be

- analysing what is required at each of the three levels for satisfactory job performance,
- discovering what the trainees know at each level before they attend the training,
- trying to plug the gap, if any, and
- communicating to the institution, to what extent they are below satisfactory job performance levels at the end of training.

Level of skills

- the basic level is to be able to *communicate;* and for this it is necessary to be able to label items, to identify parts, to name the main components of distance education, etc.
- the second level involves the *ability to perform simple procedures,* often with the use of instructions or notes,

- the third level involves *performing physically skilled actions.* These usually involve hand-eye co-ordination and learning them requires considerable practice. This takes one to a still higher level that involves judging whether a piece of skilled work is of acceptable quality, etc.

Attitude change

The process of attitude training has the following four main strategies:

i) *identifying desirable attitudes* which are expected to lead to some improvement, usually the culture or climate, in some parts of the organisation. The attitudes are usually of a fairly general nature like positive management; openness and trust in the workplace; being less prescriptive and more likely to delegate responsibility.

ii) *assessing where the* participants are with respect to the desired attitude. This is usually done by self-analysis, often with an inventory. The participants' perceptions of their 'normal' work behaviour are classified and shown to have some categories which differ form the ideal.

iii) *convincing the participants of the value of the desired* attitudes by supplying examples, models or counselling. This is reinforced by allowing them to experience some success in experimental learning, perhaps by role plays.

iv) *ensuring the acceptance on the part of participants* of the new attitude. This they will display in their behaviour when they return to work.

Evaluating trainee learning

Training is intended to make the participants more competent than they were at entry. Therefore, *assessment of their competence* in the target areas of training is an important step in evaluation. What is to be measured at this point depends upon the *learning objectives* of the programme. We can specify these by identifying:

- the facts/concepts (principles, theories) they need to know
- the techniques (skills, methods, procedures) to be adopted
- the process involved in finding out where, when, how, for whom to apply the knowledge learned.
- the attitude or value that underlie participant-acceptance or enthusiasm for the training context.

Factual Knowledge

Items on the measuring instrument are likely to differ depending on the nature of the learning objectives. The most basic form of learning, *factual knowledge,* can be measured by *short-answer questions* which require the respondent to fill in missing information and ones that call for *recognistion* of information (these are assessed by true/false or multiple-choice questions). The choice among these types of questions depends upon how those facts are to be used on the job (that is, must the learner memorise them or can they be looked up whenever they are needed?).

Conceptual knowledge

We can test *conceptual knowledge* by *short essay questions,* each of these call for the learner to relate to an aspect of what has to be learned and can be expressed in three to five lines. This permits a test to cover a fair number of points and enables pinpointing where gaps in knowledge exist.

Techniques and skills

The ability to carry out the techniques or procedures taught need to be assessed in as active and pragamatic a way as possible. (Sometimes, a performance test is obvious and simple to devise).

As learning goals become more complex, developing useful evaluation methods is increasingly difficult, for example, as we seek to asses whether trainees can *apply processes appropriately,* such as problem-solving skills, that must be integrated in the ongoing counselling session or at an intense crisis point on the job. *One cannot measure validly learning goals that require judgement, timing, tact, patience, and so on*, on a written test taken under conditions that are insulated form the pressures of interaction with others. Sometimes, more active evaluation experiences can be incorporated within the context of a training session. These could include simulations or role-playing episodes. This critical ingredient that expands these activities beyond being just practice and try-it-out sessions is the *use of systematic feedback,* that is, means for recording and comparing trainee behaviour in relation to the learning objectives for the programme. After each experimental evaluation exercise trainees can assess their own behaviour: *peers can observe and comment* upon what they see or the trainer can note what is being done and identify instances of component functioning and approaches that could be improved.

Attitudes

The final domain requiring evaluation is the trainee's *attitudes* or values about the training content. It usually is not enough for them simply to know the ideas a programme is intended to teach them; they also must *believe* that those ideas are worthwhile and be predisposed, or even enthusiastic, about putting those ideas into practice. The simplest way to evaluate the attitudes with which learners emerge form a workshop is to include, in whatever measurement instrument is used, items that call for this information.

