

**Bank Staff Learning Agenda:  
Quality of Formal Classroom  
Training FY00 Mid-Year  
Evaluation Report**

*Sukai Prom Jackson*

*Ray Rist*

*Tena Malone*

*Sean Biko Sankofa Martin*

*Chika Hayashi*

*Maria Bina Palmisano*

***Bank Staff Learning Agenda:  
Quality of Formal Classroom Training  
FY00 Mid-Year Evaluation Report  
March 2000***

---

Sukai Prom Jackson  
Ray Rist  
Tena Malone  
Sean Biko Sankofa Martin  
Chika Hayashi  
Maria Bina Palmisano

WBI Evaluation Studies  
Number ES00-49

World Bank Institute  
The World Bank  
Washington, D.C.

Copyright © 2000  
The International Bank for Reconstruction  
and Development/The World Bank  
1818 H Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20433, U.S.A.

The World Bank enjoys copyright under protocol 2 of the Universal Copyright Convention. This material may nonetheless be copied for research, educational, or scholarly purposes only in the member countries of The World Bank. Material in this series is subject to revision. The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this document are entirely those of the author(s) and should not be attributed in any manner to The World Bank, to its affiliated organizations, or the members of its Board of Directors or the countries they represent. If this is reproduced or translated, WBI would appreciate a copy.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<b>List of Tables</b> .....	i
<b>List of Acronyms</b> .....	ii
<b>Preface</b> .....	iii
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	v
<b>I. Description of the FY00 Training and Learning Programs for Bank Staff</b> .....	1
<b>II. Evaluation Purpose</b> .....	3
<b>III. Evaluation Objectives</b> .....	3
<b>IV. Data Source, Analysis, and Performance Standard</b> .....	4
<b>V. Main Findings</b> .....	5
1. Doing The Right Things – Relevance and Appropriateness – Level 1 Data Analysis .....	5
2. Doing Things Right – Efficiency, Effectiveness and Satisfaction – Level 1 Evaluation .....	8
3. Doing Things Right – Analysis of Effectiveness Using Level 2 Methodology .....	10
4. Ensuring Sustainability of Learning Outcomes and Institutional Support for Use of Learning .....	11
<b>VI. Conclusions, Interpretations and Recommendations</b> .....	15
<b>VII. Good Practices</b> .....	16
<b>VIII. Next Steps in Evaluation: January – June 2000</b> .....	17
<b>IX. Annex</b> .....	19



## LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Table A: Network Programs:</b> Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5 on the Three Factors Assessing “Doing the Right Things” .....	6
<b>Table B: Cross-Network/WBISD Supported Programs:</b> Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5 on the Three Factors Assessing “Doing the Right Things” .....	7
<b>Table C: Functional and Foundation Skills/WBISD Programs:</b> Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5 on the Three Factors Assessing “Doing the Right Things” .....	8
<b>Table D: Network Programs:</b> Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5 on the Three Factors Assessing “Doing Things Right ” .....	9
<b>Table E: Cross-Network/WBISD Programs:</b> Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5 on the Three Factors Assessing “Doing Things Right” .....	9
<b>Table F: Functional and Foundation Skills/WBISD Programs:</b> Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5 on the Three Factors Assessing “Doing Things Right” .....	10
<b>Table G: List of Courses for Level 2:</b> Evaluation and Average % Score Based on Participant Performance on Objective Tests Given at the end of the Course .....	11
<b>Table H:</b> Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5 on Potential Impact or Transfer of Learning to the Job .....	12
<b>Table I: Network Programs:</b> Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5 on Three Factors Assessing “Ensuring Sustainability” .....	13
<b>Table J: Cross-Network/WBISD Supported Programs:</b> Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5 on Three Factors Assessing “Ensuring Sustainability” .....	14
<b>Table K: Functional and Foundation Skills/WBISD Programs:</b> Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5 on Three Factors Assessing “Ensuring Sustainability” .....	14

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

<b>ACS</b>	<b>Administrative and Client Support</b>
<b>DEC</b>	<b>Development Economics</b>
<b>ESSD</b>	<b>Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development</b>
<b>FPS</b>	<b>Financial Products and Services</b>
<b>FPSI</b>	<b>Finance, Private Sector and Infrastructure</b>
<b>HD</b>	<b>Human Development</b>
<b>IRL</b>	<b>Institute for Research on Learning</b>
<b>OCS</b>	<b>Operational Core Services</b>
<b>OED</b>	<b>Operations Evaluation Department</b>
<b>OECD</b>	<b>Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development</b>
<b>PREM</b>	<b>Poverty Reduction and Economic Management</b>
<b>QAG</b>	<b>Quality Assurance Group</b>
<b>SPSS</b>	<b>Statistical Package for the Social Sciences</b>
<b>WBI</b>	<b>World Bank Institute</b>
<b>WBIES</b>	<b>World Bank Institute, Evaluation and Scholarships</b>
<b>IFT</b>	<b>Information Technology</b>
<b>COMM</b>	<b>Communications</b>
<b>HUB</b>	<b>Region-Based Training of Country Office Staff</b>

## PREFACE

### *The Learning Agenda of the Bank: FY00 Evaluation Objectives*

***For FY00, the objectives for the evaluation of the Learning Agenda for Bank staff training are:***

- To provide information on the quality of the formal classroom training (Level 1 and Level 2 Evaluations), to complement this with more differentiated analyses (by sector, course types, and participant profiles), and to provide information on good practices.
- To develop a framework and methodology for the evaluation of the impact of training on performance and productivity (Level 3 Evaluation) and to use this to carry out evaluations of five courses.
- To expand the evaluation of FY00 beyond structured classroom training to include learning activities that are alternatives to the traditional classroom training. The two addressed in this years' evaluation are:
  - Sector Weeks; and
  - The learning activities and practices of Thematic Groups (such as clinics, intact team training, group work sessions, and other small group practices).

The World Bank Institute Evaluation Unit (WBIES) has begun to conduct evaluations in all three areas. **This report is focused on the first objective – the evaluation of structured classroom training delivered between July and December 1999.**



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Evaluation Objectives

The objectives are to determine whether:

- Training programs are relevant and appropriate and are “**Doing the Right Things**” of value for the Bank and staff;
- The processes, outputs, and outcomes are technically optimal and likely to produce high impact on performance – “**Doing Things Right**”; and
- The conditions are in place to ensure the sustainability of learning outcomes – “**Ensuring Sustainability**”.

### Methodology

The evaluation uses Level 1 and Level 2 Evaluation methodologies. One hundred and eighty-three training courses are included in the Level 1 Evaluation for a total of 1,989 participants. It is estimated that this represents between 25% and 40% of the participants of the courses included in this evaluation. To date, 20 courses have been identified as appropriate for inclusion in the Level 2 Evaluation. Data for seven of these courses is included in this evaluation. WBIES is working with the Network Learning Representatives to increase the number of Level 2 assessments from 20 to 30 courses.

The analysis is made across all programs for a Bank-wide average, by Network and by Sector or Family within Network. Comparisons are made between the FY99 and FY00 data. Improvements made are highlighted while problem areas still remaining are delineated. The benchmark for judging quality based on Level 1 assessment is that 85% of the respondents to the questionnaire will award a score of 4 or 5 (i.e. good or excellent) on a five point scale. For Level 2, the performance indicator is that courses with post-test assessment will have an average score of 70%.

### Main Findings

- On a Bank-wide basis, the relevance and appropriateness of the programs are good (84% of participants rated the courses as good or excellent). The efficiency, effectiveness, and level of satisfaction are also very good (86%). This represents a major improvement over the FY99 result that averaged 77%. The sustainability or likelihood for staff to use knowledge and skills acquired from the training is very good (85% for FY00 and 75% in FY99). The built-in design and delivery factors that enhance such transfer of learning on-the-job are also quite good (81%).

- Contributing to these results is the improvement in the performance of PREM and FPSI with differences in scores between FY99 and FY00 (“difference scores”) averaging 20% and 12%, respectively. Performance on key variables (assessing relevance, appropriateness, efficiency, and effectiveness) operate at the 80-85% range for PREM, and at the 75-80% range for FPSI. While it is true that the cases involved for PREM and FPSI are quite small, the trend of the performance observed is encouraging. The design and development factors accounting for the improvement should be fully understood and adopted.
- It is also important to note that the improved results originate from including in this year’s evaluation, the WBISD foundation and functional skills programs such as— the HUB Resident Mission Staff Training (90%), and the long standing Communications training (94%), both of which are well recognized in the Bank for their high quality.
- The OCS and the Cross-Network programs have difference scores averaging 6% and 7% respectively across all variables of investigation. The rate of increase demonstrated by the two appears to have greater validity given the larger database for the two Networks. Both programs are also at a more mature stage of development when compared with PREM and FPSI and thus are less likely to yield massive rates of increase or major fluctuations in such increases.
- An examination of the design and delivery variables assessed for this study shows sector-specific variation in areas needing improvement. It also shows that the two key areas that need a concerted effort in improvement by all training programs are: (i) the pacing of the various sessions, and (ii) the depth of coverage of the course content.
- The results show that only 16 of the 183 courses in this evaluation have an above average rating of 85% on “pacing” and “depth of coverage”. The good practices used by these courses are being analyzed by WBIES and will be shared with all stakeholders.
- Two other areas still needing attention in the staff training courses are the application of concepts and principles to Bank work, and the use of case studies or group exercises or other interactive learning processes. Good practices in these areas are also being analyzed by WBIES.

### **Recommendations for Program Improvements**

Poor “pacing” and “depth of coverage” appear to be affected by the following:

- a. Conflicting demands on the part of staff, i.e. (i) staff interest for courses with not more than two days, and (ii) staff need to understand course subject matter in greater detail.
- b. Heterogeneity in the level of knowledge or ability among participants, and inability of instructors or courses designers to manage heterogeneity.

- c. Inability on the part of instructors to engage participants in the learning process or to make maximum use of the higher levels of knowledge or ability existing in the training room.

Improvements to be made in pacing and depth need to examine not only instructional methodology but also: (a) the nature of the participants and the degree to which they represent the target group for whom the course was designed and (b) the process for selecting participants into the various deliveries relative to defined prerequisites for participation.

Improvements for application to Bank work and interactive learning via case studies and group exercises could both enhance the depth of learning as well as the practical usefulness of the courses. The good practices noted by participants in these areas include the use of case studies that: provide practical, hands-on analysis; are based on situations encountered in Bank-financed projects; are more complex; and allow for intensive analysis.

