

FABRICS, INC., DEVELOPMENT PHASE

- B Person 1 is the Observer
Person 2 is the Initiator

YOU ARE THE ACTIVE LISTENER

You are meeting with a subordinate regarding their performance. You have just told the subordinate that their performance was average. Listen, then respond using decoding and feedback.

- C Person 1 is the Active Listener
Person 2 is the Observer

YOU ARE THE INITIATOR

A group of equal-level managers are meeting on a project. One of these people has just taken control of the meeting, and you don't like it.

You start. Say angrily:

"YOU'RE CONTROLLING THESE MEETINGS LIKE YOU WERE THE BOSS. WE ARE ALL EQUAL HERE AND I AM SICK AND TIRED OF YOU ACTING LIKE THE BOSS."

And so forth

We will return to Fabrics, Inc., in the next chapter (evaluation) to complete the example. As you might expect, similar exercises appear in the evaluation chapter that are designed to measure how much learning took place.

KEY TERMS

- | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| • Dry run | • Instructional strategy | • Pilot program |
| • Dysfluencies | • Learning point | • Program development plan |
| • Icebreaker | • Nonverbal cues | • Training plan |

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. You are asked to deliver a two-day workshop for managers on effective feedback skills. It is focused primarily on performance reviews. Approximately 100 managers need to be trained. Describe what the content of the training would entail, the methods you would use (e.g., lecture, case study, role-play), and the instructional media and equipment you would want, and explain why. Also, what type of room setup would you want, and why? Indicate how many sessions you would need for this number of managers, and explain why.
2. Describe how the experiential learning model relates to the social learning model.
3. What are some typical difficult trainees, and how would you deal with them?
4. How do the dry run and pilot training differ? Why?

CASE: Palm Desert (Conclusion)

The Palm Desert case at the beginning of the chapter provides an example of an effort to evaluate using a control group and pre-/postdesign. Even here, however, problems arose in the way the evaluation was managed. One issue is that learning was not assessed. Only behavioral change was assessed six months after training. We know that the training did not transfer, but we do not know why. If it did not transfer because it was never learned in the first place, what was the reason? Perhaps, there was just too much material to learn in a one-day seminar? Examining the process of developing the training might reveal this problem, and the training could be revised before being implemented. For a small organization, the training was obviously a major undertaking, and a more comprehensive training evaluation might be more advisable.

SUMMARY

We began this chapter by discussing the importance of a comprehensive evaluation. We end it by suggesting that a comprehensive evaluation is not always necessary. Understanding what to consider before evaluating makes such decisions more logical and useful.

Evaluation can be complex and, in many cases, costly. For this reason, we suggested throughout this chapter that evaluation is useful and important, but not necessary at all levels all the time. Furthermore, good detective work can, in some cases, replace complex designs in assessing the validity of evaluation.

Deciding what training should be evaluated, and at what levels, will be easier if the organization is proactive. By examining the strategic plan, it is possible to identify those areas of training that require evaluation and the extent to which evaluating is necessary. Without such direction, the training department will need to identify its mission and goals as best it can and work from there to determine the training that needs to be evaluated. Even for a large organization, it is simply not practical to evaluate everything. All organizations need to determine what training they want to evaluate and how they will do so.

THE TRAINING PROGRAM (FABRICS, INC.)

We are now ready to examine the evaluation phase of the Fabrics, Inc., training. We presented the training, and it is time to do the evaluation. In the design phase of the training process, one of the outcomes was development of evaluation objectives. Although we developed and implemented the training, it is critical to remember that developing the tools for evaluation needs to be done concurrently with developing the training, not after it.

Examination of the output of the evaluation phase of training indicated two types of evaluation: process and outcome. The process evaluation will consist of the trainer, during training, documenting the content phases and times taken in each of the training modules. These results will then be compared with the actual expectations regarding training content and times allotted.

(continued)

THE TRAINING PROGRAM (FABRICS, INC.)

For the outcome evaluation, four types are identified. The reaction questionnaire for trainers will model the one that was presented in Figure 9-1 of the text. For the training itself, the reaction questionnaire is shown in "Fabrics Reaction 1" below.

For learning, we need to revisit the learning objectives to determine what is required. We need a paper-and-pencil test for measuring knowledge (objectives 1 and 2 below) and two

behavioral tests to measure active listening and conflict resolution skills (objectives 3 and 4). More specifically, the first two learning objectives (and the others related to the training but not developed here) are accommodated using the paper-and-pencil test. The content of this test is partially represented in "Fabrics Paper-and-Pencil Test" on page 356. But first let's look at the learning objectives.

Fabrics Reaction 1

Using the scale below, evaluate the training by circling the appropriate number to the right of the item.

- 1 = Strongly disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neither agree nor disagree
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly agree

Active Listening Skills

The training met the stated objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
The information provided was enough for me to understand the concepts being taught.	1	2	3	4	5
The practice sessions provided were sufficient to give me an idea of how to perform the skill.	1	2	3	4	5
The feedback provided was useful in helping me understand how to improve.	1	2	3	4	5
The training session kept my interest throughout.	1	2	3	4	5

Circle the response below that reflects your feelings about the pace of the session just completed.

- 1. Way too fast
- 2. A bit fast
- 3. Just right
- 4. A bit slow
- 5. Way too slow

What did you like best about this part of the training?

What would you change?

Comments:

Note: A similar scale would be used for each of the other components of training that were taught.

(continued)