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What we will talk about...

- **Overview** of a ten-step evaluation procedure
What we will talk about...

- **Overview** of a ten-step evaluation procedure
- **Evaluation** of two common programs in industry
What we will talk about...

1. How did a call center’s hiring & onboarding process work?

2. How did a refresher eTraining program work?
An Overview of the 10-Step Evaluation Procedure

Yonnie Chyung
Who is NOT familiar with Kirkpatrick’s 4-level evaluation framework?

• Level 1 – Reaction

• Level 2 – Learning

• Level 3 – Behavior

• Level 4 – Results

THIS MORNING,
Someone from your organization came and asked you to evaluate the annual mandatory safety training program

What is the first thing you would do?
1. Develop survey or interview questions that I need to use
2. Decide whether to evaluate participants’ satisfaction, learning, or behavioral change
3. Tell them that they don’t have to evaluate mandatory training programs
4. None of the above (you will do something else)
Step 7: Develop data collection instruments
Step 8: Collect data
Step 9: Analyze data with rubrics
Step 10: Draw conclusions

Assess feasibility and risk factors for evaluation, and conduct formative and summative meta-evaluations

Deliverable 3: Evaluation final report

A ten-step evaluation procedure

A ten-step evaluation procedure

A ten-step evaluation procedure

Step 1: Identify an evaluand
Step 2: Identify stakeholders
Step 3: Identify the purpose of evaluation

Identification phase

Step 4: Develop a program logic model
Step 5: Determine dimensions and importance
Step 6: Determine data collection methods

Planning phase

Assess feasibility and risk factors for evaluation

Deliverable 1: Statement of work

Step 7: Develop data collection instruments
Step 8: Collect data
Step 9: Analyze data with rubrics
Step 10: Draw conclusions

Implementation phase

Deliverable 2: Evaluation proposal
Deliverable 3: Evaluation final report

A ten-step evaluation procedure

Step 1: Identify an evaluand
Step 2: Identify stakeholders
Step 3: Identify the purpose of evaluation
Assess feasibility and risk factors for evaluation

Deliverable 1: Statement of work

Identification phase

Step 4: Develop a program logic model
Assess feasibility and risk factors for evaluation, and conduct formative meta-evaluations

Implementation phase

Step 5: Determine dimensions and importance
Step 6: Determine data collection methods

Step 7: Develop data collection instruments

Step 8: Collect data
Step 9: Analyze data with rubrics
Step 10: Draw conclusions

Assess feasibility and risk factors for evaluation, and conduct formative and summative meta-evaluations

Deliverable 3: Evaluation final report

Are you an instructional designer?

Dick and Carey’s instructional design procedure

**Analyze**
- Assess needs to identify goals
- Analyze learners and contexts

**Design**
- Conduct instructional analysis
- Write performance objectives
- Develop assessment instruments
- Develop instructional strategies

**Develop**
- Revise instruction
- Develop and select instructional materials
- Conduct formative evaluation

**Implement**
- Conduct summative evaluation

A ten-step evaluation procedure

**Analyze**

- **Identification phase**
  - Step 1: Identify an evaluand
  - Step 2: Identify stakeholders
  - Step 3: Identify the purpose of evaluation

- **Planning phase**
  - Step 4: Develop a program logic model
  - Step 5: Determine dimensions and importance
  - Step 6: Determine data collection methods

- **Implementation phase**
  - Step 7: Develop data collection instruments
  - Step 8: Collect data
  - Step 9: Analyze data with rubrics
  - Step 10: Draw conclusions

**Design/Develop**

- **Identification phase**
  - Step 1: Identify an evaluand
  - Step 2: Identify stakeholders
  - Step 3: Identify the purpose of evaluation

- **Planning phase**
  - Step 4: Develop a program logic model
  - Step 5: Determine dimensions and importance
  - Step 6: Determine data collection methods

- **Implementation phase**
  - Step 7: Develop data collection instruments
  - Step 8: Collect data
  - Step 9: Analyze data with rubrics
  - Step 10: Draw conclusions

**Implement**

- **Identification phase**
  - Step 1: Identify an evaluand
  - Step 2: Identify stakeholders
  - Step 3: Identify the purpose of evaluation

- **Planning phase**
  - Step 4: Develop a program logic model
  - Step 5: Determine dimensions and importance
  - Step 6: Determine data collection methods

- **Implementation phase**
  - Step 7: Develop data collection instruments
  - Step 8: Collect data
  - Step 9: Analyze data with rubrics
  - Step 10: Draw conclusions

**Meta-evaluations**

Step 1: Identify an evaluand
Step 2: Identify stakeholders
Step 3: Identify the purpose of evaluation

Assess feasibility and risk factors for evaluation

Deliverable 1: Statement of work

Identification phase

- Step 1: Identify an evaluand
- Step 2: Identify stakeholders
- Step 3: Identify the purpose of evaluation