The poor application of principles and concepts to Bank work is common in cases where the focus is on OECD experiences or technologies and where the presenters do not know the nature of Bank work or development work in general to fully discuss implications or application. The assumption that staff would be able to independently draw out the implications or automatically develop applications to their work is invalidated. Designers of courses must be prepared to include time to discuss or to explicitly outline application of course concepts and principles to Bank work.

Precis on “what works, why and how” for Bank staff in these four areas are being prepared by WBIES and will be produced starting in March 2000.

### **Next steps for Evaluation, January – June 2000**

#### **1. Development of the Level 1 and Level 2 Systems for Evaluation**

The following actions will be taken to enhance the validity and robustness of the evaluation findings and interpretations.

- Increase response rate for Level 1 and improve on the external validity or generalization of the results of the evaluation system:
  - Networks must make the completion of an end-of-course questionnaire and participation in a Level 2 assessment requirements for course participation.
  - WBIES will pilot the use of an electronic system (Cold Fusion) for questionnaire completion and submission. This system will also increase efficiency in data collection and processing.
- Provide differentiated analysis that would increase the internal validity of the evaluation:
  - All Training Programs are to provide WBIES information requested on the Course Description form.
- Enhance the interpretation of the quantitative analysis:
  - WBIES will establish a coding system to integrate quantitative and qualitative information in the SPSS data files.

- Increase the number of courses with Level 2 assessment:
  - Network Representatives will provide WBIES with additional courses to be included in the Level 2 evaluation. WBIES will pilot the use of an electronic system for Level 2 assessments (pre- and post-testing).

## **2. Development of Level 3 Evaluation System**

The work started on Level 3 Evaluation will continue with a focus on the following factors:

- Pilot the use of electronic system for collecting data via questionnaires with the HUB training program.
- Pilot the use of an integrated system of questionnaires, interviews, observations, and product analyses as part of the Level 3 system development.
- Pilot the integration of Level 3 and Level 4 Evaluation in the Quality at Entry course.

## **3. Good Practice Notes**

- Complete good practice notes on “What Works, Why, and How” and produce first series in March 2000.
- Establish a web-site for the evaluation of the Bank staff learning agenda.

## **4. Sector Weeks**

- Develop questionnaires to assess eight sector weeks in collaboration with Networks.
- Establish an electronic system for questionnaire completion or for follow-up purposes.

## **5. Thematic Groups as a Community of Practice**

- Refine the concept note for the monitoring and evaluation with the Network Learning Representatives and develop an action plan for FY00 and FY01.
- Work with the Institute for Research on Learning (IRL) to begin quantitative and qualitative/ethnographic analysis of the practices of the communities.

# I

## DESCRIPTION OF FY00 TRAINING AND LEARNING PROGRAMS FOR BANK STAFF

The Learning Agenda for Bank Staff is composed of a variety of interrelated and mutually reinforcing activities and practices designed to enhance staff learning and performance and the development of the Bank as a learning organization. Among the most significant practices are the following.<sup>1</sup>

***Formal classroom training courses or seminars:*** These are designed primarily to develop or enhance the depth of knowledge, skills, and strategies in the technical, core business, relational, and management domains of the Bank's work. This evaluation report is focused on these courses and seminars.

***Thematic Group Continuous Learning and Performance Enhancement Activities and Practices.*** These include formal and informal group activities designated as clinics, action-learning workshops, intact team work sessions, and integrated seminal modules. They are focused *less on* knowledge acquisition and *more on*:

- Refining knowledge and practice of greater value to Bank clients via the sharing of information on good practices;
- The empowering of staff members as part of a community of professionals via the development of learning-to-learn strategies, or via opportunities that highlight the contributions they make in the development of new ideas and approaches;
- The development of products of greater value and integrity, and the achievement of a collective and coordinated impact on clients within a common sphere of influence via coordinated efforts and activities with colleagues across disciplines; and
- Renewing knowledge and exploring alternatives to current practices via an examination of new developments in the field, of cutting edge knowledge and technologies as well as via the exploration of new goals and approaches for development and poverty reduction.

---

<sup>1</sup>*In the absence of complete information about the FY00 Network Training Programs (which are still being developed), WBIES is not in a position to report on the scope of these activities for FY00. The Learning Representatives plan to provide this information to the KLC as a complement to this Report.*

WBIES will start the evaluation of the activities of the Thematic groups in FY00. A concept note has already been prepared to be discussed with the Networks.

***Individualized, Self-paced and Just-In-Time Learning for Performance or Professional Enhancement:*** These include activities designated as mentoring programs, apprenticeship programs, professional development grants programs, coaching systems, computerized desk-top modules, CD roms, video-tapes, hotlines, help-desks, and web-sites. These programs are not being evaluated by WBIES in FY00.

***Sector Weeks:*** These are designed primarily to bring all members of a sector, their client counterparts, and partners to advance their cutting edge knowledge, to share knowledge, to reflect upon on-going policies and practices, to generate new ideas, and to bond and develop collegiality among sector members. About 12 Sector Weeks are planned for FY00. WBIES anticipates evaluating a selected number of these Sector Weeks during FY00 at the request of Networks and Sector Boards.

***Other Learning Activities:*** These include Study Tours; Distance Learning Courses; and Joint Staff and Client Learning Seminars led by Networks (and not by WBI). These activities are not the focus of the FY00 evaluation by WBIES.

## II

### EVALUATION PURPOSE

It is noted above that the focus of this report is on the evaluation of formal classroom training courses delivered between July and December 1999. The purpose of the evaluation is to provide information to:

- Show trends in the performance of the Bank staff training program;
- Guide the improvement of the quality of formal training during FY00;
- Highlight exemplary practices of high impact in the FY00 programs; and
- Guide decisions for program planning in FY00 and FY01.

## III

### EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

This evaluation seeks to determine whether:

- The training programs are *relevant* and *appropriate* and offer the greatest potential value for the Bank – ***Doing the right things;***
- The processes, outputs and outcomes are *efficient, effective and satisfying* and likely to produce high impact on learning and performance – ***Doing things right;***
- The conditions are in place to ensure the sustainability of learning outcomes and the *transfer of learning on the job* – ***Ensuring sustainability.***

In addressing these areas, the evaluation will compare the performance of the training programs from FY99 and FY00, and this will highlight major improvements in performance. Performance areas that still need to be strengthened to enhance course value and quality will also be identified. The data base for FY00 is more differentiated than the FY99 data and permits analysis of differences in performance among the various sectors within Networks. This information will allow program managers to make more targeted decisions.

## IV

### DATA SOURCE, ANALYSIS, AND PERFORMANCE STANDARD

**Level 1 – Data Analysis:** The analysis will be based primarily on participant responses to Level 1 End-of-Course questionnaires which have been customized for various training types. In spite of varying formats and differing scopes of content coverage, these questionnaires all assess: (a) course outcomes (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, potential impact, overall usefulness and satisfaction); and (b) course design and delivery features related to: content, structure, instructional methods, materials, and participant behaviors. For this reporting period, the analysis is based on responses provided by 1,989 respondents. There were 95 training courses scheduled and 183 delivered between July and December 1999. *The benchmark for judging quality based on the Level 1 assessment is that 85% of the respondents to the questionnaire will award a score of 4 or 5 (i.e. good or excellent) on the five point scale of the questionnaire.*

**Level 2 – Data Analysis:** The second data source is the performance of participants on objective tests measuring learning outcomes. Thus far, assessments have been completed for seven or 35% of the 20<sup>2</sup> training courses selected at the beginning of the year for Level 2 Evaluations in FY00. While the ideal for WBIES is for both pre- and post-testing to derive gain scores, an analysis of the overall Level 2 assessment process for FY00 indicates that the post-test only methodology will be most feasible for the majority of the courses, given (a) the short duration of courses - average duration of two days, and (b) limitations in the current capacity to develop good tests for both pre- and post- purposes. The evaluation system thus established for FY00 is a criterion-referenced system based on post-test performance. Discussions with various stakeholders indicate that an acceptable level of learning mastery is an overall average of 70% (across all participants who are tested). Using this as a basis, *the performance indicator established for the evaluation of the training programs is that courses with a post-test assessment will have an average score of 70%.*

---

<sup>2</sup> This number has now been increased to 30 courses for Level 2 assessment and evaluation.

## V

### MAIN FINDINGS

The synthesis provided in this mid-year report is based on the prime factors that define – doing the right things, doing things right, and ensuring sustainability. The specific variables that define these factors are provided in the tables in the annexes and significant features of these findings are referred to in the main text below. Information in this report is provided for: (a) Networks and sectors for which data are made available (i.e. HD, PREM, FPSI, OCS<sup>3</sup>); and (b) the WBISD supported programs (i.e. cross-Network programs, HUB Country Office Staff Training, Communications, Information Technology, and the Orientation for new staff)<sup>4</sup>.

#### 1. Doing The Right Things – Relevance and Appropriateness –Level 1 Data Analysis

The factors of the training program analyzed in assessing relevance and appropriateness were:

- Linkage with the content of the Bank’s corporate performance or business requirements;
- Relevance to staff learning needs for job performance and professional growth; *and*
- The application of appropriate principles for adult learning and performance improvement.

**Comparison FY99 and FY00:** The results for “Doing the right things” summarized in Table A below indicate that on a Bank-wide basis, 84% of the respondents rated the programs as good or excellent in their relevance or appropriateness. This is “*good performance*”. It is nine percentage points above the FY99 result. It is also a mere one percentage point below the WBI benchmark for “very good” performance.

---

<sup>3</sup> The ESSD program is not included in this FY00 evaluation. It is currently being revised.

<sup>4</sup> The original plan of WBIES was to provide more differentiated analyses for the various course types and for differentiated populations. This would have included analyses for courses - with structured versus non-structured knowledge types; with technical versus social interpersonal objectives; of short versus longer duration; for specialists versus for general operational staff; with homogeneous versus heterogeneous groups; and for different populations. This information which is requested by WBIES via a Course Description Form has not been completed by the Networks. The request for demographic data on staff made via the Level 1 Questionnaire is also generally not honored. WBIES will work with the Learning Representatives for the rest of FY00 to develop a method for collecting this and other customized information desired by the Networks and other stakeholders.

