|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  | Class Analysis |
|  |  |
|  | **Instructor:** Paolo Verme, Abdelkrim Araar |
|  | **Location:** United States |
|  | **Course:** MNA - SUBSIM: A Toolkit for Subsidies Simulations |
|  | **Client:** World Bank Group Staff Learning and Development |
|  | **Class:** MNA - SUBSIM: A Toolkit for Subsidies Simulations Feb 20, 2014 |
|  | **Benchmark:** Only my company |
|  | **Date:** Feb 20, 2014 |
|  |  |
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# Summary

The graph below ranks learner satisfaction for the overall class, each evaluation form type, and then each category evaluated. The blue bars display the class average scores. If included, the orange bars display a benchmark, which can help you gauge relative performance. Any areas that fall below the benchmark average or your performance goals may warrant additional attention when reviewing the remainder of the report.

**Post Event**

# Evaluation Ratings

The table below shows the number of evaluations submitted by students for each evaluation form type, as well as the average scores for the overall form type and each category.

If included, the Follow Up form type gathers feedback from students several weeks following training, and the Manager form type gathers feedback from the students’ supervisors. Both of these assess the degree to which the training has been applied on the job and created lasting results. If the Follow Up or Manager evaluations show a decline of 1 full point or more, the students likely faced unexpected barriers to applying what they had learned back on the job.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Participant** | | **Manager** |
| **Post Event** | **Follow Up** |
| **# of Evaluations** | 5 | 0 | - |
| **Overall** | 6.17 | - | - |
| **Overall Satisfaction** | 6.50 | - | - |
| **Speaker** | 5.90 | - | - |
| **Environment (facilities)** | 6.00 | - | - |
| **Courseware** | 6.60 | - | - |
| **Content** | 6.00 | - | - |
| **Learning Effectiveness** | 6.60 | - | - |
| **Application** | 6.40 | - | - |
| **Impact** | 5.93 | - | - |

# Questions by Category

Each table below shows the number of evaluations and overall scores for each category, followed by the scores for each question. For scale-based questions, the charts to the right display the percentage of dissatisfied students in red, neutral students in yellow, and satisfied students in green. The next column shows the class average, which can be compared to the benchmark average in the last column. Attention should be paid to questions for which the average is below the benchmark and there is high percentage of dissatisfied or neutral students. For multiple choice questions, a chart shows the percentage of students that selected each option.

 % of responses 4 and below  % of responses between 4 and 6  % of responses 6 and greater

| **Overall Satisfaction (Post Event)** | | **Average** | **Benchmark** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall Satisfaction**  # of evaluations: 5 |  | 6.50 | 5.77 |
| I would recommend this learning event to my colleagues. |  | 6.80 | 5.83 |
| How would you rate the overall quality of the learning event? (Note change in scale with 1="very low" and 7="very high") |  | 6.20 | 5.76 |

| **Speaker (Post Event)** | | **Average** | **Benchmark** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Speaker**  # of evaluations: 5 |  | 5.90 | 6.11 |
| The speaker(s) communicated the subject matter effectively. |  | 5.90 | 5.72 |

| **Environment (facilities) (Post Event)** | | **Average** | **Benchmark** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Environment (facilities)**  # of evaluations: 5 |  | 6.00 | 5.59 |
| The physical environment enhanced my learning experience. |  | 6.00 | 5.57 |

| **Courseware (Post Event)** | | **Average** | **Benchmark** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Courseware**  # of evaluations: 5 |  | 6.60 | 5.77 |
| The materials, resources, and/or activities supported my learning. |  | 6.60 | 5.61 |

| **Content (Post Event)** | | **Average** | **Benchmark** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content**  # of evaluations: 5 |  | 6.00 | 5.86 |
| Overall, the content of the event met my expectations. |  | 6.60 | 6.60 |
| I had adequate opportunities to participate during the event. |  | 5.40 | 5.58 |
| Would you like to learn more about the topic? |  | | |

| **Learning Effectiveness (Post Event)** | | **Average** | **Benchmark** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning Effectiveness**  # of evaluations: 5 |  | 6.60 | 5.73 |
| My knowledge/skills increased as a result of this learning event. |  | 6.60 | 5.73 |

| **Application (Post Event)** | | **Average** | **Benchmark** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Application**  # of evaluations: 5 |  | 6.40 | 5.77 |
| The knowledge/skills gained through this learning event are directly applicable in my work. |  | 6.40 | 5.81 |

| **Impact (Post Event)** | | **Average** | **Benchmark** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Impact**  # of evaluations: 5 |  | 5.93 | 5.57 |
| This event was timely in addressing current or emerging issues. |  | 5.60 | 5.60 |
| This learning event will improve my job performance. |  | 5.60 | 5.58 |
| This learning event is a worthwhile investment for the World Bank Group. |  | 6.60 | 6.16 |

