

# Annual Trainers' Retreat

April 2003 Bhurban-Pakistan

**Annual Trainers' Retreat**  
April 2003 Bhurban-Pakistan



Human Resource Development  
Network



The report was produced by an editorial team consisting of  
Mr. Roomi S. Hayat, Ms. Robeela Bangash,  
Mr. Manzoor Khaliq and Ms. Ayesha Shaukat.

**HRDN** reserves all rights of ownership of this document. No  
part of this publication may be reproduced, stored or  
transmitted in any form or by any means - electronic,  
photocopying, recording or otherwise - without permission  
from **HRDN**.

*Copyright @ July 2003*

The statements made and views expressed in this report are  
those of the presenters at ATR, and does not necessarily  
reflect those of HRDN.

Published in July 2003  
by the **Human Resource Development Network**  
Islamabad, Pakistan.

Designed & Produced by **UN GRAFIX** Tel: 4451236

# Annual Trainers' Retreat

April 2003 Bhurban-Pakistan



Human Resource Development  
Network



## Contents

- ▶ Introduction
- ▶ Thematic Issues

### Proceedings Day 1

- ▶ Initiating the Retreat: the history by: Mr. Qadeer Baig, NGORC
- ▶ Achieving Quality through Training Evaluations by: Mr. Shadab Fariduddin, NGORC
- ▶ Training Evaluation Methodologies: Best Practises by: Mr. Roomi S. Hayat, NRSP-IRM

### Proceedings Day 2

- ▶ Utilization Studies and Impact Assessments: 'Sideline' Results by: Mr. Kamran Akbar, PPAF
- ▶ All Members' Meeting by: Mr. Sajjad Ahmad
- ▶ Plans for International HRD Congress by: Mr. Ozair Hanafi
- ▶ Next Steps

### Annexures

- ▶ Initiating the Retreat, the presentation by Mr. Qadeer Baig, Deputy Director, NGORC
- ▶ Evaluation Standards for Training Effectiveness by Mr. Shadab Fariduddin, Academic Coordinator, NGORC
- ▶ Training Evaluation Methodologies - Best Practices of NRSP- IRM by Mr. Roomi S. Hayat, Chairperson, HRDN
- ▶ Training Evaluation: Structures and Processes by Mr. Kamran Akbar, General Manager (HID) PPAF
- ▶ Tools of Evaluation
- ▶ Programme
- ▶ List of participants

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

AHK NCRD & MA	Akhtar Hameed Khan Centre for Rural Development and Municipal Administration
AKDN	Aga Khan Development Network
GBTI	Ghazi Barotha Taraqiati Idara
HRDN	Human Resource Development Network
IRM	Institute of Rural Management
LUMS	Lahore University of Management Sciences
NGORC	NGO Resource Centre
NRSP	National Rural Support Programme
OBL	Outcome Based Learning
PAKSID	Pakistan Canada Social Institutions Development Programme
PPAF	Pakistan Poverty Alleviation Fund
SASMoN	South Asia Social Mobilisation Network
SDPI	Sustainable Development Policy Institute
SPO	Strengthening Participatory Organisation
TAG-T	Technical Advisory Group on Training



The Annual Trainers Retreat, initiated in 1999, provides an informal setting for trainers to meet and discuss issues relevant to training quality and outreach and share experiences. The Fifth Retreat in this series, was organised with similar objectives by the Human Resource Development Network, Islamabad. In this event, Training Managers and Trainers representing 28 public and private (non profit and corporate) sector met to discuss various tools and methodologies used for Training Evaluation.

#### **The Objectives of the Retreat are:**

- ▶ To provide a forum for improving the effectiveness of training provided by citizen sector training institutions
- ▶ Develop a resource group for capacity building of Trainers
- ▶ Sharing best practices
- ▶ Establish industry standards in training

HRDN brings together emerging and diversified groups of trainers, from around the country, who provide training and education both in the "not for the profit" and the corporate sector. The activities of the Network are conducted in line with its mission of enhancing the professional excellence of its members through meaningful development interventions by facilitating research, training and capacity building endeavours and sharing information, resources and expertise at national and international levels.



The Annual Trainers Retreat (ATR) is one of the major events organized by HRDN, as a part of its institutional and staff capacity building efforts, for its members. The activity is aimed at enabling the members to learn and work together with a view to improve the skills in training and capacity building. This meeting not only brings together the different generations of trainers and professionals but also creates a platform for the exchange of training experiences and new innovations by the trainers.

Till the year 2001, the Annual Trainers Retreat was being organized by NGO Resource Centre Karachi. Later, HRDN joined hands with NGORC to take up this assignment with a specific theme every year. From this year (2003) HRDN has organized this event, independently, with a wide participation of its members and other prominent trainers. The contribution of NGORC in initiation of this event is gratefully acknowledged.

The theme of this year's Trainers' Retreat was "Quality Standards in Training Evaluation Methodologies". Eminent speakers presented a variety of papers on the theme. All the professional members of HRDN, who are also trainers in different fields, were invited to get together at this juncture. About 60 trainers and HRD practitioners from across the country attended this momentous occasion.

This event provided an ideal opportunity, for trainers and the network members, to share their current training activities and interests to the other fellow members. In addition to the group discussions and presentation, the evening informal gathering (cricket match this time) and BBQ dinner proved to be very relaxing and provided the participants with the opportunity to informally spent time together. This fifth retreat of trainers received more than fifteen appreciations and congratulatory letters from members and participants, coming from government and non-government organizations.

A group of journalist from reputed newspapers of the country also participated in the retreat to give coverage to the proceedings of the event. They also shared their experiences with the participants. This experience sharing and learning workshop concluded on April 6, 2003.

The next trainer's retreat will be held in April 2004. The retreat ended with the expectations that the sixth Annual Trainers' Retreat will once again provide the members further opportunity to share their knowledge and experience.

### Setting the Scene

Ms. Robeela Bangash, Honorary Network Coordinator, HRDN and Mr Roomi S. Hayat, Chairperson welcomed the participants to the Retreat. Mr. Hayat appreciated the support provided by NGO Resource Centre Karachi (NGORC) for this event. Mr. Hayat was happy that the HRDN and NGORC had collaborated in organising this event in the past which the NGORC had developed over four years, handing it to HRDN in 2002. He said that the Retreat is an initiative which is aimed at creating a conducive environment for learning in an informal setting. He expressed his happiness to see more



HRDN members present at this Retreat than at the ones held in the past. New synergies and partnerships could evolve in this environment where trainers representing public, non-profit, corporate and the education sector from not only Pakistan but Afghanistan as well were present. He said, this was the very first of the retreats, which was organised by HRDN, independently and therefore he would like all the participants to provide feedback on its usefulness and impact.

Ms. Bangash initiated the introductory session requesting the participants to briefly describe their expectations from the Retreat. These expectations can be summarized as follows:

Sharing problems relating to training and evaluations

- ▶ Identifying issues relevant to evaluations through different approaches
- ▶ Standardising training quality
- ▶ Discussing challenges in evaluations, training outcomes and impact so that the workshop leads to concrete steps towards quality indicators
- ▶ Meeting colleagues from different organisations to exchange ideas and discuss latest developments in their work

### Initiating the Retreat: the history

Mr. Qadeer Baig delivered the first session on the rationale for conducting the Annual Retreat. He said that he was happy to find old faces at the Fifth Retreat, which included the organisers, and supporters. He pointed out the interesting fact that there were more trainers from the north of Pakistan in this event than from the South as had been the case in the past.

He explained that this was a forum for enhancing the capacities of trainers belonging to training institutions from different parts of the country. Two retreats each had been organised at Lahore University of Management Sciences and the NGO Resource Centre Karachi. Mr. Qadeer Baig described the process through which the Retreat had emerged as a forum focusing on improving the effectiveness of training provided by citizen sector training institutions, developing a resource group for capacity building of Trainers, sharing best practices and setting industry standards in training.





At the first Retreat organised at LUMS in 1999, attempts were made to *map* the training sector in terms of nature of the services the training organisations have been offering in the urban and rural areas. The concerns voiced by trainers related to training effectiveness and training needs assessment and therefore the idea of setting up a formal trainers' network were also being discussed.

At the next Retreat, the idea of a Network was expanded and to create a network of training institutions was discussed. Distance learning, tools and materials available on the internet for trainers was discussed by David Bonbright (AKDN) along with managing education on a non-profit basis. It was further decided that the Retreat should be an event focusing on a specific theme, which would be decided upon by the participants. While the organisers( NGORC) prepared the discussion papers on the idea, the participants would also share experiences specifically relating to them and their work.