**Table A: Network Programs**  
**Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5 on the Three Factors**  
**Assessing “Doing the Right Things”**

	All Bank		ESSD		HD		PREM		FPSI		OCS		Total Network	
	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00
# of Respondents	1015	1989	159		43	47	102	659	77	115	335	378	716	659
Linkage with content of Bank & Performance	77%	83%	63%	-	77%	86%	66%	80%	67%	75%	80%	83%	71%	81%
ds*	6%		N/A		19%		14%		8%		3%		11%	
Linkage with staff learning needs for performance	77%	85%	65%	-	72%	82%	65%	85%	69%	77%	81%	86%	72%	82%
ds*	8%		N/A		10%		20%		8%		5%		10%	
Application of principles of adult learning	70%	82%	54%	-	72%	80%	51%	83%	56%	77%	73%	81%	63%	80%
ds*	12%		N/A		8%		32%		21%		8%		17%	
Total	75%	84%	61%	-	74%	83%	61%	82%	64%	76%	78%	83%	69%	81%
ds*	9%		N/A		9%		21%		12%		5%		12%	

\*ds = difference between the results of FY00 and FY99. Unless indicated with a minus sign, all difference scores show a positive change in favor of FY00.

**Network and Sector Performance:** The pattern of increase from FY99 to FY00 also holds true for all the Networks. This is most remarkable in the cases of PREM, FPSI and HD: The three Networks have average difference scores of 21%, 12% and 9%, respectively. The increase moves the HD and the PREM from average and poor performance to good performance. The performance is almost comparable to that of the OCS and Cross-Network programs. These two groups have average increases of 5% and 4%, respectively, basically maintaining their FY99 status of “good performance”. Most significant of all the improvements observed are: (a) the performance of PREM and FPSI in their “application of the principles of adult learning” (difference scores of 32% and 21%, respectively) and (b) the performance of PREM in its “linkage of courses with staff learning needs for performance on the job”. The findings attest to the increased efforts by the two Networks in improving the relevance and appropriateness of their courses in FY00.

The results in Table A1 in the Annex (which presents a more differentiated analysis of these factors), and Tables 2 and 3 also in the Annex (which provide results for the various sectors of the Networks), show that the following areas should be of focus in the continued efforts at program improvement.

- All programs need to pay attention to “the depth of coverage of the various courses” (77% for all Bank). Table 3 shows that this applies to almost all of the sectors with the exception of ACS (94%), DEC (91%) and the HUB (88%).
- HD needs to work on “case studies for interactive learning and knowledge construction (68%).
- The OCS needs to pay particular attention to the pacing of instruction and to the logic in the sequencing of the sessions of the courses.

**Performance of Cross-Networks:** The analysis of the results shown in Table B below indicates that the Cross-Network programs which are supported in their design and delivery by WBISD have made some improvements in their results (average difference score of 4% points). (See Table B below.) This improvement is true for the DEC and Financial Products and Services programs (FPS), even though the attainments made are still below the quality benchmark.

**Table B: Cross-Network/WBISD Supported Programs  
Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5 on the Three Factors  
Assessing “Doing the Right Things”**

	All Bank		Cross-Network										Total Cross-Networks	
	FY99	FY00	DEC		FPS		QAG		Legal		HR		FY99	FY00
			FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00		
# of Respondents	1015	1989	12	23	57	144		11	52		43		164	178
Linkage with content of Bank & Performance	77%	83%	83%	86%	81%	80%	-	75%	89%	-	65%	-	79%	80%
ds*	6%		3%		-1%		N/A		N/A		N/A		1%	
Linkage with staff learning needs for performance	77%	85%	70%	82%	80%	85%	-	77%	81%	-	77%	-	77%	81%
ds*	8%		12%		5%		N/A		N/A		N/A		4%	
Application of principles of adult learning	70%	82%	85%	80%	73%	83%	-	77%	80%	-	49%	-	72%	80%
ds*	12%		-5%		10%		N/A		N/A		N/A		8%	
Total	75%	84%	79%	83%	78%	82%	-	76%	83%	-	64%	-	76%	80%
ds*	9%		4%		4%		N/A		N/A		N/A		4%	

\*ds = difference between the results of FY00 and FY99. Unless indicated with a minus sign, all difference scores show a positive change *in favor of FY00*.

Note: Legal and HR have FY99 data only. There is no FY00 data at this time. QAG is a new addition to the Cross-Network program and thus only has FY00 data.

**Performance of WBISD Functional and Foundation Knowledge and Skills:** The FY00 evaluation includes an analysis of the performance of the WBISD programs. In FY99, only two of the programs – the ACS and the Orientation programs – were evaluated. The FY99 data for the Orientation Program is, however, not included since a different questionnaire was used in FY99. Table C below shows a high level of performance in FY00 surpassing the Bank benchmark in all programs except for the Orientation program which is rated at 81%.

**Table C: Functional and Foundation Skills/WBISD Programs  
Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5  
on the Three Factors Assessing “Doing the Right Things”**

	All Bank		WBISD										Total WBISD	
	ACS		Orientation		Communication		Information Technology		Leadership		HUB			
	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00
# of Respondents	135	98		16 <sup>-</sup>		230		4 <sup>-</sup>		16	43	128	135	1116
Linkage with content of Bank & Performance	93%	94%	-	-	-	89%	-	85%	-	75%	-	91%	-	87%
ds*	1%		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
Linkage with staff learning needs for performance	91%	95%	-	81%	-	94%	-	86%	-	97%	-	85%	-	90%
ds*	4%		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
Application of principles of adult learning	91%	89%	-	-	-	90%	-	85%	-	91%	-	93%	-	90%
ds*	-2%		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
Total	92%	93%	-	81%	-	91%	-	85%	-	88%	-	90%	-	89%
ds*	1%		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	

\*ds = difference between the results of FY00 and FY99. Unless indicated with a minus sign, all difference scores show a positive change in favor of FY00.

## 2. Doing Things Right – Efficiency, Effectiveness and Satisfaction – Level 1 Evaluation

**Comparison of FY99 and FY00:** The factors analyzed were: (a) delivery efficiency, (b) learning effectiveness, and (c) participant satisfaction. As indicated in Table D below, Bank performance is above the established standard of 85%, or of “very good” quality. It averages 86% for all three factors considered together. It is nine percentage points above the FY99 Total performance of 77%.

**Network Performance:** The Networks made the most dramatic shift in performance with an average increase of 14% for FY00 (for 83% in FY00). Table D shows this increase to come mainly from PREM (19% increase), FPSI (12%), and HD (11%). The OCS increased its performance by 6%. This increase, although less than that of the other Networks, is a more stable rate considering two factors: (i) the large number of cases included in the analysis for OCS; and (ii) the more advanced stage of curriculum development of the OCS program.

An analysis of the specific variables for “doing things right” (Table D1 and Table 2 in Annex) suggests that for all programs, the trend of improvements in the training programs could be enhanced via major modifications in the pacing of the various sessions in almost all courses for all families. The pacing is generally too fast; instructors try to cover a large amount of subject matter within the short duration that characterizes the courses. In cases where there are major differences in knowledge levels among participants, the pace ends up being highly unsatisfactory – too fast for some, or too slow for others. The low level of performance for “pacing” is identical to that for depth of coverage (see above section on Doing Things Right) and suggests a need to examine both variables in tandem when considering improvements to be made.

**Table D: Network Programs  
Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5  
on the Three Factors Assessing “Doing Things Right”**

	All Bank		Network										Total Networks	
			HD		PREM		FPSI		OCS		ESSD			
	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00
# of Respondents	1015	1989	43	47	102	44	77	115	335	378	159		716	1116
Delivery Efficiency	77%	86%	81%	76%	67%	90%	68%	78%	79%	83%	63%	-	72%	82%
ds*	9%		-5%		23%		10%		4%		N/A		10%	
Learning Effectiveness	75%	85%	65%	89%	66%	81%	66%	78%	82%	89%	52%	-	66%	84%
ds*	10%		24%		15%		12%		7%		N/A		18%	
Participants' Satisfaction	80%	87%	73%	87%	70%	89%	63%	79%	82%	89%	65%	-	71%	86%
ds*	7%		14%		19%		16%		7%		N/A		15%	
Total	77%	86%	73%	84%	68%	87%	66%	78%	81%	87%	60%	-	70%	84%
ds*	9%		11%		19%		12%		6%		N/A		14%	

\*ds = difference between the results of FY00 and FY99. Unless indicated with a minus sign, all difference scores show a positive change in favor of FY00.

**Cross-Network Performance:** The performance of the Cross-Network is shown in table E below. The results show that the programs are all above the benchmark in “doing things right”. This applies even to the newly developed courses by QAG.

**Performance of WBISD Functional and Foundation Knowledge and Skills:** These programs principally all perform above standard except for the Orientation program. (See Table F.) The evidence provided in Table 3 of the Annex suggests a need to re-examine its structure in making course adjustments, particularly the “logic in the sequencing of the various sessions” of a given course (72%), and the “pacing” of the instructional process (70%).

**Table E: Cross-Network/WBISD Supported Programs  
Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5  
on the Three Factors Assessing “Doing Things Right”**

	All Bank		Cross-Network										Total Cross-Networks	
			DEC		FPS		QAG		Legal		HR			
	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00
# of Respondents	1015	1989	12	23	57	144		11	52		43		164	178
Delivery Efficiency	77%	86%	82%	94%	84%	85%	-	86%	91%	-	66%	-	81%	86%
ds*	9%		12%		1%		N/A		N/A		N/A		5%	
Learning Effectiveness	75%	85%	83%	96%	74%	85%	-	91%	92%	-	72%	-	80%	87%
ds*	10%		13%		11%		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
Participants' Satisfaction	80%	87%	83%	96%	87%	87%	-	100%	92%	-	71%	-	83%	89%
ds*	7%		13%		0		N/A		N/A		N/A		6%	
Total	77%	86%	83%	95%	82%	86%	-	92%	92%	-	70%	-	82%	87%
ds*	9%		12%		4%		N/A		N/A		N/A		5%	

\*ds = difference between the results of FY00 and FY99. Unless indicated with a minus sign, all difference scores show a positive change in favor of FY00.

**Table F: Functional and Foundation Skills /WBISD Programs  
Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5  
on the Three Factors Assessing “Doing Things Right”**

	ACS		Orientation		Communication		Information Technology		Leadership		HUB		Total WBISD	
	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00
# of Respondents	135	98		167		230		477		16		128	135	1116
Delivery Efficiency	94%	95%	-	77%	-	94%	-	88%	-	93%	-	92%	-	90%
ds*	1%		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
Learning Effectiveness	93%	94%	-	79%	-	95%	-	84%	-	83%	-	94%	-	88%
ds*	1%		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
Participants' Satisfaction	93%	94%	-		-	95%	-	-	-	100%	-	82%	-	93%
ds*	1%		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
Total	93%	94%	-	78%	-	95%	-	86%	-	92%	-	89%	-	90%
ds*	1%		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	

\*ds = difference between the results of FY00 and FY99. Unless indicated with a minus sign, all difference scores show a positive change in favor of FY00.