Check Your Progress 3

Note: a) Space is given below for your answer.

b) Compare your answer with the one provided at the end of the unit.

Give at least one example each of changes effected by a training programme at the knowledge, skills and attitudinal levels of academics joining a distance teaching institution.

.....

.....

.....

.....

4.6 BENEFITS OF TRAINING

Even if evaluation data indicate that trainees have fulfilled the programme's learning objectives, one cannot be assured that they actually will transfer or apply those new competencies in their work roles.

There are several ways to overcome these problems and obtain valid, comprehensive information about how trainees are performing.

One way to get a reading on trainees' on-the-job behaviour and simultaneously to learn about the environment, in which they work, is to ask people whom they contact to report their observations and opinions of the trainees' behaviour.

Most training programmes are directly or indirectly financed by the organizations that employ the people who participate in them. A fundamental issue in evaluation, therefore, is assessing the degree to which the functioning of the sponsoring organisation has been affected by that training. When we shift from looking at the behaviour of specific individuals to looking for evidence that quantifies their impact on the organisation in which they work, we face an increasingly demanding challenge.

The most important step is identifying indices that reveal how effectively an organisation is operating.

The impact of training on a sponsoring organisation differs depending on the purposes which the organisation is intended to fulfil.

The process of training itself can have effects that extend well beyond the learning objectives consciously intended for it, these include its impact on the trainees, the trainer, sponsoring organisation and even people not directly associated with the training programme at all.

Trainees can gain increased satisfaction, simulation and pride, in the work that they do. The experience of learning new ideas and methods can be an inherently gratifying event, which enhances one's morale and keeps a job feeling fresh and invigorating. In an era in which worker alienation is increasing, training experiences offer a countervailing force. They can give an employee a sense of being recognised, affirmed, and supported. Often, new learning that is useful on the job also has relevance in situations elsewhere.

Trainees can benefit from their own training experiences, as well. Learning events in which all parties feel stimulated, surprised and/or personally expanded generally are the most successful. The process of professional growth can continue at every training event if trainers consciously seek input form the people they face. This process is more likely to provide honest and thorough information, if a systematic approach is taken.

Organizations also reap several "extracurricular" gains from the training programme which they sponsor. Recruitment of personnel, particularly those who perceive themselves to be upwardly mobile in technical and/or academic positions, is facilitated for an organization that has an outstanding training programme. Appropriate career counselling can also be provided by a trainer who has an opportunity to see what employees can do in tasks unrelated to their current position. A training programme also builds loyalty and productivity among personnel.

Finally, society at large is enriched by people who can do their jobs well and who enjoy them. These people contribute their skills to the professional, religious, political, and service groups they join in that they are healthier mentally and physically and they carry out a share of nation's economic performance. We are all interdependent and to that extent worthwhile training benefits everyone.

At this stage, you may be getting overwhelmed by the range of evaluation approaches and styles that are available. However, the aim of this section has been to demonstrate that there are a great many starting points, assumptions

and purposes that can direct the course of evaluation: we should not necessarily take any particular style for granted. It greatly depends on the purpose of evaluation, the expertise and resources available.

Notwithstanding the above discussion on the evaluation of training programmes in general, in the context of distance education quite a lot would depend on the institutional concerns, its approach to training, the constraints and the anxieties in genuinely evaluating a training programme. The evaluation criteria as such would vary from the set notions of evaluation which might have been valid in the conventional and culture specific (mostly western) situations. Some distance teaching institutions may go in for a professional approach towards training. In that case evaluation will become an integral part of a training programme, and the evaluation criteria would be developed specifically to judge the outcome of a programme. There are institutions which recognise the need for training but do not pay much attention to studying its impact on their activities. In this case, training itself would become a ritual, including the evaluation of it. So, the genuineness of evaluation of a training programme depends not on the mechanical application of well defined criteria but on the degree of seriousness with which a newly set up distance teaching institution uses it. The challenge here is not so much in recognising the need for training and the evaluation of it as in internalising both. Where training gets its rightful place, the quality of services (in our context distance teaching) is assured. And training improves its own quality by subjecting itself to rigorous evaluation continuously.