Assess feasibility and risk factors for evaluation

Step 4: Develop a program logic model

Step 5: Determine dimensions and importance

Step 6: Determine data collection methods

Deliverable 2: Evaluation proposal
Assess feasibility and risk factors for evaluation, and conduct formative meta-evaluations

Step 7: Develop data collection instruments

Step 8: Collect data

Step 9: Analyze data with rubrics

Deliverable 3: Evaluation final report
Assess feasibility and risk factors for evaluation, and conduct formative and summative meta-evaluations

Step 10: Draw conclusions


What do stakeholders need from the program and evaluation? Formative? Summative?
How to assess stakeholders' needs?

The Client, Ms. Jie Chen

The Evaluator, Ms. Theresa Brittain

Want to make changes based on evaluation findings

Evaluation findings won’t impact funding decisions

Other staff members (not management) want to know about (use) evaluation findings

Exit Survey

Q1. ..... ..... .....  
SD – D – N – A – SA

Q2. ..... ..... .....  
SD – D – N – A – SA

Q3. ..... ..... .....  
SD – D – N – A – SA
Step 4: Develop a program logic model

Step 5: Determine dimensions and importance

Step 6: Determine data collection methods

Assess feasibility and risk factors for evaluation, and conduct formative meta-evaluations

Step 7: Develop data collection instruments

Step 8: Collect data

Step 9: Analyze data with rubrics

Deliverable 3: Evaluation final report

Program logic model (W.F. Kellogg Foundation)

Resources → Activities → Outputs → Outcomes → Impact

If you use...

Then you will get...


Washing your face or brushing your teeth can harm the ocean, **yourself** and your children. Beat the Microbead!
Program logic model (W.F. Kellogg Foundation)

Resources
- Researchers
- Volunteers
- App developers
- App website
- Website developers
- Social media

Activities
- Develop an app that scans for inclusion of plastic microbeads in products
- Develop a website
- Announce the app via social media

Outputs
- The “Beat the microbead” app
- A website promoting the app
- # of social media users who have access to the app announcement

Outcomes
- The public is aware of the problems associated with plastic microbeads
- The public uses the app and avoids purchasing products with microbeads

Impact
- Companies stop using plastic microbeads in their products
- Companies put less pollution in the water

If you use...

Then you will get...

# Training impact model (Robert Brinkerhoff)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program capabilities</th>
<th>Critical actions</th>
<th>Key results</th>
<th>Business goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers know:</td>
<td>Volunteers do:</td>
<td>The shelter gets:</td>
<td>The shelter achieves:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• when to put a leash or a harness on dogs</td>
<td>• walk small, medium, and large dogs on a leash or harness</td>
<td>• no injuries among volunteers</td>
<td>• satisfaction among visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• how to put a harness on dogs</td>
<td>• safely handle dogs without causing injuries on dogs or volunteers themselves</td>
<td>• healthy dogs</td>
<td>• increased number of adoptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• how to handle aggressive dogs</td>
<td>• report sick dogs</td>
<td>• more adoptable dogs</td>
<td>• satisfaction among volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• how to recognize sick dogs based on symptoms</td>
<td>• train dogs to follow basic commands</td>
<td>• visitors being able to walk dogs with or without help of volunteers</td>
<td>• increased number of volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• how to train dogs to follow basic commands (e.g., sit, stay, heel, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Why use a program logic model?

- Resources
  - Researchers
  - Volunteers
  - App developers
  - App website
  - Website developers
  - Social media

- Activities
  - Develop an app that scans for inclusion of plastic microbeads in products
  - Develop a website
  - Announce the app via social media

- Outputs
  - The “Beat the microbead” app
  - A website promoting the app
  - # of social media users who have access to the app announcement

- Outcomes
  - The public is aware of the problems associated with plastic microbeads
  - The public uses the app and avoids purchasing products with microbeads

- Impact
  - Companies stop using plastic microbeads in their products
  - Companies put less pollution in the water

Which dimensions to investigate?

Which dimensions to investigate?

Formative evaluation?

Resources
- Researchers
- Volunteers
- App developers
- App website
- Website developers
- Social media

Activities
- Develop an app that scans for inclusion of plastic microbeads in products
- Develop a website
- Announce the app via social media

Outputs
- The “Beat the microbead” app
- A website promoting the app
- # of social media users who have access to the app announcement

Outcomes
- The public is aware of the problems associated with plastic microbeads
- The public uses the app and avoids purchasing products with microbeads

Impact
- Companies stop using plastic microbeads in their products
- Companies put less pollution in the water

Which dimensions to investigate?

