

ROI Comparative Analysis Project
for
The Georgia Department of Labor

Terena Campagna
Evaluation Research (TRDV 434)
December 5, 2006

Table of Contents

Project Overview.....	Page 3
Data Collection Plan.....	Page 4
ROI Analysis Plan.....	Page 8
Evaluation Results.....	Page 9
<i>Table 1-1. Participant Reactions to Training Session (Numerical ratings)</i>	
<i>Table 1-2. Participant Reactions to Training Session (Comments)</i>	
<i>Table 2-1. Learning from Training Session</i>	
<i>Figure 3-1. Sample Employee Development & Growth Plan</i>	
<i>Table 3-2. Application of Manager Coaching & Development</i>	
<i>Table 4-1. Business Impact from “Developing Your Staff”</i>	
<i>Table 4-2. Business Impact from “Coaching Your Staff for Success”</i>	
<i>Table 4-3. Overall Business Impact Values</i>	
<i>Table 4-4. Costs of Training 15 Managers per Session</i>	
<i>Table 5-1. Return on Investment Calculations</i>	
Final Project Recommendations.....	Page 14
References.....	Page 15
Appendix.....	Page 18

Project Overview

The goal of this final project is to utilize empirically-driven feedback to evaluate and calculate the ROI of two outsourced training program providers for the GA Department of Labor. The ROI comparison of both programs will be considered for the distribution of next quarter's outsourcing business for the GDOL Office of Staff Development. Each program consists of a one-day, instructor-led session with parallel course objectives. The participants who attend the sessions included thirty managers from the same District Region. The managers randomly signed up for one of the following two days (fifteen per session):

- *Friday, Nov. 17th "Developing Your People"*
- *Tuesday, Nov. 21st "Coaching Your Staff for Success"*

For both sessions, participants completed pre and post assessments regarding coaching and development. After the training session, all managers were given one week to submit a follow-up "Employee Development and Growth Plan" to the District Director. The District Director reviewed the submissions and evaluated each plan according to pre-determined rating criteria for Section 9 of the Statewide Performance Management Plan (PMP). After the ratings were documented, a Designated Review Official (DRO) provided a second level of "sign-off" for ratings at the "Exceeds Expectations" level.

Human Resources assisted as a departmental expert to convert the following three ratings into relative percentages for Fiscal Year '07/'08 budget allocation: 1. "Meets Expectations" (2% increase), 2. "Exceeds Expectations" (2.5% increase), and 3. "Needs Improvement" (1.5% increase). The increases will be disbursed based on relative percentages within the District III training and development budget allocation (*as opposed to overall departmental funding*). The "Total Annual Value" amounts determined by Human Resources are projected estimates only, and may not reflect exact amounts of final distribution.

The project included five levels of evaluation, which are critical for determining final ROI calculations. The "Data Collection Plan" outlines the Learning Objectives, Data Measures, Collection Methods, Data Sources, Timing, and Responsibilities for all levels, including: 1.) Reaction/Satisfaction, 2.) Learning, 3.) Application/Implementation, 4.) Business Impact, and 5.) ROI. Once data was collected, the "ROI Analysis Plan" outlined specific methods for identifying Data Items, Isolation Methods, Conversion Methods, Cost Categories, Intangible Benefits, Communication Targets, and Other Influences. The details of both plans include the following:

Data Collection Plan

Programs: “Coaching Your Staff for Success” and “Developing Your Employees”

ROI Consultant: Terena Campagna, Associate Director

Level	Objective(s)	Measures/Data	Data Collection Method	Data Sources	Timing	Responsibilities
1	<p>Reaction/Satisfaction After participating in this coaching/development training session, the manager will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> perceive coaching and employee development to be relevant during the full cycle of the performance management process perceive coaching and employee development to be a success factor in their current leadership role perceive coaching and employee development to be practical tools for improving individual productivity and improving organizational results 	<p>Mandatory participation (Clear communication that full participation and follow-through is required for one training session)</p> <p>Self registration for one training session and acknowledgement of “critical” responsibility to fulfill all pre and post session expectations</p> <p>Degree of learner satisfaction with content presented, design of session materials, and instructor delivery (scale of 1 – 5)</p>	<p>District Director’s Announcement Memorandum (email)</p> <p>Training Nomination & Approval System/ Staff Development Learner Agreement (email attachment)</p> <p>Training Session Evaluation Form</p>	<p>District Director/ Assistant Commissioner</p> <p>Managers</p> <p>Managers</p>	<p>Pre-program (10/13/06)</p> <p>Pre-program (10/17/06 – 11/10/06)</p> <p>Closing of Training Session</p>	<p>Senior Management</p> <p>Staff Development Training Consultant</p> <p>Session Instructor</p>