Values in Training' was therefore selected as theme for Retreat in 2001. It was felt that training provided to and by the citizen sector organizations in Pakistan is not based on any set of values. This absence of a *value framework* results in a semiconscious disregard for training norms. Unless a normative dimension is added to training, it often fails to deliver desired results and, even if it delivers, the outcome seldom corresponds to acceptable international standards. Most of the citizen sector trainers are either self-taught or have received intermittent trainings without a value-based curriculum. A clear distinction of right from wrong was felt not only to be useful but also necessary for increasing effectiveness of training. The meeting resulted in drafting a Code of Conduct for trainers, training managers, and trainees. At the Retreat 2002 organised jointly by NGORC and HRDN, effective training methodologies were discussed with a review of 'interactive learning' for enhancing quality and outreach. The Code was again redrafted and finalized. HRDN offered to disseminate the code widely and work out a process for its implementation. The Code was endorsed and adopted by HRDN members at the All Members Meeting in August 2002.

Mr. Qadeer Baig concluded by saying that he was happy that the retreat had developed into an interesting forum through the synergies it had created between not only these two institutions NGORC and HRDN, but many other institutions whose representatives had attended and met each other at the Retreat. He thanked AKF(P) PAKSID support which had enabled NGORC and other partner organisations in their capacity building efforts. (*Presentation slides as annex 1*)

### **Achieving Quality through Training Evaluations** By Shadab Fariduddin <sup>1</sup>

What sort of questions does one get on an evaluation questionnaire after training? The usual ones: on a scale of one (low) to five (high), how would you rate the facilitator/ trainer? Were the course contents up-to-date, relevant and useful? How does the training relate to your job? Was the course material easy to understand? Were the food and logistics satisfactory? What do you feel of the time management during the course? The standard feedback is "the instructor was knowledgeable but he coughed too much", "Too many hand outs",



<sup>1</sup> Based on Mr. Shadab Fariduddin's presentation and discussions at the Retreat. Mr. Fariduddin is Academic Coordinator at NGORC, Karachi.



"err- let me think- I registered because this sounded good, and we had the money for staff training", "Tea was served hot but food was too spicy", "XYZ took long to finish" or "ABC went too quick" and "the air-conditioning should be improved". Typically, feedback of this sort is taken from the trainee, the trainer and the facilitator, if this is what training evaluation is all about then trainings effectiveness, impact and quality are elusive characteristics, which cannot be quantified directly into what a trainee has learned. The question would therefore be if there is a link between good food during training and good performance at work? Does better air-conditioning really condition the trainee's skills? Is providing course material synonymous with the transfer of knowledge. How do logistics play a part in ensuring a qualitative impact of training on the trainee?

Does one measure the effectiveness and the quality of a training through a *needs assessment* process, the *number* of people who sign up, pay and attend the sessions, trainee's *satisfaction* at the end of the training, the measurable *change in knowledge* or skills, their *ability to tackle problems at work*, how they *intend to use* the skill/knowledge at the workplace, the trainee's *self-report* that their job performance changed for the better, and the report from the trainee's manager that their *job performance changed* as a result of their changed behaviour / skill through the training.

The questions raised above only quantify the magnitude of the problem. Therefore both the *approach* and the *tools* of evaluation must be changed. The results of training can be deduced from a sampling of information *before, during and after* the training is conducted. The emphasis should be on the knowledge and the improved abilities of the trainee to carry out their work by attempting to capture the individual learning before, during, after and in the workplace.

Using this approach, a trainee who has been selected for a course in Resource Mobilization should be asked to answer the following questions *before, during and after* the training: on a scale of one (low) to five (high), rate your knowledge/ ability to analyse global trends in aid and philanthropy, defining features of the citizen sector, draw up the code of ethics to guide resource mobilisation practices, analyse present income patterns.

The aim would be to capture individual learning from the training through the perspectives of adult learners (who are the best judges of what they have or have not learned). The ratings at different stages would attempt to quantify the training process and the comparative progress (individually and jointly).

Evaluating results and effectiveness from training are the most difficult to accomplish. Evaluating these often involves the use of indicators -- measurables you can and cannot see.

Do trainers and training managers deliberately shy away from evaluations? Feedback from trainees will contain like or dislike of a trainer or a session by a student. Does the answer lie with peer evaluations.

Just as feedback from the participants is important, the response of the institution is more important in terms of how evaluation is used as a tool for quality enhancement. It should be such that a circle of continual quality improvement is initiated.



These questions are designed not just to evaluate what/ who may be good or bad. It is about evaluating the relevance, the content, the structure, the profile, the resources and the performance of all those who are involved: the institution, the trainer, and the trainee. The process is carefully designed to improve the quality of programme as well as the quality of the study environment.

The evaluation tool would be aligned to knowledge of the subject before the training, value-added during the course, the comparative progress of the trainee during the course, and the progress rate during the training. Evaluation was therefore aligned in terms of "objectives" or "outcomes", defining training with relation to "learning outcomes", aligning these outcomes in terms of "skills needed and acquired" to enhance job performance, aligning training events to competency profiles of the trainee's profession and most important of all aligning evaluation through both dimensions, depth and breadth.<sup>2</sup>

Therefore the objective of training is aligned from the perspective of resource mobilization on the purpose and the learning objectives required from the training, tied with job performance, cost effectiveness and should feed into training improvement. It is important that each session should be evaluated in order to find out which session has contributed the most towards the trainee's learning, and increased his performance. Such evaluation feeds into a picture of different variables, a mix of contents, skills and the facilitator's role, which quantify the overall impact of the training.

Unfortunately this does not happen. Most training institutions design a generic training around a certain objective, cobble together a few readings on the subject and find participants for the course through advertisements promoting the training promising all to the trainee. In these cases the evaluation consists of generalised questionnaires and therefore the kind of feedback elicited cannot lead to better design and delivery of the course. Ideally the results (or the lack of these) i.e. the effectiveness, impact of a training should be visible at the trainee's workplace, at least six months down the lane. Most training organisations do not conduct evaluations using both dimensions due to time, cost and resource constraints.

Therefore different levels of evaluation standards are used. At stage 1, these are Formative Standards, which come into play when training is being designed, reviewed, and structured. Typically, this level involves standards in relations to the training needs and how are these determined, the target audience served by the training, the goals and objectives of the training in relation to the needs identified, how the attainment of these goals is to be assessed, the instructional approaches used.

Interestingly, negative learning can also be captured: a trainee was absent throughout the course (this is a case of pushing the staff into a training simply to spend the training budget) or a trainee's response to the questionnaire with "there was no learning". Could this be a case of a useless training course and the trainer delivering clichéd, superficial slogans or the learner actually quantifying his own skills and knowledge prior to the training in comparison to what he has learned in the training and realising that he was not at the level he thought he was at. Negative learning can therefore be easily captured, it is simply a case of aligning the tools and the approach.

<sup>2</sup> The depth of evaluation tests the knowledge, skill, attitude, behaviour and the change. The breadth of evaluation focuses on pre-training situations, during-training assessments and post-training situations.



At stage 2, *Process-related Standards* are applied. At this stage, the training materials are being drafted, proposed instructional approaches, and evaluation instruments are field tested to find if any modifications are required in the design and the delivery of the course. It is verified if the training materials are educationally and pedagogically sound. The assessment instruments should be valid. It should be checked if the approach merits higher-cost enhancements (e.g., video, multimedia) and a wider distribution of materials.

Evaluations for an Orientation Training would rely on different indicators in comparison to a skills' based or a staff training. Evaluation in each case would rest on definite qualities, which the training organisation wants to measure: the outcomes, learning, attitudinal change etc.

Stage 3 focuses on *outcomes*. Within this context, the training approach is studied to identify if it produced intended outcomes such as increased knowledge, appropriately shaped attitudes, and positive behavioural intent, and whether an attitudinal change and transformation occurred. The critical elements of the instructional approach that contribute to desired results are identified with the results of the training efforts. This data provides trainers with improved understanding of the various training approaches that can be applied to the target audience, the subject matter addressed, and the instructional methods used.

Finally, *Impact Assessment Standards* are targeted in stage 4. Longitudinal studies are conducted. This final stage emphasizes if the approaches meet the educational needs identified in Stage 1, the intended and unintended impacts of the training on the learner and his or her environment, the direct effects on the learner, indirect effects on others whom the trainee influences and most importantly, if the approaches employed were effective or not.