### 3. Doing Things Right: Analysis of Effectiveness Using Level 2 Evaluation Methodology

A Level 2 evaluation offers a more objective analysis of learning effectiveness. For FY00, a total of 30 courses have been identified for inclusion in the Level 2 Evaluation. Given the predominance of courses with only post-test data, the benchmark for evaluating program quality is that *courses included in the Level 2 Evaluation will have an average score of 70% based on the post-test score of participants.*

An analysis of the level of performance mastery for the seven courses tested thus far reveals a Bank-wide average of 74%, with a score range of 61% and 78%. As shown in Table G below, five or 71% of the seven courses thus far evaluated have average scores at or above 70%. One of the seven courses misses this standard by two percentage points, scoring an average of 68%. The overall performance for FY00 is a great improvement from the FY99 results, where only 58% of the courses met the established criterion of quality performance. The difference between the two results is 15 percentage points. The more objective evidence from the Level 2 assessment correlates with the observed trend of improvements in FY00 noted in the Level 1 evaluation.

**Table G: List of Courses for Level 2  
Evaluation and their Average % Score Based on Participant Performance  
on Correct Answers in Tests Measuring Learning**

Seven Courses with Level 2 Assessment by Network		Average % Score	
	Course Score	Network Score	Bank Total
<b>FPSI</b>		<b>61%</b>	
• Micro-finance	61%		
<b>OCS</b>		<b>78%</b>	
• Project Cycle Management with the Logframe	72%		
• Activity Base Costing	78%		
• Performance Measurement	73%		
• Training the Trainers (Procurement)	87%		
<b>Cross-Network (CN)</b>		<b>76%</b>	
• Microeconomic Policy	84%		
• Investment Operations Economic	68%		
<b>Overall Bank Score</b>			<b>74%</b>

**4. Ensuring the Sustainability of Learning Outcomes and Institutional Support for Use of Learning**

Training has value for the Bank when participants use the knowledge and skills they have acquired from the courses and improve their job performance and productivity. Information of this type is generally provided via a Level 3 Evaluation<sup>5</sup>. This Level 1 Evaluation, however, assesses the sustainability of the learning outcomes and their transfer effects via:

- Participant ratings of the likelihood that they will use the knowledge or skills acquired from the training;
- An analysis of key design and delivery features of training that have been demonstrated in the literature on training to impact transfer of learning;
- An analysis of the type of management involvement that staff perceive as important in enhancing transfer of learning and performance improvement;
- An analysis of other performance enhancement or support systems that staff perceive as important in enhancing their use of knowledge and skills from training.

Participants indicated a very high likelihood to use the knowledge and skills acquired from the training. The Bank-wide average rating in FY00 is 85%. (See Table H) This level

<sup>5</sup> WBIES is starting a Level 3 Evaluation of selected courses in FY00.

of performance is true for PREM, OCS, ACS, and the WBISD programs. HD and FPSI have ratings of 75% and 74% respectively. The Cross-Networks have 89%. Tables 2 and 3 in the Annex show sector variations within Networks. The lowest performing sectors are: Energy and Mining – 64% (from FPSI); Education – 68% (from HD); FPS – 79% (from Cross-Network); PSG – 75% (from FPSI); Gender – 75% (from PREM); and the Orientation program – 81% (from WBISD).

**Table H :  
Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5  
on Potential Impact or Transfer of Learning to the Job**

**Networks**

	All Bank		Networks										Total Networks	
			HD		PREM		FPSI		OCS		ESSD			
	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00
# of Respondents	1015	1989	43	47	102	659	77	115	335	378	159		716	659
The likelihood to use knowledge and skills acquired from the training	75%	85%	71%	75%	60%	84%	66%	74%	78%	86%	68%	-	69%	80%
ds*	10%		12%		7%		N/A		N/A		N/A		12%	

\*ds = difference between the results of FY00 and FY99. Unless indicated with a minus sign, all difference scores show a positive change in favor of FY00.

**Cross-Network Programs**

	All Bank		Cross-Networks										Total Cross-Networks	
			DEC		FPS		QAG		Legal		HR			
	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00
# of Respondents	1015	1989	12	23	57	144		11	52		43		164	178
The likelihood to use knowledge and skills acquired from the training	75%	85%	75%	87%	72%	79%	-	100%	78%	-	84%	-	77%	89%
ds*	10%		12%		7%		N/A		N/A		N/A		12%	

\*ds = difference between the results of FY00 and FY99. Unless indicated with a minus sign, all difference scores show a positive change in favor of FY00.

**Functional and Foundation Skills/WBISD Programs**

	ACS		Orientation		Communication		Information Technology		Leadership		HUB		Total WBISD	
	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00
# of Respondents	135	98		167		230		477		16		128	135	1116
The likelihood to use knowledge and skills acquired from the training	92%	97%	-	81%		94%	-	86%		100%	-	87%		91%
ds*	5%		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	

\*ds = difference between the results of FY00 and FY99. Unless indicated with a minus sign, all difference scores show a positive change in favor of FY00.

The course design and delivery variables noted in Tables I and J below have an empirical linkage with the sustainability or longevity of learning acquired. The evidence shows that for FY00 and on a Bank-wide basis, 81% of the participants rated the courses as good or excellent in attributes that enhance learning sustainability. This result is a marked improvement from FY99 when the ratings for these variables was 70%. The results also show that the programs with the lowest ratings are HD (67%), Orientation (68%), FPS (73%), and FPSI (77%).

The qualitative analysis of comments and recommendations indicates that participants would like their managers to provide time for them to practice and master new knowledge and skills. They also want moral support in the form of trust, encouragement, and incentives to implement new ideas. The most desired support systems to enhance performance improvement are noted to include help-desks, hotlines, clinics, learning groups, access to quality web-sites and access to experts and resource persons. WBIES is currently involved in assessing such factors as part of the Level 3 Evaluation of a selected number of courses. It is also exploring the use of a Bank-wide survey to assess management support in transferring learning acquired and the value of support systems such as web-sites and help-desks. The information from these two sources will be used in the end-of year report.

**Table I: Network Programs  
Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5  
on Three Factors Assessing “Ensuring Sustainability”**

	All Bank		Network										Total Networks	
			HD		PREM		FPSI		OCS		ESSD			
	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00
# of Respondents	1015	1989	43	47	102	44	77	115	335	378	159		716	1116
Application to Bank work	77%	83%	70%	83%	62%	82%	64%	73%	83%	83%	63%	-	72%	82%
ds*	6%		13%		20%		9%		0		N/A		10%	
Use of case studies and group problem solving exercises	65%	80%	72%	68%	38%	89%	48%	74%	64%	80%	58%	-	66%	84%
ds*	15%		-4%		51%		26%		16%		N/A		18%	
Materials for follow-up learning or job application	69%	81%	69%	50%	53%	80%	52%	84%	78%	80%	45%	-	71%	86%
ds*	12%		-19%		27%		32%		2%		N/A		15%	
Total	70%	81%	70%	67%	51%	84%	55%	77%	75%	81%	55%	-	70%	84%
ds*	11%		-3%		33%		22%		6%		N/A		14%	

\*ds = difference between the results of FY00 and FY99. Unless indicated with a minus sign, all difference scores show a positive change in favor of FY00.

**Table J: Cross-Network/WBISD Supported Programs  
Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5  
on Three Variables Assessing “Ensuring Sustainability”**

	All Bank		Cross-Network										All Cross-Networks	
			DEC		FPS		QAG		Legal		HR			
	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00
# of Respondents	1015	1989	12	23	5	14		11	52		43		164	178
Application to Bank work	77%	83%	92%	96%	84%	82%	-	80%	84%	-	60%	-	80%	86%
ds*	6%		4%		-2%		N/A		N/A		N/A		6%	
Use of case studies and group problem solving exercises	65%	80%	67%	91%	69%	66%	-	91%	74%	-	32%	-	61%	83%
ds*	15%		24%		-3%		N/A		N/A		N/A		22%	
Materials for follow-up learning or job application	69%	81%	83%	86%	71%	71%	-	100%	96%	-	51%	-	75%	86%
ds*	12%		3%		0		N/A		N/A		N/A		11%	
Total	70%	81%	81%	91%	75%	73%	-	90%	85%	-	48%	-	72%	85%
ds*	11%		10%		-2%		N/A		N/A		N/A		13%	

\*ds = difference between the results of FY00 and FY99. Unless indicated with a minus sign, all difference scores show a positive change in favor of FY00.

**Table K: Functional and Foundation Skills/WBISD Programs  
Percentage of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5  
on Three Variables Assessing “Ensuring Sustainability”**

	ACS		Orientation		Communication		Information Technology		Leadership		HUB		Total	
	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00	FY99	FY00
# of Respondents	135	98		167		230		477		16		128	135	1116
Application to Bank work	92%	94%	-	-	-	88%	-	84%	-	87%	-	91%	-	88%
ds*	2%		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
Use of case studies and group problem solving exercises	94%	91%	-	68%	-	90%	-	80%	-	83%	-	94%	-	84%
ds*	-3%		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
Materials for follow-up learning or job application	87%	85%	-	-	-	84%	-	86%	-	85%	-	85%	-	85%
ds*	-2%		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
Total	91%	90%	-	68%	-	87%	-	83%	-	84%	-	90%	-	85%
ds*	-1%		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	

\*ds = difference between the results of FY00 and FY99. Unless indicated with a minus sign, all difference scores show a positive change in favor of FY00.

## **VI**

### **CONCLUSIONS, INTERPRETATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Three major results of the study should be highlighted:

1. Improvements in performance from FY99.
2. Reduction in variation among Networks.
3. Major weaknesses still remaining among most programs in the “depth of content coverage” and in “the pacing of the various course sessions”.

A major contributor to the observed results is the remarkable improvement in the performance of PREM, FPSI and HD. How does one explain the observed trend in the results? While it is true that the numbers included in the study for the Network are not large enough to make definitive statements about the trend of performance, credit needs to be given to the efforts that have been made by these Networks in FY00 to scale down on their number of courses and to improve the quality of the structured classroom training.

The OCS and the Cross-Network programs show an increase in performance which although less dramatic, is perhaps more stable and gives more valid information on the rate of improvement expected of training programs that have moved beyond the early mechanical stage of development to a more advanced stage characterized by minor adjustments and complementary pilots.

