Training Evaluation Proposal

Introduction
The conventional method of evaluating the lab projects in the training program has served us well. However, upon taking a closer look at the feedback provided by trainees and evaluation engineers, it appears that there are areas for improvement. The conventional method and its drawbacks are explained below, as well as the proposed method and its benefits to all parties.

Conventional Method
Currently each lab project concludes this way:
- A member of Engineering provides approximately two hours for evaluation and feedback per trainee.
- The grading rubric is completed and submitted electronically to the trainer.
- Upon receipt, the trainer compiles a performance summary for the trainee's manager & team lead.

Drawbacks
There are several drawbacks to the conventional method reported by different stakeholders:

Evaluation Engineers
- With a full lab, each evaluation engineer must devote 6-8 hours of his/her day for evaluation.
- The process takes too long for larger groups, and additional time must be put in that day to fulfill important obligations.
- No special consideration is given by managers the number of hours devoted to evaluation for the training program.

Trainees
- Trainees receive inconsistent feedback due to the number of engineers involved in evaluation (one per project, with substitutes in the event of travel, illness, other obligations).
- One engineer may make a recommendation during one grading session, while another directly disagrees during the next grading session. The trainee's local team may have a third opinion.
- Feedback is appreciated, but wait times can be considerably long on evaluation day.

Managers & Engineering Leads
- Only local teams are chosen to participate due to the nature of evaluation. This requires a high level of commitment to the training program that is not requested of other regions.
- Some teams wish to be more involved in the early development of their trainees.

Trainer
- It can be difficult to find volunteers for evaluation due to the major commitment of hours and conflicting schedules.
- It can be difficult to maintain consistency among graders due to differing roles and experience, as well as substitutes.
- Oftentimes there is minor involvement from trainee's manager or team lead: Performance summaries are usually met with little to no response.
- When the manager or team lead is not confident in the product post-training, feedback is not always reported to the trainer for improvement of the program.

Training Evaluation Proposal

Proposed Method

The main goals of this proposal are to alleviate some of the burden on local teams, provide consistent feedback to trainees, and get their teams more involved in their development. Previously, this may not have been possible due to team size, but growth seems to allow for it presently. The proposed method is as follows:

- A functionality check is performed by a member of Engineering on grading day, playing the role of the customer.
    - This will involve a revised rubric that focuses on adherence to specification and error handling.
    - Any member of Engineering can participate at any time, and consistency will be built into the rubric.
    - The completed rubric is then submitted electronically to the trainer for record-keeping.
- A member of the trainee's team will then perform the code review alongside the trainee.
    - This can be completed in-person or remotely, taking place on evaluation day.
    - This will ensure the team is fully aware of the current product and involved in the future success of the trainee.
    - This section may or may not carry a formal score since it is intended for learning and improvement. Consistency between teams will also be difficult. This point is up for discussion.
- The trainee's code reviewer will then report his impressions to the trainer, well as the trainee's manager & team lead, in the form of a meeting within the next five business days. This will close the loop on training feedback.