The principles to practice are

- ▶ Outcome Based Learning
- ▶ Aligning training to evaluation
- ▶ Linking training to performance
- ▶ Focusing on core results:
  - ▶ Knowledge
  - ▶ Skills
  - ▶ Attitude

While it is understood that complex systems are difficult to manage and control; and a centralised system can delay necessary localised changes restraining the development and implementation of adequate quality assurance measures at each institution. Flexibility based on training needs makes it easy to adapt and improve the content of the curriculum according to the development within the relevant professional areas. Evaluation therefore should reflect the flexibility in planning and development of the training. Means of quality assurance should then be developed at these local levels within the overall quality framework reflecting the culture of the local environment.

The capability and the quality of the programmes should be continually evaluated within the system itself. This can be done by evolving a system of internal monitoring which would serve the purpose of quality management with regard to the relevance and quality of the courses as well as the quality of the entire programme. (*Complete paper as annex 2*)



## Training Evaluation Methodologies: Best Practises by NRSP- Institute of Rural Management

By: Roomi S. Hayat



Mr. Roomi S. Hayat, gave an exhaustive lecture on training evaluation methodologies currently practised by NRSP-IRM. He explained that training or 'skill enhancement' was the key component of NRSP's programme being implemented in the country. As one of the principles which was translated into all programme activities, effective and qualitative capacity development of the staff and the communities was undertaken at a very large scale.

IRM was the centre of activity with staff and communities being trained from all over Pakistan at all times. Staff from Government of Maldives had recently attended training at IRM. Mr. Hayat emphasized that the effectiveness and qualitative delivery of NRSP's programme was relatively *less* dependant on the number of staff and community members being trained and *more* on the quality of training and the level of knowledge and skills being imparted and attitudinal change which had occurred as a result. (*Complete paper as annex 3*)

Training Evaluation is therefore a continuous and ongoing process. Evaluation is vital as it aligns the goals, knowledge, skills and outcomes of a training of a heterogeneous audience at IRM. He described the training programmes and the evaluations methods being practiced at IRM. He described how utilisation studies and impact assessments had led IRM to redesign a number of trainings. One example is that of poultry farming for CO members adopted by IRM under its vocational training portfolio. The training was broadly based on the one conducted by the concerned government line department. Post training utilisation and impact assessments showed that many problems, which the trainees had reported prior to the training, still persisted. The Training Coordinator studied the training design and reported that this was a generic training which could not effectively deal with seemingly simple and *similar* problems of the trainees who came from *dissimilar* geographical set ups. Expert trainers were selected for the next training in poultry farming, which scored better in utilisation studies.



In the general discussion, which followed the lecture, the participants examined a number of issues. Mr. Khalid Iqbal Khattak pointed it out that the problems emanating out of training were because trainees are usually in a hurry to get away as soon as a training ends. In 90% of all post training evaluations the participants either rated the training as either very good or very bad, ticking off As or Es on a questionnaire. Mr. Shadab Fariduddin explained this in context of what NGORC was dealing with this problem. He said that if 'centrist' tendencies and dispersions were separated, there was a possibility of having slightly more accurate evaluations. After training, the evaluations of the trainer, training coordinator and the participants should be shared with the senior management and the trainee's workplace. This



would also attempt to eliminate inaccurate reporting in evaluations.

Mr Sohail Manzoor pointed out that pre training evaluation serves little or no purpose. With the participants sitting inside the training hall, it anyway is too late to change the course contents. Ideally TNA should be conducted before the training is designed. Though organisations like to claim that they may be able to change course contents, provide different trainers with different areas of expertise through this feedback, practically this is not always possible.

Trainings are rated absolutely worthless when trainees have too many expectations from a particular workshop. Trainees should therefore be forwarded course design and contents prior to the training. This would mean that even if TNA was not conducted, the trainees would be of the same level making it a more homogenous group and thereby easier to manage and teach. Continuing on the issue of commitment and earnestness (or otherwise) of the trainee towards training and learning, Mr. Roomi Hayat said that there are instances where course contents are forwarded prior to a training and participants do not read their homework prior, during or even after the training. Organisations or trainers do not have the time or the resources to follow up on their trainees.



To Mr. Asmatullah, evaluations fit in a scientific realm. Knowledge, skills, attitudes, the depth, breadth, quantitative and qualitative evaluations deal with scholarship. Who and what controls the intervening variables? In the West, there are no yardsticks or measurables for cognitive change. This yardstick should therefore be based on skills- all others such as change attitudes result from this.



Ms. Grace T. Shaikh shared her perspectives on evaluation and impact. She felt that training utilizations and impact were dependant upon ground realities. Sometimes the on-ground situation prevents the trainee from using the skills they have acquired. Training is perhaps really not the strategic tool or the only intervention, which can have a transformational impact, as is expected.



Mr. Qadeer Baig thanked the participants and the resource persons at the end of the day. He said that training should be conducted with just one objective: the outcome. While learning environments are important in impact and evaluations, it is just as important that we measure up to our job. We should be able to assess in different contexts and face the challenges. As long as the pre and post training links are kept in view with the goal i.e. are we going to achieve what we set ourselves, the outcomes will be apparent. Mr. Qadeer Baig concluded with the generous offer that NGORC would be happy to share its work on outcome-based approaches in training with the organisations and the trainers present at the Retreat.





### Utilization Studies and Impact Assessments: 'Sideline' Results by Mr. Kamran Akbar, PPAF

Mr. Kamran Akbar showed a short documentary of a certificate awarding ceremony to the participants. A trainee was shown praising her trainers and Enterprise development training she had attended. She thanked PPAF for providing her the skills, which would help her change the living standards of her family. She was 20 years of age, had never ventured out of her village and this had been the first time that she had visited Lahore and interacted with participants from other villages.

When the Utilization Study was conducted a few months later, the monitoring team from PPAF found out that the trainee had never put her training to use. They noted that the trainee had acquired self-confidence, self-assurance and had been able to attain greater decision-making authority within her household.

A discussion among the participants followed on training utilisation and impact assessments. Retention of the knowledge and skills imparted in the training were discussed at length. It was unanimously agreed among the participants that if 20% of the course contents had been retained six months after the training, it should be considered a success. (*Complete paper as annex 4*)

The session concluded with Mr. Ghias M. Khan( SASMON) elaborating the factors to be considered for Training Evaluation. The process includes formal and informal classes, workshops and seminars, etc. Training objectives, strategies and activities (conducted during training), and course content were of vital importance for evaluation. Information from these categories not only illustrate different aspects of the *need* for training but also provide indicators for evaluation e.g. inputs required such as trainers, administrators, technology and funds. The output would lead to increased knowledge (course content), changes in teacher competencies as well in addition to those discussed by other speakers.



As a rule, training design should be comprehensive and must satisfy evaluation criteria for both internal consistency and external compatibility. The elements of training and evaluation designs can be defined by questions relating to monitoring and training accountability. To assess information for evaluation, it is important to consider ways and means through which reliable and valid information can be collected and analyzed.

Monitoring is necessary during each phase of the training. During the development phase, when trainings are tested and refined, monitoring information can identify problems and lead to beneficial modifications that helps to ensure successful training implementation. The data and indicators developed for comprehensiveness, internal consistency and external compatibility collected during this phase is invaluable to training administrators. For training beyond the development phase, monitoring provides information about the coverage of the training objectives and other training processes.



Feedback as to whether the training has met its desired goals should also be collected and recorded throughout the training course. Fine tuning of activities and strategies should occur when monitoring information indicates that training targets are not being addressed. Several sources of data should be collected for monitoring: observations by evaluators, training records, data from training staff who are resource persons and information from participants or their associates (peers).

Evaluation concerns and questions that address these concerns should be kept in mind. These should include training information needs, and the sources and procedures for collecting pertinent training data. Focus should be on the collection and analysis of **qualitative data** during training implementation.

Various techniques, such as building conceptual framework for the training, formulating of evaluation questions, sampling techniques and instrumentation play an important role in evaluation.

### All Members' Meeting

Mr. Sajjad Ahmad, requested the assembled participants to discuss arrangements relating to the annual All Member's Meeting (AMM). It was decided that a two-day programme would be organised on (Sep 20-21). It was suggested that the venue should not be Islamabad. Abbottabad, Swat and Lahore were recommended. It was also recommended that Ms. Maleeha Gohar should be requested for a performance by Ajoka Theatre on a social issue. It was debated whether a registration fee should be charged for such programmes from non members.