Irrespective of the calculated rate of increases in performance, it is evident that the observed trend of improved performance is likely to be maintained when concerted efforts are directed at improving four key design features: the pacing of the various sessions of the courses; the depth of coverage; the application of concepts and principles to Bank work; and the use of case studies and group exercises for interactive learning.

The FY00 evaluation included a significant number of WBISD programs designed to develop functional and foundation skills. The ratings for the program are primarily at or above the Bank benchmark, with the exception of the newly developed program, Orientation for New Staff. The high quality of these WBISD programs is linked to good needs assessments, planning, and the use of resident training experts in design and delivery, and is complemented with the use of outside consulting companies with expertise both in content, design and delivery.

## **VII**

### **GOOD PRACTICES**

As one basis for guiding action in the areas of the Bank staff training program that need improvement, Table 5 in the Annex provides a list of all the courses included in this study together with information on their performance relative to the 85% benchmark on all the variables of the study. The table is significant in highlighting courses that consistently manifest high performance on most or all of the variables. Of significance for improving the training in the rest of FY00 are 15 training courses that have high scores (i.e. ratings of 85% and above) on the variables noted above to represent the areas of weakness in the Bank's training program. These areas are: the pacing of the various sessions; the depth of coverage; the application of concepts and principles to Bank work; and the use of case studies and group exercises for interactive learning. The task managers for these courses are being requested to share information about the practices they apply in the design, delivery and overall management of their training courses. WBIES is synthesizing this information and will produce precis highlighting "What Works, Why and How?."

## **VIII**

### **NEXT STEPS IN EVALUATION JANUARY – JUNE 2000**

The following outlines the continuation of the evaluation activities during the second half of FY00.

#### **Evaluation of Formal Classroom Training**

##### **1. Level 1 Evaluation**

- Continue to provide Task Teams and Learning Representatives individual evaluation reports of courses within five to ten days after submission to WBIES.
- Encourage training managers to complete the Course Description Form and Participant Demographic Profile to allow WBIES to conduct differentiated analysis by course type, population of participants and knowledge structure.
- Coordinate with other units to establish an accessible database for monitoring information on courses planned actual deliveries and course types.
- Pilot the use of electronic system (Cold Fusion) for questionnaire completion and submission. This process should remove the extensive amount of time spent by WBIES in cleaning up questionnaires that are incorrectly completed.

##### **2. Level 2 Evaluation**

- Increase the number of courses with Level 2 Evaluation from 20 to 30.
- Continue technical work in enhancing test validity and reliability.
- Pilot the use of an electronic system for Level 2 testing.

##### **3. Level 3 Evaluation**

- Develop a framework and design for assessment and evaluation.
- Develop an electronic system for questionnaire completion and submission (starting with the HUB training).
- Develop an integrated system for using questionnaires, interviews, and product analysis in Level 3 Evaluation.
- Develop a system for providing individual reports and for synthesis across reports.
- Pilot test via a small scale survey the use of knowledge acquired on the job and the value of performance enhancement systems – managers, web-sites, hotlines, help-desks. etc. This will be done to complement the 5-10 cases studies of Level 3 Evaluations.

##### **4. Good Practice Notes**

- Complete good practice notes on, “What Works, Why, and How?” with the first series appearing in March 2000.

## **Evaluation of Other Learning Activities**

### **5. Sector Weeks**

- Define a set of common or core questions for Sector Weeks.
- Develop with each sector a questionnaire to assess its Sector Week.
- Use electronic system in most cases for questionnaire completion and submission.
- Develop a system for providing individual reports and for synthesis across reports.

### **6. Evaluation of the Thematic Group as a “Community of Practice”**

- Refine the concept note with the Network Learning Representatives and develop a plan of action.
- Begin both quantitative and qualitative analyses of the learning and practices of the Thematic Groups.

**IX**

**ANNEX**

**Table A1**  
Relevance and Appropriateness: An Analysis of Specific Variables Included  
in the Level 1 Evaluation.....21

**Table D1**  
Delivery Efficiency, Effectiveness and Satisfaction: An Analysis of Specific  
Variables Included in the Level 1 Evaluation .....22

**Table 1**  
Level 1 Evaluation by Network and by WBISD Supported Programs .....23

**Table 2**  
Level 1 Evaluation for Networks by Sector .....24

**Table 3**  
Level 1 Evaluation for WBISD Supported Programs and Sub-Programs.....25

**Table 4**  
List of Courses Included in the Mid-Year Evaluation by Network and Sector.....26

**Table 5**  
Course Performance at 85% Benchmark by Variable of Investigation.....32



**Table A1**  
**Relevance and Appropriateness: Specific Variables Included in the Analysis**

	All Bank	Networks						WBISD Supported Programs		
		HD	PREM	FPSI	OCS	ESSD	ACS	Cross-Network	All Others	
<i># of Respondents</i>	1989	47	44	115	378		98	178	1129	
<b>Linkage with content of Bank business &amp; performance</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>83</b>		<b>94</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>86</b>	
The choice of content covered	90	100	93	92	91		96	93	91	
The depth of coverage of the various sessions	77	75	64	61	74		94	79	83	
Application to Bank work	83	83	82	73	83		94	84	85	
<b>Linkage with staff learning needs for performance</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>86</b>		<b>95</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>88</b>	
The relevance to staff learning needs for job performance	86	89	86	78	89		94	89	86	
The likelihood to use knowledge/skills	85	75	84	74	86		97	81	87	
Overall Usefulness of the course	86	83	84	79	84		96	86	91	
<b>Application of principles of adult learning</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>81</b>		<b>89</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>86</b>	
- Balance of theory and practice	83	100	80	80	81		86	73	90	
- Balance of lecture, discussion	83	100	83	73	80		92	77	90	
- Application to Bank work	83	83	82	73	83		94	84	85	
- Case studies for interaction & knowledge construction	80	68	89	74	80		91	71	82	
- Follow-up materials for follow-up learning or job application	81	50	80	84	80		85	74	85	

**Table D1**  
**Delivery Efficiency and Effectiveness – Specific Variables Included in the Analysis**

	All Bank	Networks						WBISD Supported Programs		
		HD	PREM	FPSI	OCS	ESSD	ACS	Cross-Network	All Others	
<b># of Respondents</b>	1989	47	44	115	378		98	178	1129	
<b>Delivery Efficiency</b>	86	76	90	78	83		95	86	88	
Match of announced objectives with those delivered	92	76	96	92	95		96	94	92	
Logic in sequence	88	82	98	79	85		96	90	90	
Pacing for learning	78	66	80	66	72		96	76	83	
Materials used during training	85	81	87	77	80		92	83	88	
<b>Learning Effectiveness</b>	85	89	81	78	89		94	87	86	
<b>Participant Satisfaction</b>	87	87	89	79	89		94	89	91	

**Table 1**  
Level 1 Evaluation By Network and by WBISD Supported Programs

% of Respondents Providing Ratings of 4 or 5 on Questionnaire	Total*		Networks					WBISD Supported Programs		
	Bank-wide	HD	PREM	FPSI	OCS	ESSD	ACS	Cross-Networks	All Others	
Course Evaluated										
Number of course offerings	183	3	5	7	27	0	8	15	112	
Number of Respondents	1989	47	44	115	378	0	98	178	1129	

**1. Outcomes**

Efficiency** (Content matched objectives)	92	76	96	92	95		96	94	92
Relevance ** (To staff learning needs)	86	89	86	78	89		94	89	86
Effectiveness ** (In increasing learning)	85	89	81	78	89		94	87	86
Potential impact ** (Likelihood to use knowledge)	85	75	84	74	86		97	81	87
<b>Total Outcomes</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>90</b>		<b>95</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>88</b>

**2. Design and Delivery**

<b>2.1 Structure</b>									
Choice of content	90	100	93	92	81		96	93	91
Logic in sequence **	88	82	98	79	85		96	90	90
Pacing **	78	66	80	66	72		96	76	83
Depth of coverage **	77	75	64	61	74		94	79	83
<b>Total Structure</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>78</b>		<b>95</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>2.2 Instructional Approach</b>									
Balance-theory and practice **	83	100	80	80	81		86	73	90
Balance-lecture, discussion **	83	100	83	73	80		92	77	90
Application to Bank work **	83	83	82	73	83		94	84	85
Case studies and group exercise **	80	68	89	74	80		91	71	82
Materials used during training **	85	81	87	77	80		92	83	88
Materials for follow-up on the job **	81	50	80	84	80		85	74	85
Instructor's effectiveness	96	93	100	98	95		100	95	96
Instructor's delivery**	93	86	96	93	94		100	91	93
Instructor keeps me engaged	87	/	/	/	/		/	/	87^
<b>Overall quality of the instructor</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>/</b>	<b>/</b>	<b>/</b>	<b>/</b>		<b>/</b>	<b>/</b>	<b>90*</b>
<b>Total Instructional Approach</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>84</b>		<b>92</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>Total Design and Delivery</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>83</b>		<b>94</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>88</b>

**3. Overall Ratings by Participants**

Overall quality ** (Rating by participants)	90	88	93	87	90		95	89	97
Overall usefulness ** (Rating by participants)	86	83	84	79	90		96	86	91
Overall satisfaction ** (Rating by participants)	87	87	89	79	89		94	89	91
<b>Total Overall Rating</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>90</b>		<b>95</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>85</b>

<b>GRAND TOTAL (Outcomes, Design &amp; Delivery, Overall Ratings)</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>86</b>		<b>95</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>87</b>
---	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	--	-----------	-----------	-----------

\* Total number of courses and respondents includes 2 courses and 36 respondents without identifying Network

\*\* Indicating the Pearson Chi-Square significance test is significant at 0.05 level

^ Question asked in short-form

# Question asked in HUB training

■ Shaded cells indicate ratings below 85% benchmark

**Table 2**  
Level 1 Evaluation for Networks by Sector

Courses Evaluated →	HD		OCS			PREM		FPSI		Other Trust Funds	
	Edu.	HPN	Quality	Proc.	FM Disb.	RM	Econ. Policy	Gender	PSG		Energy & Mining
Number of course offerings	2	1	10	6	2	9	4	1	2	3	2
Number of respondents	28	19	116	90	30	142	36	8	42	46	27

<b>1. Outcomes</b>											
Efficiency ** (content matched objectives)	67	90	89	94	100	96	94	100	98	87	93
Relevance ** (to staff learning needs)	86	95	87	84	97	89	86	88	88	67	82
Effectiveness ** (in increasing learning)	86	95	84	83	90	88	83	75	81	71	85
Potential impact ** (likelihood to use knowledge)	68	84	85	88	97	83	86	75	71	64	93
<b>Total Outcomes</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>88</b>