# Qualitative Feedback

The comments below may identify specific opportunities for training improvement, areas in which the students require further support, and examples of how the training will be applied on the job. If further information is needed, consider contacting students who could have additional insights in any of these areas.

|  |
| --- |
| **Post Event** |
| **What did you find most useful?**   * Clear materials and explanations (Student\_38688246) |
| **What did you find least useful?**   * Very little time to explore all the capabilities of the Stata routine. I think this needs to be scheduled for a full day perhaps to give participants opportunities to ask more questions. (Student\_38688246) |
| **What would you recommend to improve this learning event?**   * To make it longer (Student\_38680106) * Add a more technical part explaining what exactly this routine does in the background to produce results (Student\_38688246) * The material was presented a bit in a hurry towards the end. Part of this resulted from a very slow start. I would recommend increasing the time by 30 mins, or perhaps require participants to have an intermediate knowledge of STATA. (Student\_38680177) |
| **What kinds of additional support would help you apply what you learned on the job?**   * I think the materials were very good. Just more time for questions and presentation of the material would have been ideal (Student\_38688246) |

# Demographics

The graphs below display the percentage of learners from each demographic that completed the evaluations. The top demographic choices, by number of evaluations, are displayed in the legend to the right with their respective percentages. Use this information to set the context for who has provided feedback in the rest of the report.

# Learner Responses

The table below ranks the students from top to bottom based on their overall evaluation average. The charts in the center column display the percentage of low ratings across the entire evaluation in red, neutral ratings in yellow, and high ratings in green. The students with the highest ratings represent your success cases. Review their comments and demographics to determine the factors that led to the success and the business results that will result from it. Consider contacting any dissatisfied students to apologize that the training did not meet their expectations and learn what could have been done to improve the experience.

 % of responses 4 and below  % of responses between 4 and 6  % of responses 6 and greater

**Post Event**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Learner** | **Distribution** | **Overall Avg.** |
| Student\_38680106 |  | 6.69 |
| Student\_38680177 |  | 6.62 |
| Student\_22773215 |  | 6.08 |
| Student\_38688246 |  | 6.00 |
| Student\_38680166 |  | 5.46 |
| Student\_23080211 | No Response | |
| Student\_23238357 | No Response | |
| Student\_38087679 | No Response | |
| Student\_38688861 | No Response | |
| Student\_38799377 | No Response | |
| Student\_39616555 | No Response | |
| Student\_39616556 | No Response | |
| Student\_39616557 | No Response | |
| Student\_39616558 | No Response | |

# Next Steps

**Improve Quality:**

Identify opportunities to improve content, delivery, logistics, and follow up with students. Discuss with those responsible for each area and determine action steps toward improvement.

**Increase Results:**

Application of learning can be increased when the class instructor or the students’ managers discuss with the students how they will utilize what they learned on the job. Set goals based on the learning objectives and agree on timing and follow up for those goals. Aim to identify and eliminate any barriers to success.

**Investigate Further:**

In Metrics that Matter®, you have a number of reports available for investigating the results you see in this report. Here are a few suggestions to get you started:

* **Evaluation Retrieval:** View the full evaluations from each student, in order to drill into the causes for dissatisfied students and for success cases.
* **Testing Summary:** If students completed scored tests in class, use this report to assess knowledge transfer.
* **Talent Development Summary:** Expand the level of analysis from one class to multiple classes over a date range. Filter results to a client, course, or student demographic.

**Communicate to Clients:**

Your learning clients will find value in hearing the success stories where business results will improve as a result of training, as well as areas in which collaboration between the client and your learning organization can improve results in the future.