Although a specific theme for the meeting was not decided, it was however recommended that sessions should focus on the role of trainers in development, current issues in development, peace and gender, documentaries on these, globalisation and sustainable development and sharing case studies on best practices. It was also recommended that Mr. Javed Jabbar, Dr. Nasim Ashraf, Ms. Khadija Haq, Mr. I.A Rahman, Dr. A. Q. Khan, Mr. Shaukat Aziz, Ms. Kamla Bhasin, Ms. Nilofer Bakhtiar, Ms. Shahnaz Kapadia should be invited to the meeting. The Local Chapters within Pakistan and abroad should be invited to present their progress.

This session concluded with a presentation by Mr. Sajjad Ahmad on HRDN progress.

## Plans for International HRD Congress

Mr. Ozair Hanafi, member of the BoD discussed the upcoming International HRD Congress with the participants. He suggested a theme: **Building a Professional Pakistan**, making it clear that the themes and sub-themes would be discussed at length and may include the following:



- ▶ Harnessing Human Capital- Key to Economic Development
- ▶ Paradigms of Capacity Building
- ▶ Challenges and Opportunities in Capacity Building
- ▶ Change Management
- ▶ Strategies for Human Resource Management
- ▶ Essentials of Quality Standards in Training
- ▶ Leveraging Human Capital

It was also decided that the event would take place on 7-8 June. The aim of this Congress would be to develop recommendations for the optimum development of Human Resources in the region through consultations and dialogue between the public & private (profit and non profit) organisations. Key policy makers in the development and public sector and academia will be invited to engage and collaborate in devising strategies and mechanisms, which would accelerate and increase the productivity of human resources. It was also discussed that the corporate world constitutes a very large sector in the country and should be invited to participate with CBOs and NGOs. By inviting these sectors (for sponsorships and participation), an invigorating dialogue would result and the conclusive objectives would be met. The participants discussed the issue of registration fees for the different categories of delegates who would attend.

## Next Steps

The participants unanimously agreed that the Retreat paved the way for setting indicators on training quality. The Retreat had highlighted some of the key issues, which required further discussion. It was therefore decided that the Technical Advisory Group On Training (TAG-T) should be expanded. It was decided that the TAG-T should meet in the near future and come up with comprehensive measurables or indicators for setting standards in Training. National Centre for Rural Development is also planning for accreditation with ISO 9003 for the training institute and Mr. Israr ul Haq who was representing the organisation said that he would be happy to share the training course evaluation forms which had been developed by his institute.

The fifth annual Trainer's Retreat concluded with a vote of thanks by Mr. Roomi S. Hayat.



## Annual Trainers' Retreat

April 2003 Bhurban-Pakistan

- ▶ **Initiating the Retreat**, the presentation by Mr. Qadeer Baig, Deputy Director, NGORC
- ▶ **Evaluation Standards for Training Effectiveness** by Mr. Shadab Fariduddin, Academic Coordinator, NGORC
- ▶ **Training Evaluation Methodologies- Best Practices of NRSP- IRM** by Mr. Roomi S. Hayat, Chairperson, HRDN
- ▶ **Training Evaluation: Structures and Processes** by Mr. Kamran Akbar, General Manager (HID) PPAF
- ▶ Tools of Evaluation
- ▶ Programme
- ▶ List of participants



Presentation by Mr. Qadeer Baig, NGORC

## Trainers' Retreat 2003

History  
Purpose and Objectives



NGO Resource Centre  
(A Project of Aga Khan Foundation)

Annexure 1

### Purpose and Objectives of Trainers' Retreat

- To provide a forum for improving the effectiveness of training provided by citizen sector training institutions
- Develop a resource group for capacity building of Trainers
- Sharing best practice
- Setting industry standards

### Retreat Process History 1999 - 2002

- LUMS, Lahore - 1999
- LUMS, Lahore - 2002
- Murree - 2001
- Murree - 2002 in collaboration with
- HRDN

### Retreat - 1999

- Mapping the training sector
- Sessions on training effectiveness and training needs assessment
- Setting up a process for trainer's network

### Retreat - 2000

- Discussed the rationale for the creation of a network of training institutions
- Introduced Distance Learning in Non-profit Management Education
- Decided that retreat will be a thematic forum
- 'Values in Training' was selected as theme for Retreat 2001

### Retreat - 2001

- Without adding a normative dimension to training it fails to deliver desired results
- Most of the citizen sector are without a value-based curriculum
- The forum drafted Code of Conduct for trainers, training managers, and participants
- HRDN offered to disseminate the code widely and see through its implementation

### Retreat 2002 and beyond

- Focused on effective training methodologies
- Review 'interactive learning' for enhancing quality and outreach
- Finalized code of conduct and roadmap for its implementation
- HRDN to organize Trainers' Retreat in collaboration with NGORC
- The code of conduct endorsed by HRDN Annual General meeting



## Evaluation Standards for Training Effectiveness

By: Shadab Fariduddin<sup>1</sup>, Academic Coordinator, Development Management Education (DME)  
Programme, NGO Resource Centre (A Project of Aga Khan Foundation), Karachi.

Training is widely understood as communication directed at a defined population for the purpose of developing skills, modifying behaviour, and increasing competence. Generally, training focuses exclusively on what needs to be known. Education is a longer-term process that incorporates the goals of training and explains why certain information must be known. Education emphasises the scientific foundation of the material presented. Both training and education induce learning, a process that modifies knowledge and behaviour through teaching and experience. The description here pertains to both training and education. Therefore, in this paper, "training" refers to both processes.

In contrast to informal training (which is embedded in most instances of human exchange), formal training interventions have stated goals, content, and strategies for instruction. My intent is to offer a general approach to training effectiveness that addresses formal training across settings and topics. The approach suggested here draws upon the experiences gained by adopting an Outcome Based Learning methodology for our Development Management Education Programme, which is now a year old.

The measure of a training program lies in its effectiveness. Training is effective to the degree that it produces desired results in the people being trained. In concise terms, quality training occurs when each participant is able to use the skills and knowledge gained in the program to bring about a desired result on the job. It is therefore as important for the trainers to be aware of, if not well-versed in, evaluation methodologies as conducting the training itself.

Evaluation standards therefore must be inextricably involved with any training and development initiative - a single event, series of courses or modules, long duration training programs, open and distance learning and e-technology training. Thus, the quality standards in evaluation then become standards of training effectiveness. The evaluation standards that we have adopted require standard-setting in 4-stages, which are described further below. The lessons here are culled from implementation of standards as in stage 1 and 2 of the OBL effectiveness model we are putting in place to enhance the quality of training offered.

OBL refers to "outcome-based learning". As a training methodology, OBL focuses on "exit" outcomes: results in terms of improved knowledge and/or skills that will come about - and attainment of which can be verified - at the end of a training. Moreover knowledge/skill thus transferred or acquired must be useful in enhancing job performance. In effect then, OBL is the usual iterative training cycle with the key distinctive feature being its measurement mechanism that captures the effectiveness of training. OBL methodology integrates pre, during and post training assessment activities and thus gives evaluation standards a three-dimensional focus.

OBL forces us to focus on the outcome, as in knowledge, skill, and behaviour of learners. While we

<sup>1</sup> Comments invited: shadab\_fariduddin@ngorc.org.pk

always have had training objectives for every course, we always had difficulty gauging "learning", perse, of participants as a result of our conducting training. In other words there was a mismatch between various training components: objectives did not match with contents did not match with assessment. Training was, thus, an amalgamation of three disjoints: objectives, contents, and assessment.

Further, that the training objectives were couched in such soft terms that would render assessment of learning impossible. Concomitantly, the assessment tool contained more feedback questions and comments on food, air-conditioning, logistics, training material, etc. than on the "amount of learning" as a result of training. Consider the following real-case illustration:

Before OBL	After OBL
We used a Course Evaluation Form focusing on: Kindly rate the following on a scale of 1(Low) to 5 (High)	Now our Course Evaluation Form asks: Kindly rate your knowledge of or ability to do the following on a scale of 1(Low) to 5 (High)
Instructor had command on the subject:	Analyse global trends in international aid and philanthropy.
Course contents were up-to-date, relevant and useful:	Analyse local trends in international aid and philanthropy.
Food and logistics were satisfactory:	Explain the defining features of the citizen sector in relation to the state and business.
Time management during the course was good:	Draw up a resource mobilisation code of ethics for the organisation Analyse present income patterns.
Course material was relevant and readable:	Evaluation now focuses on core results: Knowledge, skills and, attitude. Effects of training are now demonstrable.
The evaluation was: Weak, Diverse, Post-hoc And therefore led to improvement in the training peripherals adding a feel-good factor about the training effectiveness among participants, instructors and training managers and coordinators.	Assessment has made measurement/monitoring easier by establishing causal relationship between acquisition and diffusion of knowledge/skills.