<b>2. Design and Delivery</b>											
<b>2.1 Structure</b>											
Choice of content **	100	/	89	90	93	91	91	100	95	87	96
Logic in sequence **	84	79	84	83	83	90	97	100	73	80	85
Pacing **	80	47	69	67	80	73	80	80	44	71	89
Depth of coverage **	75	/	67	73	73	82	52	80	44	71	70
<b>Total Structure</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>2.2 Instructional Approach</b>											
Balance-theory and practice **	100	/	78	73	87	84	83	60	83	76	81
Balance-lecture, discussion **	100	/	73	81	80	87	86	60	71	71	81
Application to Bank work **	83	/	81	92	83	77	88	40	68	70	87
Case studies and group exercise **	56	84	77	85	70	87	88	100	85	67	62
Materials used during training	78	84	81	78	77	84	89	67	76	77	83
Materials for follow-up on the job **	50	/	78	78	87	77	79	100	91	77	92
Instructor's effectiveness **	96	89	96	99	90	96	100	100	100	96	100
Instructor's delivery **	84	88	88	94	97	95	100	75	/	93	92
Instructor keeps me engaged **	94	88	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Overall Quality of instructors	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
<b>Total Instructional Approach</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>85</b>
Total Design and Delivery	84	75	80	82	83	85	86	83	73	78	85

<b>3. Overall Ratings by Participants</b>											
Overall quality ** (by participants)	83	95	87	87	93	92	94	88	94	81	92
Overall usefulness ** (rating by participants)	78	90	87	90	97	87	86	75	84	69	93
Overall satisfaction ** (rating by participants)	85	90	88	85	97	87	89	88	84	75	82
<b>Total Overall Rating</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>89</b>

<b>GRAND TOTAL (Outcomes, Design &amp; Delivery, Overall Ratings)</b>											
	81	86	84	85	92	88	88	83	82	75	87

\*\* Indicating the Pearson Chi-Square significance test is significant at 0.05 level

■ Shaded cells indicate ratings below 85% benchmark

**Table 3**  
**Level 1 Evaluation for WBISD Supported Programs and Sub-Programs**

	ACS		Cross-Network				All other Programs			
	DEC	FPS	QAG	Orientation	Infor. Tech.	Comm.	HUB	Leadership		
Number of course offerings	8	12	1	9	69	29	4	1		
Number of respondents	98	144	11	167	477	230	128	16		
<b>1. Outcomes</b>										
Efficiency ** (content matched objectives)	96	100	92	100	91	97	92	94		
Relevance ** (to staff learning needs)	94	91	88	91	85	94	83	94		
Effectiveness ** (in increasing learning)	94	96	85	91	84	95	83	94		
Potential impact ** (likelihood to use knowledge)	97	87	79	100	86	94	87	100		
<b>Total Outcomes</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>95</b>		
<b>2. Design and Delivery</b>										
<b>2.1 Structure</b>										
Choice of content **	96	100	92	91	89	95	94	94		
Logic in sequence **	96	91	90	82	72	98	97	94		
Pacing **	96	96	73	80	84	88	94	88		
Depth of coverage **	94	91	78	73	83	84	88	56		
<b>Total Structure</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>83</b>		
<b>2.2 Instructional Approach</b>										
Balance-theory and practice **	86	91	69	82	87	96	97	100		
Balance-lecture, discussion **	92	96	73	90	88	93	96	94		
Application to Bank work **	94	96	82	80	84	88	91	87		
Case studies and group exercise **	91	91	66	91	80	90	94	81		
Materials used during training	92	87	83	82	88	93	85	94		
Materials for follow-up on the job **	85	86	71	100	86	84	85	47		
Instructor's effectiveness **	100	100	94	91	95	100	99	100		
Instructor's delivery **	100	100	90	90	99	100	100	/		
Instructor keeps me engaged	/	/	/	/	/	99	/	/		
Overall Quality of instructors	/	/	/	/	/	/	90	/		
<b>Total Instructional Approach</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>86</b>		
<b>Total Design and Delivery</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>85</b>		
<b>3. Overall Ratings (by Participants)</b>										
Overall quality ** (rating by participants)	96	96	88	82	/	96	100	100		
Overall usefulness ** (rating by participants)	94	87	85	100	/	93	83	100		
Overall satisfaction ** (rating by participants)	96	96	87	100	/	95	82	100		
Layout of the course in Learning Space	/	/	/	/	81	/	/	/		
Navigating Through modules & topics	/	/	/	/	82	/	/	/		
Joining a discussion group	/	/	/	/	75	/	/	/		
Moving between Learning Space & Internet	/	/	/	/	80	/	/	/		
<b>Total Overall Ratings</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>100</b>		
<b>Grand Total (Outcomes, Design &amp; Delivery, Overall Ratings)</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>93</b>		

Shaded cells indicate ratings below the 85% benchmark

**Table 4**  
**List of Courses included in Mid-year Evaluation by Network and Sector**

Order	Filename (.xls)	N	Course Title	Course Code	Course Dates	Network	Sector
143	buildskills1116	10	Building Your Skills for Working in a team-based Environment		11/16-11/18/99	ACS	
104	building skills1025	11	Building Your Skills in a Team-Based Environment I	bstb	10/25-10/27/99	ACS	
106	copingwoverwhelming demands105	7	Coping with Overwhelming Demands	COMO415	10/5/99	ACS	
107	identifyingstaffingneeds1015	8	Identifying Staff Training Needs	TR6	10/15/99	ACS	
147	identifyingstaffneeds1122	15	Identifying Staff Training Needs		11/22/99	ACS	
108	leadandmanaging108	16	Leading & Managing in a Team-based Environment		11/8-11/12/99	ACS	
153	ppreffteamwk1118	17	Personal Effectiveness Team Work		11/18-11/19/99	ACS	
109	powerofpersonaleffectiveness106	15	The Power of Personal effectiveness in team Work	POFE	10/6-10/7/99	ACS	
118	NN-DEC Analysis and Evaluation of Investment Operations (ECON33) 10.1	8	Analysis and Evaluation of Investment Operations	ECON33	10/1/99	Cross	DEC
3	basicecon823	15	Basic Economics		8/23/99	Cross	DEC
119	NN-Financial Products-IBRD Loan and Hedging Products (specialized training) (FPS3)11.1	8	Financial Products-IBRD Loan and Hedging Products (specialized training) (FPS3)11.1	FPS3	11/1/99	Cross	Financial Products
127	IBRD1018	8	IBRD Loan and Hedging (S)		10/18/09	Cross	FPS
11	ibrd924	4	New IBRD Loan and Hedging		9/24/99	Cross	FPS
101	ibrd721	13	New IBRD Loan and Hedging		7/21/99	Cross	FPS
100	ibrd719	4	New IBRD Loan and Hedging (G)		7/19/99	Cross	FPS
6	ibrd726	15	New IBRD Loan and Hedging (G)		7/26/99	Cross	FPS
8	ibrd89	18	New IBRD Loan and Hedging (G)		8/9/99	Cross	FPS
12	newibrd99	15	New IBRD Loan and Hedging (G)		9/9/99	Cross	FPS
10	ibrd923	13	New IBRD Loan and Hedging (G)		9/23/99	Cross	FPS
7	ibrd823	13	New IBRD Loan and Hedging (S)		8/23/99	Cross	FPS
9	ibrd913	20	New IBRD Loan and Hedging (S)		9/13-9/15/99	Cross	FPS
146	ibrd712	13	New IBRD Loan and Hedging Products Specialized Training (S)		7/12/99	Cross	FPS
156	qualatentry1215	11	Project Quality at Entry		12/15/99	Cross	QAG
5	energyaccess	13	Energy Access for Rural Development		9/13/99	FPSI	Energy
148	informatics1020	17	Informatics in Development		10/20-10/21/99	FPSI	Energy Mining
158	transmission126	16	Transmission Pricing and Congestion Management	EMT0109	12/6/99	FPSI	Energy Mining
117	Micro & Rural Finance in Africa 1114-18	28	Micro and Rural Finance in Africa		11/14/99-11/18/99	FPSI	PFG
113	project finance and guarantees 11.1-11.5	14	Project Finance and Guarantees		11/1-11/5/99	FPSI	PFG
115	economic and finance RWSS 11.9-99	12	Economic and Finance of RWSS		11/9/99	FPSI	water and urban
157	studytour	15	Study Tour of Water Supply & Sanitation		11/1-11/5/99	FPSI	water and urban

**Table 4**  
**List of Courses included in Mid-year Evaluation by Network and Sector (continued)**

Order	filename (.xls)	N	course title	course code	course dates	Network	sector
129	HD-EDU-Assessing Strategies for Literacy and Basic Education for Adults and Youth Roles of Government and Civil Society (EDU011)	11	Assessing Strategies for Literacy and Basic Education for Adults and Youth Roles of Government and Civil Society	EDU0117	11/23/99	HD	Education
s-2		17	Restructuring & Reculturing Education reform	EDU0142	10/26/99	HD	Education
s-1		19	Quality at Entry in HNP Projects	PHN90	11/1-11/2/99	HD	HNP
130	OCS-DIS-Disbursement for Operational Staff (OC0001) 10.20-21	17	Disbursement for Operational Staff	OC00001	10/20-10/21/99	OCS	Disbursement
120	OCS-Financial Management-Trust Funds-Task Team Leader Training	20	OCS-Financial Management-Trust Funds-Task Team Leader Training	TFE1, OCF0202	11/18/99	OCS	Financial Management
141	audits128	13	Review of Audit Reports & ARCS				
159	trustsfund1216	19	Trust Fund: Project Team Leader Training		12/8-12/9/99	OCS	Financial Mgmt
132	OCS-M-Trust Funds-Project Team Leader Training (OCF0202)12.	20	Trust Funds-Project Team Leader Training	OCF0202	12/16/99	OCS	Financial Mgmt
131	OCS-FM-Trust Funds-Project Team Leader Training (OCF0202)11.12	16	Trust Funds-Project Team Leader Training	OCF0202	12/2/99	OCS	FM
112	advanced procurement (PRO19) 11.1-11.5	13	Advanced procurement	PRO19	11/12/99	OCS	FM
142	basicproc1115	14	Basic Procurement		11/11-11/5/99	OCS	Procurement
4	basicproc712	20	Basic Procurement		11/15-11/19/99	OCS	Procurement
83	bproc913	19	Basic Procurement		7/12/99-7/16/99	OCS	Procurement
128	procanddatamgmt119	9	Procurement and Data Management		11/9/99-11/11/99	OCS	Procurement
154	procofwrks127	15	Procurement of Works		12/7-12/9/99	OCS	Procurement
133	OCS-Q-Intro to COSTAB (OCQ0213) 10.05-07.99	18	Intro to COSTAB	OCQ0213	10/05-10/07/99	OCS	Quality
134	OCS-Q-Intro. To Bank Operations (OCQ0010) 10.18-21.99	23	Intro. To Bank Operations	OCQ0010	10/18-10/21/99	OCS	Quality
135	OCS-Q-Intro. To Bank Operations (OCQ0010) 11.29-12.01.99	7	OCS-Q-Intro. To Bank Operations	OCQ0010	11/29-12/01/99	OCS	Quality
138	OCS-Q-Project Cycle Management with Logical Framework (ITP12) 10.12-15.99	4	Project Cycle Management with Logical Framework (ITP12) 10.12-15.99	ITP12	10/12-10/15/99	OCS	Quality
136	OCS-Q-Project Cycle Management with the Logical Framework (ITP12) 11.09-12.99	6	Project Cycle Management with the Logical Framework 11.09-12.99	ITP12	11/9-11/12/99	OCS	Quality