4.7 LET US SUM UP

Evaluation is the collection, analysis and interpretation of information about any aspect of a programme of education and training, as part of a recognized process of judging its effectiveness, its efficiency and any other outcomes it may have.

Evaluation determines the effectiveness of a training programme, helps to decide whether to continue or discontinue training programme, and provide information for improvement of the future training programme.

There are various approaches or frameworks for evaluation. The goal-based and systems-based approaches are popular.

The Kirkpatrick's model that follows the goal-based evaluation approach is based on simple questions that translate into four levels of evaluation: reaction, learning, behaviour, and results. Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) model and Input, Process, Output, Outcome (IPO) model are two important system-based approach we have discussed in this unit.

Training aims at effecting changes at the levels of knowledge, skills, and attitudes, so evaluation of a training programme also should appropriately be designed to measure the impact of training at these levels.

4.8 CHECK YOUR PROGRESS: POSSIBLE ANSWERS

Check Your Progress 2

i) Context, Input, Process, Product

ii) Input, Process, Output

iii) Reaction, learning, behaviour, results

Check Your Progress 3

After training, the new recruited staff should be able to do at least the following:

i) At the knowledge level, they should be able to give an account of the growth of distance education during the last two centuries and explain the relevant concepts.

ii) At the skills level, they should be able to outline and prepare a self-instructional unit (i.e. the format).

iii) At the attitudinal level, they should be able to appreciate that distance teaching is also an effective mode of teaching, and their own subjects/ disciplines can be taught through this system.

4.9 REFERENCES

Brock, M.N., et al. (1992). Journaling together: collaborative diary-keeping and teacher development. In J. Flowerdew et al (eds.) *Language Teacher Education*, Hong Kong, City Polytechnique of Hong Kong.

Brinkerhoff, R.O. (1988). An integrated evaluation model for HRD. *Training and Development Journal*, February, 66-68.

Bushnell, D.S. (1990). Input, process, output: A model for evaluating training. *Training and Development Journal*, 44(3), 41-43.

Fitz-Enz, J. (1994). Yes…you can weigh training's value. *Training*, 31 (7), 54- 58.

Eseryel, D. (2002) Approaches to evaluation of training: theory & practice. *Educational Technology & Society*, 5(2). Retrieved on August 12, 2010 from http://www.ifets.info/journals/5_2/eseryel.html

Gagne, R. & Briggs, L. J. (1974). *Principles of Instructional Design*. New York: Holton, Rinehart & Winston.

Goldstein, I. (1993). *Training in Organizations: Needs Assessment, Development, & Evaluation. Monterey*, CA: Brooks-Cole.

Hurteau, M., Moule, S. & Mongiat, S. (2009). How legitimate and justified are judgements in program evaluation? *Evaluation.* 15(3), 307-319.

Indira Gandhi National Open University Act, 1985 (No. 50 of 1985) and the Statutes of the University.

Keegan, D. (1986). *The Foundations of Distance Education*. London, Croom Helm.

Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1959). Techniques for evaluating training programmes. *Journal of the American Society of Training Directors*, 13, 3-26.

Kirkpatrick, D.L. and Kirkpatrick, J.D. (2006). *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels,* Berrett-Koehler ISBN:9781576753484

Mager, R.F. (1962). *Preparing Objectives for Programmed Instruction*. San Francisco, CA: Fearson Publishers.