Adopting OBL contributed to training effectiveness in two visible ways. First, it set standards in terms of concrete learning outcomes (knowledge of, or ability to do, something). Second, it sharply refocused assessment mechanism on measurement of learning (not food, air-conditioning, reading material, logistics etc.). Once learning outcomes and assessment standards were simultaneously set at the very beginning contents, delivery mode, exercises, all subsequently followed. Thus, linking the two soul-mate standards - learning outcomes and assessment mechanism - brought about an alignment of the training disjoints referred above. The key was connecting the start with the end, that is, designing a tool of evaluation based on "learning objectives" or "outcomes", thereby achieving the first level of alignment. However achieving this alignment requires that training outcomes of knowledge and skills be built upon findings of a proper pre-training assessment of needs, which can be considered as the second level of alignment that removes disjoint between training and actual job situations (on an ideal level, all training events should be tuned in with competency profiles of a profession). This is possible when training situation is matched with the job situation in which the skills acquired would be put to use. Connecting training to the job creates two dimensions of evaluation for which quality assurance standards are required:

**Depth of Evaluation:** Refers to the profundity of learning, for example, what are the evaluation standards--- and tools--- for assessing learners' acquisition of?

- ▶ Knowledge
- ▶ Skill
- ▶ Attitude
- ▶ Behaviour
- ▶ Change

**Breadth of Evaluation:** Refers as to how expansive is the quality system in terms of its coverage of:

- ▶ Pre-training situations
- ▶ During-training assessments
- ▶ Post-training situations

A comprehensive set of evaluation standards ideally covers all elements of both dimensions. Even then in training research, it is often difficult to arrive at definitive answers. Typically, many variables interplay with each other and make results difficult to interpret. Furthermore, the amount of variance attributed to any one variable is usually small. Therefore, if training is to be an essential component of planned interventions, a uniform system of evaluation is needed to explain how training is made effective and to indicate how resources for training should be organised. Given the limited resources available for training along with an increasing demand for proof as to the effectiveness of training, it is only prudent that evaluation standards are put in place in phases. An iterative process of gradual improvement should lead to cementing of the system. However, any attempt in system building needs to stem from, and then adhere to, evaluation standard principles:

### Quality Evaluation Principles

- ▶ Evaluation comes first; training event/concept should follow.
- ▶ Evaluation standards must come from learning objectives.
- ▶ Evaluation feeds into training improvement.
- ▶ Evaluation ties up with job performance.
- ▶ Evaluation needs to be cost effective.

Based on these principles evaluation standards can be set at four levels to achieve a uniform and consistent system of evaluation.

#### Phase 1: Formative Standards

Set when training efforts are being conceived, reviewed, and structured. Typically, this level involves development of standards as to:

- ▶ What are the needs and how are they determined?
- ▶ What are the target populations served by the training?
- ▶ How do the goals and objectives of the training relate to identified needs?
- ▶ How will the attainment of these goals be assessed?
- ▶ What instructional approach should be taken?

#### Phase 2: Process-related Standards

In phase 2, draft training materials, proposed instructional approaches, and evaluation instruments are field tested to know:

- ▶ What modifications are needed?
- ▶ Are the materials educationally and pedagogically sound?
- ▶ Are the assessment instruments valid?
- ▶ Is there enough confidence in the approach to warrant higher-cost enhancements (e.g., video, multimedia) and wider distribution of materials?

#### Phase 3: Outcome Assessment Standards

- ▶ Phase 3 is primarily concerned with the following questions:
- ▶ Does the approach produce intended outcomes such as increased knowledge, appropriately shaped attitudes, and positive behavioural intent?
- ▶ Are targeted behaviours modified?

What are the critical elements of the instructional approach that contribute to desired results? At the conclusion of this stage, the results of the training effort are documented. These data provide trainers with improved understanding of the various training approaches that can be applied to (1) the population trained, (2) the subject matter addressed, and (3) the instructional methods used.



▶ Phase 3 typically involves a controlled evaluation study based on a limited sample.

- ▶ Here longitudinal studies are conducted. This final stage emphasises:
- ▶ Do the learning approaches under study meet the educational needs identified in Phase 1?
- ▶ What are the intended and unintended impacts of the training on the learner and his or her environment?
- ▶ What are the intended and unintended impacts of the training on the learner and his or her environment?
- ▶ What are the direct effects on the learner?
- ▶ What are the indirect effects on others whom the trainee influences?
- ▶ Why are the approaches studied effective or not?

The model described here recognises that formal training interventions are affected by several real-world factors such as uneven resource availability across training settings and differing levels of experience and expertise among instructors. Accordingly, training evaluation should be conducted in the field where possible in order to incorporate these variables into the study of effectiveness.

Two approaches to training intervention effectiveness research can be used to uncover results without committing extraordinary resources to the exercise. One approach employs triangulation (use of multiple data sources and methods) to gather data from prospective end users and combine qualitative data (e.g., from focus groups, interviews, and observations) with various forms of quantitative data (e.g., those from controlled study situations). Data are then used to assemble a valid argument for the interpretation of results.

The other approach to effectiveness research explores cause-and-effect relationships that are pertinent to the learning process and have been established through years of training research. For the purpose of training assessment, the cause-and-effect relationships of interest are those between the process, outcomes, and impacts of training. In these relationships, the process variables (e.g., training methods and mediums used) are indicators of the outcomes (e.g., knowledge gained among trainees). The key to identifying the essential elements of effective training lies in understanding the correlation of these variables with the intended impact of training (e.g., diffusion of new skills and abilities).

Experience indicates that the principles can be best put to practice by adopting Outcome Based Learning (OBL). This is because OBL aligns training to evaluation, links training to performance, and focuses on core results: knowledge, skills, attitude, and therefore makes measurement/monitoring easy by establishing causal relationship between acquisition and diffusion of knowledge/skills.

#### References:

- ▶ Dixon, Nancy M, Evaluation: A Tool for Improving HRD Quality. San Diego: University Associates, Inc
- ▶ Ford, Jevin J; Kozlowski, Steve; Salas, Aduardo, et al, Improving Training Effectiveness in Work Organisations. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers
- ▶ Gagné, RM, The conditions of Learning and Theory of Instruction. 4 e. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.
- ▶ -----, <http://www.cdc.gov/niosh>, date accessed: January 22, 2003
- ▶ Jordaan, Johan, There's more to Training than Fighting Fires. [www.mweb.co.za](http://www.mweb.co.za), date accessed: April 2, 2003
- ▶ Laird, Dugan, Approaches to Training and Development. 2e. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- ▶ Mohr, LB, Impact Analysis for Program Evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- ▶ Stewart Jim, Managing Change through T & D. 2e. London: Kogan Pag
- ▶ Tuckman, BW, Conducting Educational Research. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich





## Training Evaluation Methodologies Best Practices of NRSP-Institute of Rural Management.

By: Roomi S. Hayat, Director NRSP-Institute of Rural Management

### Introduction:

In any learning environment we tend to assess the process of training rather than measuring the level of learning of the participant involved in the training course.

Measuring the extent of learning is crucial for any capacity building initiatives

### 1. Measuring Learning

The process of assessing the effectiveness of any learning initiative is often described as "training evaluation". Measuring the extent of learning is crucial for any capacity building initiative. Unfortunately, it is the most neglected part in training cycle. In the context of learning, measurement refers to the process of quantifying the amount of knowledge or skill a learner has acquired in the currency of the programme.

Training evaluation has several functions and applications. These are primarily used to further improve the course contents and to make it more pertinent to the needs of the target audience.

Some of the main areas where evaluation helps are:

- ▶ **Assessing level of participant knowledge.** Pre-training assessment of the participant is particularly helpful in determining the existing level of knowledge and skill and helps in fine-tuning the planned topics and course contents.
- ▶ **Measure Participant's learning.** Reveals areas of participant's weakness or limitation in mastering the course contents. This assessment, usually undertaken during as well as after the training, facilitates in course correction during the workshop.
- ▶ **Feedback into Course design.** Provides feedback into the efficacy of the course design in meeting the overall needs of the target audience according to the objectives of the training.
- ▶ **Facilitates in Curriculum revision.** The use of testing for this objective facilitates in identifying weakness in the curriculum and helps in improving the course curriculum.
- ▶ **Rating organization of workshop.** In an increasingly competitive environment, the administrative, logistic and other support has assumed significant importance in the overall success of the programme. Therefore assessing the quality of non-training activities (i.e. boarding / lodging etc) helps in enhancing satisfaction of participant, consequently improving overall quality of learning.
- ▶ **Assessing Training Utilization.** Studying utilization of training greatly facilitates in assessing the utility and effectiveness, of the course contents, in relation to the ground realities of the workplace of the participant.
- ▶ **Motivate learners.** The use of tests for the purpose of assessments signals the participant of the importance of the activity and that they will be evaluated motivates them to pay more attention to the course contents.