**Table 4**  
**List of Courses included in Mid-year Evaluation by Network and Sector (continued)**

Order filename (.xls)	N	course title	course code	course dates	Network	sector
137 OCS-Q-Project Cycle Management with the Logical Framework (ITP12) 9.14-17.99	16	Project Cycle Management with the Logical Framework 9.14-17.99	ITP12	9/14-9/17/99	OCS	Quality
13 logfrm720	7	Project Cycle Management with the Logframe		7/20/99	OCS	quality
155 projsupervision126	12	Project Supervision and Implementation		12/6-12/10/99	OCS	Quality
139 OCS-Q-Project Supervision and Implementation (OCQ0040)10.04-07.99	4	Project Supervision and Implementation	OCQ0040	10/4-10/7/99	OCS	Quality
102 yongprof	19	Young Professionals		10/4/99	OCS	Quality
1 actbased809	17	Activity Based Costing		8/9/99	OCS	Resource Mgmt
2 activity816	19	Activity Based Costing		8/16/99	OCS	Resource Mgmt
110 activity based costing (RM102) 10.18-20	22	Activity Based Costing	Rm102	10/18-10/20/99	OCS	Resource Mgmt
111 activity based costing (RM102) 11.1-11.3	16	Activity Based Costing	Rm102	11/1-11/3/99	OCS	Resource Mgmt
124 budgetdevandexecution 1022	15	Budget Development and Execution		10/18/99-10/22/99	OCS	Resource Mgmt
14 perfmearure729	14	Performance Measurements		7/29/99	OCS	Resource Mgmt
15 perfmearure812	15	Performance Measurements		8/12/99	OCS	Resource Mgmt
16 prm819	16	Performance Measurements		8/19/99	OCS	Resource Mgmt
140 OCS-RM-Budget Development and Execution (OCR0104) 11.15-19.99	21	Budget Development and Execution	OCR0104	11/15-11/19/99	OCS	RM
125 debtsustainability 114	9	Debt Sustainability		11/4/99-11/5/99	PREM	Economic. Policy
103 livedatabase 1025-2699	6	Economic Statistics	ECON65	10/26-10/20/99	PREM	Economic. Policy
116 prem-live database 1025-2699	15	Live Data Base		7/16/99	PREM	Economic. Policy
105 challengingunipolar1928	6	Live Data Base	ECON77	10/25-10/26/99	PREM	Economic. Policy
s-3	8	Challenging the Unipolar Paradigm: Women, Men, Gender Relations & Development	GDR1	10/28/99	PREM	Gender
s-4	3	Advanced Media Training	COM0013	11/2/99	SD	Comm.
s-5	3	Advanced Media Training	COM0013	12/2/99	SD	Comm.
84 editstks920	11	Building Bridges-Creating and Maintaining Productive Professional Relationships	COM0127	11/16/99	SD	Comm.
s-6	8	Editing Skills			SD	Comm.
s-7	10	Editorial Skills II	COM0021	11/16-11/18/99	SD	Comm.
54 givandrecefeedback83	7	Giving and Receiving Feedback	COM0023	10/6/10/7/99	SD	Comm.
85 improvwrtgskis916	9	Giving and Receiving Feedback			SD	Comm.
s-8	5	Improving Writing Skills			SD	Comm.
s-10	1	Interviewing Skills	COM0012	10/4-10/5/99	SD	Comm.
s-9	14	Media Expertise Training	COM0014	11/29-12/1/99	SD	Comm.
67 mediatrng98	9	Media Expertise Training	COM0014	11/3-11/5/99	SD	Comm.
s-11	10	Media Training			SD	Comm.
68 minutewriting825	12	Memo Writing Workshop-Part 1	COM0017	11/15-11/19/99	SD	Comm.
69 mntwrtng99	12	Minute Writing			SD	Comm.
	9	Minute Writing			SD	Comm.

**Table 4**  
**List of Courses included in Mid-year Evaluation by Network and Sector (continued)**

Order filename (.xls)	N	course title	course code	course dates	Network	sector
s-12	12	Minute Writing	COM0015	11/9/99	SD	Comm.
41 organize76	4	Organizing and Delivering Presentation			SD	Comm.
73 orgdelpres817	4	Organizing and Delivering Presentations			SD	Comm.
s-13	4	Organizing and Delivering Presentations	COM0018	10/12-10/21/99	SD	Comm.
s-14	1	Organizing and Delivering Presentations	COM0018	11/9-11/18	SD	Comm.
s-15	3	Organizing and Delivering Presentations	COM0018	9/21-9/30/99	SD	Comm.
s-16	19	Preparing Your next Presentation	COM0057	11/8-11/9/99	SD	Comm.
s-17	10	Presenting Ideas Effectively	COM0022	11/10-11/11/99	SD	Comm.
s-18	9	Presenting Ideas Effectively	COM0022	9/28/9/29/99	SD	Comm.
s-19	7	Report Writing-Part I	COM0024	10/18-10/22/99	SD	Comm.
97 shortdocwrtng913	6	Short Document Writing			SD	Comm.
45 trainer727	10	Training of Trainers		7/27/99	SD	Comm.
s-20	10	Training the Trainer-Foundations	LDD0028	10/19-10/21/99	SD	Comm.
s-21	8	Working in a Multicultural Environment	COM0030	10/13-10/14/99	SD	Comm.
161 hub-brady		Building Your Skills for Working in a Team-Based Environment		09/21-09/23/99	SD	HUB
162 hub-hindle/hoveida		MNA Hub -Portfolio Management (2 data sets merged)		09/19-09/25/99	SD	HUB
144 hubuidskills121	25	SAR Building Your Skills for Working in a team-based Environment		12/1-12/3/99	SD	HUB
145 hubnepal1128	44	SAR Hub Training/portfolio management		11/28-12/9/99	SD	HUB
20 access714	8	Access			SD	info tech
21 access811	8	Access			SD	info tech
22 advexcel714	5	Advanced Excel			SD	info tech
23 advexcel812	6	Advanced Excel			SD	info tech
47 advexcel824	10	Advanced Excel			SD	info tech
48 advexcel825	6	Advanced Excel			SD	info tech
80 advexcel915	5	Advanced Excel			SD	info tech
82 advxcl927	6	Advanced Excel			SD	info tech
24 advpp721	9	Advanced PowerPoint			SD	info tech
49 advppwp1818	6	Advanced PowerPoint			SD	info tech
81 advpp922	6	Advanced PowerPoint			SD	info tech
25 assembler720	9	Assembling Large Bank Documents			SD	info tech
50 charts and database730	10	Charts and Database			SD	info tech
51 chartsanddata92	5	Charts and Database			SD	info tech
26 excel726	8	Excel			SD	info tech
27 excel76	6	Excel			SD	info tech
28 excel83	6	Excel			SD	info tech
52 excel827	7	Excel			SD	info tech
53 excel98	4	Excel			SD	info tech
29 incorpxcel728	5	Incorporating Excel Graphs			SD	info tech
86 incorpxclgrafs929	6	Incorporating Excel Graphs			SD	info tech
55 incorpgraphs91	9	Incorporating Graphs			SD	info tech
87 integratedoffc923	7	Integrated Office			SD	info tech
56 intergratewpxp819	8	Integrating Word, Excel and PowerPoint			SD	info tech
57 interword823	5	Intermediate Word			SD	info tech
89 intword910	5	Intermediate Word			SD	info tech
88 introexcel928	4	Introduction to Excel			SD	info tech
30 lotusnotes71	8	Lotus Notes			SD	info tech

**Table 4**  
**List of Courses included in Mid-year Evaluation by Network and Sector (continued)**

Order	filename (.xls)	N	course title	course code	course dates	Network	sector
31	lotusnotes712	9	Lotus Notes			SD	info tech
32	lotusnotes719	7	Lotus Notes			SD	info tech
33	lotusnotes72	9	Lotus Notes			SD	info tech
34	lotusnotes723	7	Lotus Notes			SD	info tech
35	lotusnotes727	10	Lotus Notes			SD	info tech
36	lotusnotes78	8	Lotus Notes			SD	info tech
37	lotusnotes79	6	Lotus Notes			SD	info tech
38	lotusnotes82	6	Lotus Notes			SD	info tech
58	lotusnotes816	6	Lotus Notes			SD	info tech
59	lotusnotes820	10	Lotus Notes			SD	info tech
60	lotusnotes830	7	Lotus Notes			SD	info tech
61	lotusnotes85	7	Lotus Notes			SD	info tech
62	lotusnotes86	9	Lotus Notes			SD	info tech
63	lotusnotes89	6	Lotus Notes			SD	info tech
64	lotusnotes93	5	Lotus Notes			SD	info tech
65	lotusnotes97	6	Lotus Notes			SD	info tech
90	lotusnotes913	8	Lotus Notes			SD	info tech
39	maillists722	3	Mailing List			SD	info tech
66	maillists819	8	Mailing List			SD	info tech
79	access914	8	MS Access			SD	info tech
70	notescal91	6	Notes Calendar			SD	info tech
71	notescalendar728	7	Notes Calendar			SD	info tech
72	notescalendar811	7	Notes Calendar			SD	info tech
91	notescalendar914	6	Notes Calendar			SD	info tech
92	notesmail917	8	Notes Mail			SD	info tech
93	notesmail920	7	Notes Mail			SD	info tech
94	notesmail921	10	Notes Mail			SD	info tech
40	office617	9	Office			SD	info tech
42	powerp713	8	PowerPoint			SD	info tech
43	powerp76	9	PowerPoint			SD	info tech
44	powerp83	2	PowerPoint			SD	info tech
74	powerp810	7	PowerPoint			SD	info tech
75	powerp817	6	PowerPoint			SD	info tech
76	powerp826	7	PowerPoint			SD	info tech
77	powerp98	6	PowerPoint			SD	info tech
95	powerp924	7	PowerPoint			SD	info tech
96	powerp930	8	PowerPoint			SD	info tech
99	transitionxcl923	3	Transitional Excel			SD	info tech
98	transitionpp929	7	Transitional PowerPoint			SD	info tech
46	word716	6	Word			SD	info tech
78	word831	9	Word			SD	info tech
149	imatrix1213	16	Leading & Managing in Matrix Environment		12/13/99	SD	Leadership & management
18	orient824	30	Orientation		8/24/99	SD	orientation
19	orient921	18	Orientation		9/5/99	SD	orientation
17	orient1005	21	Orientation		10/5/99	SD	orientation