Resources
- Researchers
- Volunteers
- App developers
- App website
- Website developers
- Social media

Activities
- Develop an app that scans for inclusion of plastic microbeads in products
- Develop a website
- Announce the app via social media

Outputs
- The “Beat the microbead” app
- A website promoting the app
- # of social media users who have access to the app announcement

Outcomes
- The public is aware of the problems associated with plastic microbeads
- The public uses the app and avoids purchasing products with microbeads

Impact
- Companies stop using plastic microbeads in their products
- Companies put less pollution in the water

Step 4: Develop a program logic model

Step 5: Determine dimensions and importance

Assess feasibility and risk factors for evaluation, and conduct formative meta-evaluations

Which dimensions to investigate?

Which *dimensions* to investigate?

**Resources**
- Researchers
- Volunteers
- App developers
- App website
- Website developers
- Social media

**Activities**
- Develop an app that scans for inclusion of plastic microbeads in products
- Develop a website
- Announce the app via social media

**Outputs**
- The “Beat the microbead” app
- A website promoting the app
- # of social media users who have access to the app announcement

**Outcomes**
- The public is aware of the problems associated with plastic microbeads
- The public uses the app and avoids purchasing products with microbeads

**Impact**
- Companies stop using plastic microbeads in their products
- Companies put less pollution in the water

Step 4: Develop a program logic model

Step 5: Determine dimensions and importance

Step 6: Determine data collection methods

Assess feasibility and risk factors for evaluation, and conduct formative meta-evaluations

Planning phase

Step 7:

Step 8:
Collect data

Step 9:
Analyze data with rubrics

Step 10:
Draw conclusions

Survey, Interview, Focus group, Observation, Extant data review, Test

Deliverable 2: Evaluation proposal

Deliverable 3: Evaluation final report

Step 7: Develop data collection instruments

Step 8: Collect data

Step 9: Analyze data with rubrics

Step 10: Draw conclusions

Assess feasibility and risk factors for evaluation, and conduct formative and summative meta-evaluations

Deliverable 3: Evaluation final report

A ten-step evaluation procedure

Identification phase

Step 1: Identify an evaluand
- Identify stakeholders
- Identify the purpose of evaluation

Planning phase

Step 4: Develop a program logic model
Step 5: Determine dimensions and importance
Step 6: Determine data collection methods
- Assess feasibility and risk factors for evaluation, and conduct formative meta-evaluations

Implementation phase

Step 7: Develop data collection instruments
Step 8: Collect data
Step 9: Analyze data with rubrics
Step 10: Draw conclusions
- Assess feasibility and risk factors for evaluation, and conduct formative and summative meta-evaluations

Deliverable 1: Statement of work
Deliverable 2: Evaluation proposal
Deliverable 3: Evaluation final report

Case #1:
An evaluation of Nation’s Vision Insurance (NVI) call center’s hiring and onboarding process

Mark Morgan
(Casey Ney)
(Jaime Martin)
Case #1

- **Overview** and background

- **Step 4: The program logic model** (what worked)

- **Step 8: Gathering extant data** (what wasn’t expected)
Background

- National vision insurance company
- 100 CSRs hired annually
- 2015, hiring through agency
- 2016, hiring directly by HR
Background

Project Team

- 2 Boise State students who were external to NVI
- 1 Boise State student who was internal to NVI
- Upstream stakeholder - Andy, Call Center Manager
What is one of your “go to” questions during analysis with sponsors and stakeholders?
Program Logic Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Increased number of candidates who apply</td>
<td>• Why was program implemented?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Decreased number of interviews per candidate</td>
<td>● What will tell you it is working?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Lower absenteeism among new employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Decreased cost per call</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Increased schedule adherence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Increased customer satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Begin on-boarding candidates early in the process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Potential candidates for managerial positions in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Overall improvement in team performance as a result of more Supervisor coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Overall success of NVI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why was program implemented?

What will tell you it is working?
Program Logic Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR Recruiter</td>
<td>Get the HR recruiter up to speed on call center needs by calibrating with management team on expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call Center Manager</td>
<td>Develop an assessment tool that matches employee expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Vendor</td>
<td>Implement change management with supervisors around new process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Software</td>
<td>Gather input from training in determining measurements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call center supervisors</td>
<td>Create video of call center / work environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call center training team</td>
<td>Ask questions in interview about pre-work (call center video, background about NVI) sent to candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Management Team</td>
<td>Schedule “meet the leadership team” activity for First day of employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer ambassadors (ex-CSRs)</td>
<td>Assign peer ambassador to help adapt to culture of company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR Lifecycle competency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Who is involved?
- What is being done?
Dimensions and importance weighting

★★★ 1. Interview Process Streamline
   • What gains were made for the effort of streamlining?

★★★★★ 2. Candidate Performance
   • How are the candidates performing with new standards vs. before?

★★★★ 3. Turnover
   • How did turnover change with the new hiring process?