### 2. Evaluation Standard

The standards against which effectiveness of training are evaluated are called "evaluation standards". These are developed in relation to the objectives and expected outcome of the training. e.g. in the case of effective presentation skills training, the indicator of standard would be that participant is able to effectively present the underlying idea before the audience impressively and in a manner that they understand it exactly as it was intended.

*Adapted from: Wentling, Tim L., (1993) Planning for Effective Training. Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations: Rome, Italy*

### Training- defined

Training relates to extending and developing individual's capabilities for better performance in their job. It involves transfer of new knowledge, skills, behavior and attitude.

(Source: Learn to Train,  
Roomi S. Hayat, Director  
NRSP- Institute of Rural Management)



### ► Perspectives on Training Evaluation

Evaluation is often looked at from four different levels (the "Kirkpatrick levels").

- a) **Reaction** (what does the learner feel about the training),
- b) **Learning** (what facts, knowledge, etc., did the learner gain),
- c) **Behaviours** (what skills did the learner develop, that is, what new information is the learner using on the job) and
- d) **Results or effectiveness** (what results occurred, that is, did the learner apply the new skills to the necessary tasks in the organisation and, if so, what results were achieved).

Evaluation therefore has only one objective: to impart skills and knowledge in an effective manner and aims at achieving certain outcomes. Assessing level of participant's knowledge in pre-training assessments of the participant is particularly helpful in determining the current level of knowledge and skills and helps in fine-tuning the planned topics and course contents. This is done at a number of occasions: training needs assessment (prior to attending the training, pre training, during and post training assessment. Testing does not only lead to facilitate in identifying weakness in the curriculum but helps in improving course curriculum. The use of tests / evaluation makes the participants' understand the importance of the activity and the feeling that they will be evaluated motivates them to pay more attention to the course contents. In an increasingly competitive environment, the administrative, logistic and other support has assumed significant importance in the overall success of the programme. Therefore assessing the quality of non-training activities (organisation, logistics etc) helps in enhancing the satisfaction level of the participant. **Training Utilisation Studies** facilitate in assess the utility and effectiveness of the course contents in relation to the ground realities of the workplace of the participant.

### ► Method for Measuring Learning and performance

- True-False
- Objective type (Multiple Choice Questions-MCQs)
- Matching correct answer
- Intensity Scale (for agreement or disagreement)
- Short Answer
- Descriptive (Essay)





▶ **Instruments for Measuring Learning and performance**

- ▶ Paper and Pencil tests
- ▶ Performance tests
- ▶ Case studies
- ▶ Questionnaire
- ▶ Priority Ranking
- ▶ Matrix Interpretation
- ▶ Check List
- ▶ Frequency rating
- ▶ Scale sheet
- ▶ Graphics representation

**3. Training Evaluation Practices of NRSP- Institute of Rural Management**

The NRSP- Institute of Rural Management is involved in intensive capacity development programmes, for both the staff and community members, for the past decade. The programmes offered under the community-training component of the institute include:

- ▶ Community Management Training Programme
- ▶ Business Development Services
- ▶ Natural Resource Management Training Programme
- ▶ Social Sector Training programme

The portfolio of the staff-training programme includes:

- ▶ Internship Training Programme
- ▶ Management Development Programme
- ▶ Micro-Finance Training Programme
- ▶ Strengthening HRM

▶ **Institute of Rural Management - Training Evaluation System**

The NRSP- Institute of Rural Management considers evaluation to be an essential step in training assessment and making the training contents more pertinent to the needs of the participants. The assessment is carried for three main purposes:

- ▶ To assess change in level of learning and understanding
- ▶ To study training utilization and acquisition of new skills and knowledge
- ▶ To improve course design for future initiatives

Different methodologies may be used for evaluations but the purposes are similar as pointed out earlier.

The stages at which training is evaluated are:

- ▶ Pre-training assessment (Usually held prior to the training, however it is not mandatory)
- ▶ Daily Evaluation (during training)
- ▶ Terminal Evaluation (Post-training assessment typically conducted 6 months after the training)
- ▶ Training Utilization Study (TUS)
- ▶ Impact Assessment

*Adapted from: Wentling, Tim L., (1993) Planning for Effective Training. Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations: Rome. Italy.*

### ► Pre-training evaluation

This methodology provides information primarily at two levels: the existing level of competency of the learner and for the last minute fine-tuning of the course topics. A pre-training test of the level of knowledge of the participants proves to be an effective benchmark for assessing the reinforcement that the training contents have led to the participants' understanding of the concepts.

The NRSP- Institute of Rural Management utilizes the techniques to create a benchmark and then measure it against the impact the training has brought to the participants in understanding of the underlying concepts. The training participants are provided with questionnaires regarding the workshop contents. A similar post-test at the end of the workshop serves to compare the enhanced knowledge of the participants with this benchmark. Such tools are utilized in various vocational training offered by the institute.

### ► Daily Evaluation

Daily evaluation facilitates in measuring the effectiveness of the course contents and helps in identifying changes in the learning levels of the participants. This helps in monitoring the progress and facilitates in course correction according to the stated objectives of the workshop. The most common applications are:

- Matching expectations/ fears of the participants with objectives (helps in fine tuning if the contents)
- Daily feedback sessions at the end of the day or the first activity on the next day (facilitates in course correction)
- Evaluation of the Resource person / trainers of each session
- Mood Meters (Satisfaction or Happiness Index) to check overall satisfaction, how the trainees have reacted to the workshop and if they have any non-training grievances

### ► Terminal Evaluation (Post-training assessment)

Terminal training evaluation is useful for future events and facilitates in making necessary changes in the workshop design and contents in order to make them more effective. Following post training evaluation instruments are applied:

- **Participant Self-Learning Scale:** Measures learning of the participants by comparing the change in level of understanding at the pre-training level with the one achieved by the end of the workshop.
- **Peer Assessment Sheet:** Facilitates in assessing learning behaviour of peers and colleagues, from the point of view of the co-learners.
- **Course Evaluation:** Assessing relevance of the course design. It facilitates in determining its efficacy in meeting the overall needs of the target audience in accordance to the objectives of the training. This also identifies weaknesses in the curriculum.
- **Workshop Organisational Evaluation:** In an increasingly competitive environment, the



administrative, logistic and other support towards holding of the training has assumed significant importance in the overall success of the programme. Therefore, assessing the quality of non-training activities (i.e. boarding, lodging, quantity and quality of material etc) helps in enhancing satisfaction of participant, consequently improving the overall quality of learning.

▶ **Training Coordinator Assessment:** This specifically focuses on the expertise of the training coordinator and the trainers for each session.

### ▶ **Training Utilisation Study (TUS)**

Studying utilisation of training greatly facilitates in assessing the utility and effectiveness of the course contents in relation to the ground realities of the workplace of the participant, its relevance to the participant's job responsibilities and its impact on the work/ performance. Generally conducted after a period of six to seven months of holding the training event, it helps to assess the ability of the participant to utilize the learned skills and also provides, the evaluator, the ground to measure change in his/her post training practices.

### ▶ **Impact Assessment**

Experts, who are not trainers but are monitoring and evaluation experts, conduct the impact assessments. Typically this is done two to three years after the training is conducted. Impact assessment focuses on training outcomes, impact vis-à-vis the local environment, population, and living standards of the people.

Impact assessment is a comprehensive evaluation method and requires bench marking of the people and the surrounding so as to enable impact assessment experts to determine the impact of the training on the lives of the people.

### ▶ **Obstacles**

A number of factors impede learning assessment and effective training utilization, the factors vary from absence of staff skilled in conducting evaluation, indifferent attitude of the trainer to lack of importance for evaluation by the organization that is funding / conducting the training.

▶ The dearth of expert trainers is one of the major problems faced by the training institutions and organizations.

▶ In some cases, training may not be effective because the training needs assessment is not conducted properly or is not translated correctly into the training design.

▶ Generally, participants as well as trainers both feel shy of evaluation as it is reflective of their (good / bad) performance.

▶ Inputs from trainees are not evaluative perceptions of the students but are the expressions of the likes/dislikes of a trainer.

▶ Peer evaluations are also constrained due to collegial bonds or these can be used as tools for manipulation.



▶ In general evaluation is not expected or rewarded and therefore is not considered a motivational factor - for trainers or trainees.