Marsden, J. (1991). Evaluation: Towards a definition and statement of purpose. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*, 7(1), 31-38. Retrieved on August 13, 2010 from http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet7/marsden.html

Muraskin, L. (1998). *Understanding Evaluation: The Way to Better Prevention Programs.* ED.gov. (Retrieved on August 23, 2010 from http://www2.ed.gov/offices/.../primer1.html

Nickols, F. (2002). *Evaluating training: there is no "cookbook" approach*. Distance Consulting LLC. Retrieved on July, 2010 from http://www.nickols.us/evaluating_training.htm

Rae, L. (2002). *Assessing the Value of Your Training*, England: Gower.

Reeve, J. & Peerbhoy, D. (2007). Evaluating the evaluation: Understanding the utility and limitations of evaluation as a tool for organizational learning. *Health Education Journal.* 66(2), 120-131.

Sibbald, A. (1998). It is not just courses: other ways of developing higher education support staff. In Doidge, J. et. al.(eds.) *Developing Staff and Allied Staff in Higher Education,* London, Kogan Page.

Stufflebeam, D.L. (1999). Foundational Models for 21st Century Program Evaluation.

Stufflebeam, D.L. (1968). *Evaluation as Enlightenment for Decision-Making*. Columbus, Ohio: Evaluation Center, Ohio State University

Tennyson, R.D. (1999). Instructional development and ISD4 methodology. *Performance Improvement*, 38(6), 19-27.

Worthen, B.R. & Sanders, J.R. (1987). *Educational Evaluation*. New York: Longman.

References (evaluation of training)

Brinkerhoff, R.O. (1988). An integrated evaluation model for HRD. *Training and Development Journal,* February, 66-68.

Bushnell, D.S. (1990). Input, process, output: A model for evaluating training. *Training and Development Journal*, 44(3), 41-43.

Fitz-Enz, J. (1994). Yes…you can weigh training's value. *Training*, 31 (7), 54 – 58.

Eseryel, D. (2002) Approaches to evaluation of training: theory & practice. *Educational Technology & Society*, 5(2). Retrieved on August 12, 2010 from http://www.ifets.info/journals/5_2/eseryel.html

Gagne, R. & Briggs, L. J. (1974). *Principles of Instructional Design*. New York: Holton, Rinehart & Winston.

Goldstein, I. (1993). *Training in Organizations: Needs Assessment, Development, & Evaluation. Monterey*, CA:Brooks-Cole.

Hurteau, M., Moule, S. & Mongiat, S. (2009). How legitimate and justified are judgements in program evaluation? *Evaluation.* 15(3), 307-319.

Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1959). Techniques for evaluating training programmes. Journal of the American Society of Training Directors, 13, 3-26.

Kirkpatrick, D.L. and Kirkpatrick, J. D. (2006). Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels, Berrett-Koehler ISBN:9781576753484

Mager, R.F. (1962). *Preparing Objectives for Programmed Instruction*. San Francisco, CA:Fearson Publishers.

Marsden, J. (1991). Evaluation: Towards a definition and statement of purpose. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*, 7(1), 31-38. Retrieved on August 13, 2010 from http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet7/marsden.html

Muraskin, L. (1998). Understanding Evaluation: The Way to Better Prevention Programs. ED.gov. (Retrieved on August 23, 2010 from http://www2.ed.gov/offices/.../primer1.html

Nickols, F (2002). Evaluating training: there is no "cookbook" approach. Distance Consulting LLC. Retrieved on July, 2010 from http://www.nickols.us/evaluating_training.htm

Rae, L (2002). Assessing the Value of Your Training, England: Gower.

Reeve, J. & Peerbhoy, D. (2007). Evaluating the evaluation: Understanding the utility and limitations of evaluation as a tool for organizational learning. *Health Education Journal.* 66(2), 120-131.

Stufflebeam, D.L. (1999). Foundational Models for 21st Century Program Evaluation.

Stufflebeam, D.L. (1968). Evaluation as Enlightenment for Decision-Making. Columbus, Ohio: Evaluation Center, Ohio State University

Tennyson, R.D. (1999). Instructional development and ISD4 methodology. *Performance Improvement*, 38(6), 19-27.

Worthen, B.R. & Sanders, J. R. (1987). *Educational Evaluation*. New York: Longman.