## Learning and Development Awards Category Submission Form: Best Advance in Learning Measurement

*Title of Your Entry Program:*

***EvaluateIt***

*Title Here*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Name of Entering Organization: Capgemini University |
| Name of Helping Organization (Vendor) if submitted jointly: N/A |
| Date: 07/04/2015 |
| Category: Best Advance in Learning Measurement |

Company Background (of entering organization, not the vendor)



|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company At-a-Glance  Briefing Report | |
| Headquarters | Paris, France |
| Year Founded | 1967 |
| Revenue | €10.573 billion |
| Employees | 145,000 |
| Global Scale | Capgemini operates in more than 44 countries worldwide |
| Customers/Output, etc. | Global brands, public and government organizations throughout the world |
| Industry | Consulting, Technology, Outsourcing and Local Professional Services |
| Stock Symbol | CAP: Euronet Paris |
| Website | www.capgemini.com |

Budget and Timeframe

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Budget and Timeframe*  Briefing Report | |
| Overall budget | N/A |
| Number of (HR, Learning, Talent) employees involved with the implementation? | ~20 |
| Number of Operations or Subject Matter Expert employees involved with the implementation? | ~25 |
| Number of contractors involved with implementation | 1 |
| Timeframe to implement | 1 year |
| Number of contractors involved with implementation | 1 |
| Start date of the program | 1/1/2013 |

Business Conditions & Business Needs

(*Judging Criteria* *One: Fit to the Needs)*

Capgemini’s ambition is to reach the “Champions League” of IT services and be recognized as a world-class consulting, technology and outsourcing provider.

In 2013, Capgemini and our University embarked on a transformation program to increase competitiveness by improving our ability to exploit our Rightshore™ capabilities and increase our delivery margin.

Within Capgemini, the Engagement Management (EM) role (project management, program management and service delivery management) and associated certification program is the most important factor in achieving this ambition.

EM certification is managed at our global headquarters and diligently applied across all business units, targeting all employees who are in charge of Capgemini responsibility projects. They are accountable for specific deliverables, budgets, and teams. Specific sets of criteria have been defined across all five levels of the EM certification program. These criteria are aimed to assess the knowledge, skills, and experience of the candidates. The EM certification and training are largely based on the Unified Project Management (UPM) in-house methodology and the tools that support the role. UPM is inspired by the Project Management Body of Knowledge, which is managed by the Project Management Institute. However, UPM has evolved over time to become specifically targeted to the management of application and managed services projects, while staying within the context of Capgemini's tools, key performance indicators, financial, risk and delivery policies. While the "foundation" level of this certification is primarily curriculum-based (mandatory courses and a multiple-choice test) the four other levels are performance-based. The candidate must not only answer knowledge and scenario-based questions, but his performance in the field, including feedback from peers and managers and deliverables produced on projects, is also part of the assessment. To quote three senior executives:

*“Our position is that our [EM] certification is unique, [...] not only do you need to take the training and pass the tests, but you have to have demonstrated actual experience, successful experience, to become certified.”*

*“The EM certification, not only looks to make sure that you are knowledgeable about [...] project management but that you also have proven success.”*

*“EM certification is extremely structured and difficult to obtain. It recognizes the EMs that have proven experience at a certain level of competency.”*

As our University’s vision is to bring people together to develop their capabilities and achieve the full potential of our Group and its businesses, it was important to understand the benefits that the EM training program delivered to the business as an essential component of certification.

Overview

(*Judging Criteria* *One: Fit to the Needs)*

In 2014, our University launched a new program, EvaluateIt, with the goal of understanding the impact of training programs, optimizing and refining them, and validating financial investments.

The program was designed to:

* Help assure the business they are getting the best value for their learning investment, through evidence collected in the program
* Help the University and local learning and development organizations implement a continuous improvement program rather than run expensive and infrequent re-design cycles
* Close the gap in our development process around evaluation where we do not have a consistent evaluation framework
* Help participants continue to enhance their learning through assessments and provide their input on the quality of the learning through timely and effective feedback
* Help the Capgemini learning network implement a consistent and robust evaluation method for its training programs

The overall focus is on assessing the effectiveness of a learning solution, rather than its efficiency. The framework was based on industry best practice (Kirkpatrick, Bersin) with external expert advice, used systematically and piloted over 18 months. It is now a standard approach that our University applies to all learning programs.

The framework consists of four levels, described in the next section – Like It, Know It, Show It and Impact It. Like It is now mandatory for all learning programs, both new and old, while Know It and Show It are being introduced for new programs. Impact It will be applied selectively to programs that warrant the extra measurement effort involved.

Design of the Program

*(Judging Criteria Two)*

Evaluate It is a four-level framework:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Level | Measurement Objective | Typical Evaluation Method |
| Like It | Relevance, experience and intent to apply | Feedback form at the end of the course |
| Know It | Knowledge acquisition and retention | Knowledge test 3-6 weeks after the course |
| Show It | Behavior and individual performance | Survey of managers or subordinates requesting feedback of observed changes 3-6 months after the course, and/or individual KPIs collected. |
| Impact It | Adoption and business performance | KPIs collected as part of the operational processes of the organization. Adoption of the course in different business units is also analyzed. Performed once or twice a year. |

We decided to use the framework to measure the effectiveness of the EM Practitioner training program, which is one of the prerequisites for achieving EM Level 1 certification.