▶ Unrealistic criteria e.g. turnover of a workshop cannot be used as a measure for effective training.

## Training Evaluation: Structures and Processes

By Kamran Akbar, General Manager- (HID), Pakistan Poverty Alleviation Fund, Islamabad.

I was conducting a training workshop in Peshawar, supported by DFID, for intern social organisers in the education sector. One of the topics we discussed, I remember vaguely, related to confidence building, of individuals and communities, as one of the most significant components of the development process. In the cultural context of the North West Frontier Province, it was discussed that fathers hardly ever hug their sons, let alone daughters. Typically, they are dictatorial with their children, wanting them to walk the straight and narrow, clipping their wings whenever they feel the kids have strayed and punishing them for their 'misdeeds'. The lack of confidence resulting from this in the children can be easily imagined. Further, mothers uphold and perpetuate a stereotypical and draconian image of fathers, widening the gap further and enhancing the lack of confidence. At the end of the two weeks training, participants filled-in evaluation forms, circled certain numbers, informed that every thing was well.

As per standard practice, I obtained feedback from the participants. Some praised my knowledge, I felt happy. Another admired my facilitation skills, I was still happier. She was a shy 18 years old matriculate from Bannu, on her second ever visit outside her native town. I did not expect any logical analysis or output from her. As any other trainer would do, I asked her to describe what she had learnt. She said, "I learnt about the kind of role I would play when I become a mother." There was pin-drop silence in the training room. I had received the best results ever possible. This was something no forum could have assessed.

Evaluation forms generally do well in providing feedback to the organisation and the participants on courses and extent of learning imparted. The problem starts when trainees gain experience as 'trainees', learning exactly what check or circle and what to state about a certain trainer. In one of my courses, I remember a participant from Peshawar, who was sitting throughout the day with boredom clearly written across his face. In the latter part of the day he became little 'normal'. He informed us that it this was his 105th training workshop. Every thing had become so mechanical by now that nothing excited him. He knew where to circle what and what to write in his remarks.

This does not in any way mean that formal evaluation forms are insignificant. These are extremely important in the sense that they serve as institutional memory and are structured to gauge immediate reaction and learning of the trainees. Real evaluation of a training must be carried out after, lets say six months, of the training, to check if the trainees are applying what they had learned in the training.

Another important aspect is 'sideline results' or what may be called unexpected results. PPAF had organised a ToT in Enterprise Development Programme (EDP). The ToT had four modules, one of which was 'Financial Management'. The module was designed for illiterate and semi-literate micro entrepreneurs. The feedback we receive from this is extensively used as part of Community



## Annual Trainers' Retreat

April 2003 Bhurban-Pakistan

### Management Skills Training (CMST).

In a ToT, on EDP, organised at Lahore, the trainers trained an illiterate community member named Tahira. During the training she visited Anarkali - her first visit to any place outside her native suburb Kachi Kothi. The certificate distribution ceremony was organised in a five-star hotel. Tahira volunteered to speak and spoke extempore. She informed that her family had resisted her visit to the hotel but she had been determined to attend the ceremony. When asked what benefit she had of the training, she said, "I am standing in front of you." When 'followed-up', it was found that Tahira was not using the skills imparted to her, but she was a more confident person. Neither Tahira nor the head waiter had filled out any evaluation forms. They could not formally evaluate the training but what they had said and done was something no questionnaire could have incorporated or assessed. How does one record such results. How do you record such results? Well! That's the question I am to trying to find answer of!



Annexure 5

## Tools for Evaluation

### Evaluation Matrix

Although by all appearances, the "Evaluation Matrix" is a very simple tool, it has a powerful purpose. It helps you to consider a wider range of data collection methods than you might otherwise consider in relation to each of the questions addressed by your evaluation. Evaluators sometimes get into the habit of using one or other data collection method, e.g., an end-of-training questionnaire, without considering the advantages of alternative methods. This tool prompts you to consider each evaluation question and to decide which of the many data collection options have the greatest potential for providing the desired information.

#### Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Questions	Data Collection Methods											
	Anecdotal Records	Expert Review	Implementation Logs	In-Basket Exercises	Instructor Interviews	Observations	On-Line Data	Portfolios	Test	User Interviews	User Log	User Questionnaires
a. What knowledge was learned by trainees?							X	X	X	X		
b. What skills were developed by trainees?						X	X	X	X	X		
c. What attitudes were formed by trainees?						X				X	X	X
d. What were trainee reactions to the IMM?	X									X		X
e. What were instructor reactions to the IMM?					X	X						

### Anecdotal Record Form

Evaluation data does not have to be reported as "cold hard statistics." Often you will want to tell the "human story" involved in your development or implementation project. One way of capturing those important stories and critical incidents that provide the human story is the "Anecdotal Record Form." Participants in an interactive multimedia design project can use this instrument to describe a noteworthy event and to offer their own interpretation of its relevance. It is very important to try to complete an Anecdotal Record Form as soon as possible after a critical event has occurred so as not to forget critical information. It is equally important to separate your description of the incident from your interpretation of it!

Adapted from : [http://mime1.marc.gatech.edu/MM\\_Tools/evaluation.html](http://mime1.marc.gatech.edu/MM_Tools/evaluation.html)



### Expert Review Checklist

Expert review is one of the primary evaluation strategies used in both formative (How can this multimedia program be improved?) and summative (What is the effectiveness and worth of this multimedia program?) evaluation. It is often a good idea to provide experts with some sort of instrument or guide to insure that they critique all of the important aspects of the IMM program that you want reviewed. This "Expert Review Checklist" has been designed for use by an instructional design expert. You would employ different sorts of Expert Review Checklists with different types of experts such as a content expert or a human computer interface expert.

### Focus Group Protocol

Focus groups are a powerful means of collecting data about learner or instructor reactions to a new interactive multimedia program. However, focus groups need to be carefully planned so that you get the kind and quality of information you are seeking. This "Focus Group Protocol" is a brief example of a list of questions that might be addressed during a focus group regarding an interactive multimedia program.

### Formative Review Log

The "Formative Review Log" is a simple instrument that can be used by anyone you have asked to review your program in its formative stages. The instrument has three columns, the first for recording the screen or format sheet number that the person is reviewing, the second for writing down observations (e.g., errors, confusing points, or ideas), and the third for recording what actions have been taken in reaction to the feedback provided by members of the project team. Using an instrument like this with many different types of users will probably have the greatest pay-off for formative evaluation throughout the life of the project.

### Implementation Log

It is one thing to plan and develop a good interactive multimedia program. It is entirely another thing to implement it as planned. Many training innovations have failed because implementation factors (such as instructor motivation) were not considered. It is essential to make every effort to collect information regarding the actual use of an interactive multimedia program as compared to the planned use. The "Implementation Log" tool has been designed to make that comparison a little more systematic.

### Interview Protocol

Interviews are a powerful means of collecting data about learner or instructor reactions to a new interactive multimedia program. However, interviews need to be carefully planned so that you get the kind and quality of information you are seeking. This "Interview Protocol" is a brief example of a list of questions that might be addressed during an interview regarding an interactive multimedia program.

Consider collecting evaluation data with more than one method if time and resources allow. For example, a questionnaire can be used to collect information about global reactions to an interactive multimedia program. Then, either interviews or focus groups can be used to collect more detailed information. Alternatively, interviews or focus groups might be used to identify the most important evaluation issues that will be included in a questionnaire sent to many people.



### Questionnaire

Questionnaires are undoubtedly the single most frequently used type of evaluation instrument. Poorly designed questionnaires are often administered at the close of a course or training session as a "smileometer" or "happiness indicator." They are also often distributed to users of interactive multimedia programs. If the only thing you find out about your interactive multimedia program with a questionnaire is whether the trainees liked it, you are not making good use of this strategy. As shown in the "Questionnaire," a wealth of information can be provided by a well-designed instrument.

### Interface Rating Form

The "User Interface" of an interactive instructional product, e.g., a multimedia program, is a critical element of the product that must be carefully evaluated. If the user interface is not well-designed, learners will have little opportunity to learn from the program. This rating form includes ten major criteria for assessing the user interface for an interactive program, such as "ease of use" and "screen design." Not all of the criteria may be relevant to the particular program you are evaluating, but most of them will. You may need to add additional criteria to the list. Novice users of interactive instructional products are generally not good candidates for using this form. The people rating the user interface should be experienced users of the type of program you are asking them to rate. Even better, they could be experienced designers of interactive programs.