**Table 4**  
**List of Courses included in Mid-year Evaluation by Network and Sector (continued)**

Order filename (.xls)	N	course title	Course code	course dates	Network	sector
121 orientation1013	16	Orientation		10/13/99	SD	orientation
123 orientation119	15	Orientation		11/9/99	SD	orientation
122 orientation1116	20	Orientation		11/16/99	SD	orientation
152 orientation112	16	Orientation of New Staff		11/2-11/4/99	SD	Orientation
150 orient121	15	Orientation of New Staff		12/1-12/2/99	SD	Orientation
151 orient1214	16	Orientation of New Staff		12/14-12/15/99	SD	Orientation
126 FIP	8	FIP		10/28/99		
160 ypfundamentals		Fundamentals in Finance for YP Orientation				

**Table 5**  
**Course Performance at 85% Benchmark by Variables of Investigation**

The list below provides the 19 variables included in the study. An "X" in the table indicates 85% of participants rating the variable as good (4) or excellent (5) on a five point scale

Description of variables		v101	v102	v103	v104	v108	v109	v110	v111	v112	v113	v114	v115	v116	v117	v118	v119	v120	v121	v122	
v101	degree of match between the announced course objectives and those delivered — <i>efficiency</i>																				
v102	extent to which the objectives delivered met your learning needs — <i>relevance</i>																				
v103	degree to which the training delivered increased your knowledge or skills — <i>effectiveness</i>																				
v104	extent to which you will use the new knowledge or skills — <i>impact</i>																				
v108	the choice of content or objective matter covered																				
v109	the logic in the sequence of content, modules, or sessions																				
v110	the pacing of the various sessions																				
v111	the depth of coverage of the various sessions																				
v112	the balance between theoretical and practical content																				
v113	the balance among the lectures, discussions, and application of concepts																				
v114	the application of principles and concepts to World Bank work																				
v115	the use of case studies and/or group problem solving exercises																				
v116	the materials used during the course																				
v117	the materials provided for follow-up learning or job application																				
v118	instructors' level of knowledge of subject or course content																				
v119	the effectiveness of the instructors																				
v120	the overall quality of the course, relative to similar Bank training																				
v121	the overall usefulness of the course to you																				
v122	the overall level of satisfaction with what you got from the course																				

**HD**

Course #	Course Title / Network	v101	v102	v103	v104	v108	v109	v110	v111	v112	v113	v114	v115	v116	v117	v118	v119	v120	v121	v122	
129	Assessing Strategies for Literacy and Basic Education for Adults and Youth Roles of Government and Civil Society		X	X		X	X	X		X	X					X	X	X	X	X	X
s-1	Quality at Entry in HNP Projects (11/1-11/2/99)	X	X	X		n/a			n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			n/a	X	X	X	X	X	X
s-2	Restructuring & Reculturing Education reform (10/26/99)					n/a			n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		X	n/a	X					

*Continued*

**Table 5**  
**Course Performance at 85% Benchmark by Variables of Investigation (continued)**

**OCS**

Course #	Course Title / Network	v101	v102	v103	v104	v108	v109	v110	v111	v112	v113	v114	v115	v116	v117	v118	v119	v120	v121	v122
1	Activity Based Costing (08/09/99)	X	X			X	X		X	X	X			X		X	n/a			
2	Activity Based Costing (08/16/99)	X	X			X	X			X	X			X		X	n/a	X		
4	Basic Procurement (07/12/99-01/16/99)	X	X	X	X	X	X					X				X	n/a	X	X	X
13	Project Cycle Management with Logframe (07/20/99)	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X			X	X	X	n/a	X	X	X
14	Performance measurement (07/29/99)	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X			X	X	X	n/a	X	X	X
15	Performance measurement (08/12/99)	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X			X	X	X	n/a	X	X	X
16	Performance measurement (08/19/99)	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X			X	X	X	n/a	X	X	X
83	Basic Procurement	X																		
102	Young Professionals (10/04/99)	X	X																	
110	Activity Based Costing (10/18-10/20/99)	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X					X	X	X	X	X
111	Activity Based Costing (11/01-11/03/99)	X	X	X		X	X							X		X	X	X	X	X
112	Advanced procurement (11/01-11/05/99)	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
120	Financial Management-Trust Funds																			
124	Budget Development and Execution (10/18-10/22/99)	X			X															
128	Procurement and Data Management (11/09-11/11/99)	X				X	X					X					X			
130	Disbursement for Operational Staff (10/20-10/21/99)	X	X	X	X	X	X													
131	Trust Funds-Project Team Leader Training																			
132	Trust Funds-Project Team Leader Training																			
133	Intro to COSTAB	X	X	X		X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
134	Intro. To Bank Operations																			
135	OCS-Q-Intro. To Bank Operations	X	X	X	X	X	X							X						
136	Project Cycle Management with the Logframe (11/09/-11/12/99)																			
137	Project Cycle Management with the Logical Framework (09/14-09/17/99)	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
138	Project Cycle Management with Logical Framework (10/12-10/15/99)	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
139	Project Supervision and Implementation	X	X	X	X	X	X			X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X
140	Budget Development and Execution	X	X	X	X	X	X			X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X
141	Review of Audit Reports & ARCS	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
142	Basic Procurement	X																		
154	Procurement of Works	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
155	Project Supervision and Implementation	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
159	Trust Fund: Project Team Leader Training	X			X	X	X					X			X	X	X	n/a	n/a	n/a

Continued

**Table 5**  
**Course Performance at 85% Benchmark by Variables of Investigation (continued)**

Course #	Course Title / Network	v101	v102	v103	v104	v108	v109	v110	v111	v112	v113	v114	v115	v116	v117	v118	v119	v120	v121	v122	
<b>PREM</b>																					
103	Live Data Base (07/16/99)	X	X		X	X	X			X		X	X			X	n/a	X	X	X	
105	Challenging the Unipolar Paradigm: Women, Men, Gender Relations & Development	X	X			X	X						X			X		X			X
114	Economic Statistics (11/09/99)		X	X			X			X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X			X
116	Live Data Base (10/25-10/26/99)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
125	Debt Sustainability (11/04-11/05/99)	X				X	X	X	X					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>FPSI</b>																					
5	Energy Access for Rural Development (9/13/99)																				
113	Project Finance and Guarantees (11/01-11/05/99)	X	X			X										X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
115	Economic and Finance of RWSS ((11/09/99)	X				X		X				X				X	X				
117	Micro and Rural Finance in Africa (11/14-11/18/99)		X			X	X			X			X	X		X	X	X			
148	Informatics in development (10/20-10/21/99)	X														X	X	X			
157	Study Tour of Water Supply & Sanitation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	X	X
158	Transmission Pricing and Congestion Management	X				X	X				X					X	X				X
<b>ACS</b>																					
104	Building Your Skills in a Team-Based Environment (10/25-10/27/99)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
106	Coping with Overwhelming Demands (10/05/99)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
107	Identifying Staff Training Needs (10/15/99)		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X
108	Leading & Managing in a Team-based Environment (11/08-11/12/99)																				
109	The Power of Personal effectiveness in team Work (10/06-10/07/99)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
143	Building Your Skills in a Team-Based Environment (11/16-11/18/99)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
147	Identifying Staff Learning Needs (11/22/99)	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	n/a	n/a	n/a
153	Personal Effectiveness Team Work (11/18-11/19/99)	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Continued

**Table 5**  
**Course Performance at 85% Benchmark by Variables of Investigation (continued)**

Course #	Course Title /Network	v101	v102	v103	v104	v108	v109	v110	v111	v112	v113	v114	v115	v116	v117	v118	v119	v120	v121	v122
3	Basic Economics (08/23/99)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	n/a	x	x	x
6	New IBRD Loan and Hedging (07/26/99)	x	x	x		x	x			x		x		x		x	n/a	x	x	x
7	New IBRD Loan and Hedging (08/23/99)	x						x				x				x	n/a		x	x
8	New IBRD Loan and Hedging (08/09/99)	x	x			x	x							x		x	n/a	x		x
9	New IBRD Loan and Hedging (09/13-09/15/99)	x	x	x	x	x	x					x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
10	New IBRD Loan and Hedging (09/23/99)	x				x	x									x	x			x
11	New IBRD Loan and Hedging (09/23/99)	x	x	x	x	x	x				x		x	x	x	x	x			x
12	New IBRD Loan and Hedging (09/09/99)	x	x			x	x					x		x		x	x			
100	New IBRD Loan and Hedging (07/19/99)	x	x	x			x	x			x	x		x		x	n/a	x	x	
101	New IBRD Loan and Hedging (07/21/99)		x			x	x									x	n/a		x	
118	Analysis and Evaluation of Investment Operations	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x
119	Financial Products-IBRD Loan and Hedging Products (specialized training) (FPS3)11.1	x	x	x		x	x				x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
127	New IBRD Loan and Hedging (10/18/99)	x	x			x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
146	New IBRD Loan and Hedging (7/12/99)		x			x	x									x		x		n/a
156	Project Quality at Entry	x	x	x	x	x					x		x		x	x	x		x	x

**HUB**

144	SAR Building Your Skills for Working in a team-based Environment	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
145	SAR Hub Training/portfolio management	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
161	Building Your Skills for Working in a Team-Based Environment, MNA Hub: Cairo	x	x		x	n/a	x	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	x	x							
162	MNA Hub -Portfolio Management (merged)					n/a		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a									