EM Practitioner is a blended learning program, consisting of a Virtual Classroom session, some mandatory e-learning modules, and a 5-day face-to-face classroom program followed by an examination. Using a combination of exercises and role-plays, the course covers:

* How to practice in a safe environment, preparing some of the standard deliverables for an engagement manager
* How to effectively manage scope, analyze and manage project financials
* How to prepare periodic reporting at varying levels within a client organization (i.e. a steering committee) and prepare for and present difficult client discussions

One of the key financial measures is the Delivery Value Improvement (DVI), which measures the profitability of the project. We chose to measure this KPI as it directly influences the strategic goal of competitiveness.

From the framework, we decided to measure Like It, Know It and Show It.

Delivery of the Program

*(Judging Criteria Three)*

The model was implemented in three phases: Like It, Know It and Show It.

For Like It, every participant was asked to fill in a questionnaire at the end of the course. This measured not only their enjoyment of the course, but also the degree of knowledge they felt they had gained as a result. An example of the questionnaire is shown below.



For Know It, we created an online examination that tested participants’ knowledge in the key areas covered by the course, such as certification, configuration management, estimation, quality management, Rightshore™, risk management, tools, and tracking and reporting. We measured the examination pass rate and the number of people taking the exam.

An example of the exam is shown below.



Finally, for Show It we measured the DVI on projects and correlated this against certification level.

To gather the information to perform this analysis, we used N2K, Capgemini’s Information System. N2K shows the financial result per engagement and contract, and also records the level of certification of the Engagement Manager. Mapping this information gave us the required insight into the correlation between certification and engagement success.

The results for the three levels are explained in section 4.

Change Management Efforts

*(Judging Criteria Three)*

We work closely with key business stakeholders whenever we launch transformation initiatives such as the one described here. The University Board, which comprises the head of each strategic business unit (SBU) and the head of each central function, sets the overall strategy and signed off on this initiative. We then worked with Group Delivery and the Club d’Experts (which leads the EM community) to develop, socialize and promote the program to its members. In this way we were able to anticipate any challenges and address them before they became an issue, which made the whole implementation process run more smoothly.

For the analyses, we used our group-wide N2K database, which captures the KPIs of client projects from across the organization. At the beginning of the program, N2K was not fully implemented in all business units, so we had to gather information from different sources and make a consolidated view. The lack of a common approach made it difficult at times to get comparable data.

With the gradual rollout and deployment of N2K, consistent and comparable datasets become more and more available.

Measureable Benefits

*(Judging Criteria Four)*

We derived benefits from all three levels in the EvaluateIt framework when applied to EM Practitioner.

# Like It

EM Practitioner was delivered to over 590 participants in the first three quarters of 2014 and achieved an overall rating of 4.2 out of 5, which is average for all the EM programs. Analyzing variations between geographies and delivery methods allowed us to identify the fact that delivering the course in the evening (as is the practice in one country) is less effective than normal delivery, so this practice has been discouraged.

Further analysis by individual modules within the program (especially when coupled with Know It results) allowed us to identify which modules are more successful than others. This has been taken into account in a recent upgrade to the program, and we are monitoring feedback to see the effect this has had.

# Know It

We measured the pass rate for both the Level 1 and Level 2 EM Certification examinations. For those who sat the test without having attended a course, the blended pass rate was 60%. For those who had attended EM Practitioner, the pass rate was 81%, clearly demonstrating the impact of the course.

Further analysis of success rates in each of the topics examined showed clearly that some topics were understood better than others (e.g. questions on ‘Tools’ were answered correctly by 85% of participants, whereas ‘Quality Management’ only managed 48%). As stated above, this information was used to help improve the design of the course.

# Show It

We analyzed projects delivered in the first seven months of 2014 by two business units and measured the DVI delivered by both certified and non-certified EMs. We found that non-certified EMs delivered a positive DVI on 63% and 62% of projects, whereas the equivalent figures for certified EMs were 68% and 72%, respectively. This clearly shows that certification (and therefore training) has a strong correlation with delivering greater competitiveness.

Overall

*(Judging Criteria Five)*

The evaluation method for Like It and Know It is in place. More work is needed in the evaluation method for Show It – at the moment the figures are at a high level for each SBU. For Show It, the evaluation method should use more detailed data available in N2K and GFS to determine the success of engagement managers on the level of certification, and it should also include OTACE (on time and above client expectation) scores. Additionally, the quantitative approach should be complemented with qualitative interviews, which provide additional insights on how to improve the effectiveness of the program.

Once Show It is in place, analyses for Impact It can be started up, using the same gathered data but then looking at it from an SBU perspective.

Although the program is performing well, and has had a tangible and positive impact on the performance of the organization, a couple of recommendations can be made to investigate some specific situations where the results are lower than the average:

* On the overall EM curriculum level, APPS1-FSGBU and SOG are below par with 3.8. Investigation is necessary to identify the root cause and define the next steps to improve
* On a country level, the scores in the Netherlands and Belgium are low. Further investigation is necessary to determine the root course and define an improvement plan
* On a module level the E-learnings score an average of 0.5 point lower. Investigation is needed to determine how the EMP e-learning score compares to other e-learnings as well as how e-learnings can be improved
* With regard to the exam, investigation is recommended to determine if language issues have an effect on the pass rate
* Investigating topics with a low pass rate (particularly Tracking and Reporting and UPM) on the exam is necessary to determine if the modules deliver the right key messages to answer the questions correctly

While there is always room for improvement, when we look at the impact EvaluateIt has had on the Group, it’s easy to see that it has allowed us to not only simplify the task of evaluating our projects, but also cut down on the waste of valuable time and make better use of local skills, knowledge and resources.