### Evaluation Report Sample

The "Evaluation Report Sample" presents one way of structuring an evaluation report. Evaluation reports are notorious for being weighty volumes that few people read. Not surprisingly, lengthy reports have little effect on decision-makers. This tool illustrates a strategy for dividing an evaluation report into two-page sections that each include four parts:

- 1) an attention-getting headline,
- 2) a description of the major issues related to the headline,
- 3) a presentation of data related to the issues, and
- 4) a bottom-line recommendation or summary of the findings.

People who receive a report in this format can take two or three sections at a time and make them agenda items for their team meetings. In this way, the evaluation findings are much more likely to have an impact on practical decisions.





## Annual Trainers' Retreat

April 2003 Bhurban-Pakistan

### Annexure 6

#### Annual Trainer's Retreat PC Bhurban, Murree Hills, April 5 - 6, 2003

##### *Programme Day 1, Saturday, April 5, 2003*

Starting the Process	Mr. Sajjad Ahmed	1100
Recitation from the Holy Quran	Mr. Abdul Malik	1105
Introductions	Ms Robeela Bangash	1110
Welcome Note	Mr. Roomi S. Hayat	1125
Objectives, Purpose and history of Retreats	Mr. Qadeer Baig	1135

##### **Session I:**

##### Quality Standards in Training Evaluation Methodologies

<b>Theme Paper I</b>	Mr. Shadab Fariduddin	1200
Lunch & Prayer Break		1300
<b>Theme Paper II</b>	Mr. Roomi S. Hayat	1430
Concluding the day	Mr. Qadeer Baig	1530

##### *Programme Day 2, Sunday, April 6, 2003*

Beginning (Review & Feedback)	Mr. Sajjad Ahmed	0900
-------------------------------	------------------	------

##### **Session II**

##### Defining the future course of action for

▶ Annual trainers' Retreat 2004	Mr. Mubashar Nabi	0930
▶ All Members Meeting, 2003	Mr. Sajjad Ahmad	1000
▶ HRD Congress, 2003	Mr. Ozair A. Hanafi	1030
Tea Break		1130
Concluding the Event	Mr. Roomi S. Hayat	1200
Lunch & Prayer		1300

	Name	Designation	Organisation
1.	Mr. Abdul Malik	Consultant Community Dev	Free Lance
2.	Dr. Abdullah Sheikh	Assistant Professor	M. A. J. University, Islamabad
3.	Mr. Adnan Shaikh	Accounts Assistant	HRDN
4.	Ms. Afshan Tehseen	Programme Officer	ActionAid Pakistan
5.	Mr. Ahmed Saeed Shaikh	PAKSID Coordinator	Aga Khan Foundation (Pakistan)
6.	Mr. Ali Akbar	Programme Officer	Rural Support Programmes Network
7.	Ms. Aliya Sethi	Programme Officer	Aga Khan Foundation (Pakistan)
8.	Mr. Arshad Akif	Programme Manager	Thames Business School
9.	Ms. Asma Raja	Programme Officer	SAHIL
10.	Mr. Asmat Ullah	Training Manager	Sustainable Development Policy Institute
11.	Ms. Ayesha Shaukat	Programme Officer	HRDN
12.	Mr. Ayaz Ahmed	Training Manager	Pakistan Tobacco Company
13.	Mr. Aziz Jan	Journalist	Dawn
14.	Brig. Riaz Ahmed	Regional General Manager	Punjab Rural Support Programme
15.	Mr. Farooq Rashid	Journalist	The Nation
16.	Mr. Fazal Ahmed	Training Officer	Norwegian Afghanistan Council
17.	Mr. Ghias Muhammad Khan	Regional Coordinator	South Asia Social Mobilisation Network
18.	Mr. Ghulam Hafeez	IT Assistant	HRDN
19.	Ms. Grace T. Shaikh	Project Manager	PLAN International
20.	Mr. Ijaz Khaliq	Programme Officer	NRSP- Institute of Rural Management
21.	Mr. Israr ul Haq Ch.	Director Training	National Centre for Rural Development
22.	Mr. Jaffar Ali Shah	Training Officer	Sarhad Rural Support Programme
23.	Mr. Kamran Akbar	General Manager, HRD	Pakistan Poverty Alleviation Fund
24.	Mr. Kamran Malik	Programme Officer	NRSP- Institute of Rural Management
25.	Mr. Khalid Iqbal Khattak	Training Officer	IUCN
26.	Mr. Malik Fateh Khan	Regional General Manager	NRSP
27.	Ms. Manizeh Bano	Executive Director	SAHIL
28.	Mr. Manzoor Khaliq	National Project Coordinator	International Labour Organisation, Pakistan
29.	Mr. Mubashar Nabi	Management Executive	Pakistan Poverty Alleviation Fund
30.	Ms. Mudassra Anwar	Deputy Director	Bait ul Maal, Islamabad
31.	Mr. M.A. Cheema	Director Resource Center	IUCN
32.	Mr. M. Qaiser Khan	Admin. Assistant	HRDN
33.	Mr. Muhammad Tahir Waqar	Programme Officer	NRSP



**Annual Trainers' Retreat**  
April 2003 Bhurban-Pakistan

**List of Participants**  
**Annexure 7**

	Name	Designation	Organisation
34.	Mr. Najaf Khan	Programme Officer	NRSP
35.	Ms Nargis Seemab	Gender Coordinator	Sarhad Rural Support Programme
36.	Mr. Ozair A Hanafi	Executive Director	Human Development Institute-Khushhali Bank
37.	Mr. Qadeer Baig	Deputy Director	NGO Resource Centre, Karachi
38.	Mr. Rauf Arif	Journalist	The Nation
39.	Mr. Rehan A Syed	Programme Assistant AV	NRSP- Institute of Rural Management
40.	Ms Rehana Khilji	Gender Coordinato	Strengthening Participatory Organisation
41.	Ms Rifat Shams	Management Executive	Pakistan Poverty Alleviation Fund
42.	Ms Robeela Bangash	Honorary Network Coordinator	HRDN
43.	Mr. Roomi S. Hayat	Chairperson	HRDN
44.	Ms Rumana Imam	HR Manager	IUCN
45.	Ms Saboochi Ali	Programme Officer	SAHIL
46.	Mr. Sagheer Bukhari	Programme Officer	Rozan
47.	Mr. Sajjad Ahmed	Programme Officer	HRDN
48.	Mr. Sajjad Ashraf	Social Organizer	National Rural Support Programme
49.	Mr. Sarfraz Hussain	Programme Officer	SAHIL
50.	Mr. Shadab Farid ud Din	Academic Coordinator	NGO Resource Centre
51.	Mr. Shahid Minhas	Training Office	Sustainable Development Policy Institute
52.	Ms Shahida Kazmi	Programme Officer	Plan Pakistan
53.	Ms Shazia Bangash	Consultant	NDP, Dept of Agriculture, Govt of Punjab
54.	Mr. Sohail Manzoor	Programme Officer	NRSP- Institute of Rural Management
55.	Mr. Sono Khangrani	Executive Director	Thardeep Rural Development Programme
56.	Mr. Tariq Ansari	Manager	Total Quality Consultants
57.	Mr. Zeeshan	Education Officer	PLAN Pakistan
58.	Mr. Zia Abbasi	Journalist	Dawn
59.	Mr. Zulfiqar Rao	Training Officer	Trust for Voluntary Organisations
60.	Mr. Zulfarnain Abbass Jaffer	Programme Officer	Ghazi Barotha Tarqiati Idara

#### The Human Resource

Development Network (HRDN) is a private non profit organization registered under the Societies Act of 1860. Established in March 2000, it is supported by the Aga Khan Foundation (Pakistan) and ActionAid Pakistan.

HRDN is an association of development organisations and development professionals. It provides a platform for development organisations and practitioners to pool resources, researches and share experiences in the development sector.

The aim is to empower individuals to participate more productively within their workplace and community and to enhance their contribution to society as responsible citizens. The objectives are to provide linkages services efficiently to organisations and individuals within the Network so that their focus can be sharpened and enhanced. HRDN thus enables and facilitates expert solutions for basic social and human problems, improving the internal and external efficiencies of these organisations by providing them with advice and expertise in niche areas.





Human Resource Development  
Network

Human Resource Development Network  
41, Street 56, F-6/4, Islamabad, Pakistan  
Tel: +92 51 2828259, 2821757 | Fax: +92 51 2826540  
E-mail: [info@hrdn.net](mailto:info@hrdn.net) | Website: [www.hrdn.net](http://www.hrdn.net)

Supported by:  
Aga Khan Foundation (Pakistan)



AGA KHAN FOUNDATION  
(PAKISTAN)

**actionaid**  
pakistan