★ 4. Brand Awareness
   • Is there more brand awareness of NVI in Columbus, OH than before?
Step 8: Data collection

- Surveys
- Interviews

Have you conducted interviews remotely?
Step 8: Data collection

- Survey... decent return rate
- Interview... interviewing remotely
- Extant data review... yikes!
Step 8: Data collection

Client: Keep it confidential
Evaluator: No problem
Umm…
Step 8: Data collection

We should have:
A) Told them no way
B) Asked for help from analysts
C) Just sucked it up
D) Something else
Step 9: Analyze data (development of rubrics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Importance Weighting</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Actual Performance / Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Not successful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Minimum required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Excellent performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Per Call – Basic Doctor</th>
<th>Candidate Performance</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>1. &gt; $2.00</th>
<th>2. ≤ $2.00</th>
<th>3. &lt; $1.75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Call – Candidate</td>
<td>Candidate Required</td>
<td>1. &gt; $4.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occurrences (absences)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Queue percentage – Basic Doctor</th>
<th>Candidate Performance</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>1. &gt; 8%</th>
<th>2. ≤ 8%</th>
<th>3. &lt; 6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Queue percentage – Member</td>
<td>Candidate Performance</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>1. &gt; 12%</td>
<td>2. ≤ 12%</td>
<td>3. &lt; 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrences (absences)</td>
<td>Candidate Required</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. &gt; 3</td>
<td>2. ≤ 3</td>
<td>3. &lt; 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidate Performance

Required

1. > 3
2. <= 3
3. < 2
Step 9: Analyze data (development of rubrics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Cost per call - BD</th>
<th>Cost per call - Mbr</th>
<th>Schedule Adherence - BD</th>
<th>Schedule Adherence - Mbr</th>
<th>Final Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>$2.44</td>
<td>$3.31</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>Not Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>$1.68</td>
<td>$2.89</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>Meeting Minimums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>$1.32</td>
<td>$2.05</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>$2.99</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>Meeting Minimums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>$1.42</td>
<td>$3.20</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>Meeting Minimums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$2.26</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>$1.22</td>
<td>$2.26</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>$1.47</td>
<td>$2.73</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>$1.22</td>
<td>$2.29</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>$1.45</td>
<td>$2.86</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>Meeting Minimums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>$1.83</td>
<td>$2.89</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>Meeting Minimums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>$1.76</td>
<td>$1.21</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>Meeting Minimums</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Dimensional results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Overall Quality: Fair</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interview Process Streamline</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Candidate Performance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>★★★★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Turnover</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Brand Awareness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recap

• Step 4: The program logic model (what worked)

• Step 8: Gathering extant data (what wasn’t expected)
Case #2: An evaluation of the front desk payment posting (FDPP) refresher eTraining program at U-Health

Tammy Wheeler
Jie Chen
Theresa Brittain
Case #2

• Overview and background

• What worked well

• Challenges
• Medical college

• 207 Patient Access Representatives participating in eTraining

• eTraining Goal: To refresh and enhance representatives ability to perform front desk payment posting tasks.
## WHAT WORKED WELL

Training Impact Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Program Capabilities</th>
<th>Critical Actions</th>
<th>Key Results</th>
<th>Business Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Means (Planning)
CAUTION!

CHALLENGES AHEAD

1. Convincing the client to move forward with project

2. Getting more than one source of data
Thoughts?
Change can take time
It’s me again!
CURRENT DATA

TEST SCORES

96%

100%

TRAINING IMPACT MODEL

RESOURCES

ACTIVITIES

PROGRAM CAPABILITIES

CRITICAL ACTIONS

KEY RESULTS

BUSINESS GOALS
FREE FREE FREE LABOR
Dimensions and importance weighting

⭐ eTraining design
   How well is the eTraining program designed employing appropriate instructional strategies?

★★ Program implementation and support
   How much are the PAR, their supervisors and the access manager involved while assessing needs, developing the program content, implementing the program, and for continuous monitoring of program outcomes? What should/can be changed?

★★ On-the-job performance
   After completing the eTraining, how well do PARs use the front desk payment posting skills learned?
1st hurdle met
14.5% web survey response rate

MY NAME IS:

BLANK
Sorry, Out of Office
What Would YOU DO?

1. Interview manager in greater detail based upon web survey findings.
2. Interview internal evaluator.
3. Skip interviews altogether and go on vacation, too.
4. None of the above (something else)
What Now? Triangulate the Data

93.1% ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ that the eTraining was easy to navigate and complete, whereas 3.4% disagree.

+ Interview team lead on LMS and authoring tool

+ Extant data
Check, Check, Check
DONE!
# Dimensional results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. e-Learning Design</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implementation and Support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>★★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On-the-Job Performance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>★★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excellent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fair</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you!

Q&As