Level	Objective(s)	Measures/Data	Data Collection Method	Data Sources	Timing	<i>Responsibilities</i>
2	<p>Learning After completing the coaching and employee development session, managers will improve their understanding of or skills for each of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognizing and reaching agreement on the developmental need • clearly stating the developmental objectives in terms that are specific, measurable, and realistic • preparing an effective and realistic plan for achieving the development objectives • identifying and overcoming potential obstacles the employee may face • determining what resource assistance will be needed to support the employee's efforts • established an appropriate schedule and method for review of the employee's progress 	Assessments are completed by the participant and shared with a learning partner	Personal assessment "Developmental Effectiveness Checklist" (email)	Managers	Prior to the beginning and at the conclusion of the training session	Staff Development Training Consultant

Level	Objective(s)	Measures/Data	Data Collection Method	Data Sources	Timing	<i>Responsibilities</i>
3	<p>Application/Implementation One week after attending the coaching and development session, managers will complete and submit an "Employee Development and Growth Plan" (reflecting all direct-report staff), including the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An Individual Development Plan (IDP) for each staff member that clearly identifies one specific coaching goal and links to either a.) Enhancing an employee strength, b.) Remediating an employee weakness, or c.) Addressing an organizational need. 2. Detailed description of the developmental assignment and method to complete the goal (On-the-job, Off-the-job, or Alternative to Classroom), 3. Specific timeline for completion of goal and measures for follow-up. 	<p>Evaluation and rating of participant "Employee Development and Growth Plan" according to pre-determined criteria (ratings include "Meets expectations", "Exceeds expectations", or "Needs Improvement").</p>	<p>Manager submits hard copy of completed plan to the District Director (Section 9 PMF Word or PMTools format)</p>	<p>Managers</p>	<p>Week following training session (Due 11/24/06)</p>	<p>District Director</p>

Level	Objective(s)	Measures/Data	Data Collection Method	Data Sources	Timing	Responsibilities
4	<p>Business Impact</p> <p>After completing the coaching and development training session, all managers should complete an “Employee Development and Growth Plan” approved to meet Section 9 of the Statewide Performance Management Form.</p>	<p>Secondary approval will be conducted by the division’s Assistant Commissioner level for all plans that receive an evaluation rating of “Exceeds expectations” (due to budgetary considerations)</p> <p>Using the anticipated “percent allocation” for the Evaluation Rating Scale, HR predicts an estimate of the monetary value.</p>	<p>Performance Monitoring</p> <p>Expert monetary conversion</p>	<p>Designated Review Official (DRO)</p> <p>Human Resource Consultant</p>	<p>Post session (following review by District Director)</p> <p>Post session (following review of DD or DRO)</p>	<p>Designated Review Official (DRO)</p> <p>Human Resource Consultant</p>
5	<p>ROI</p> <p>The ROI value will be calculated separately for each coaching and development training session.</p>	<p><u>Comments: ROI calculations for both sessions will be compared and considered in addition to other levels of evaluation feedback.</u></p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>				

ROI Analysis Plan

Programs: “Coaching Your Staff for Success” and “Developing Your Employees”

ROI Consultant: Terena Campagna, Associate Director

Data Items (Usually level 4)	Methods for Isolating the Effects of the Program	Methods of Converting Data to Monetary Values	Cost Categories	Intangible Benefits	Communication Targets for Final Report	Other Influences/ Issues During Application	Comments
Percent of Budget Allocation for Fiscal Year 07/08	Participant’s Estimate of Training’s Impact	Using internal experts to provide value of budgetary percentage <i>(according to Cost Center formula and total line item budget amount)</i>	Training Session Contractor Fees Travel Expenses Manager Time Admin. Support & Overhead Evaluation	Internal Customer Satisfaction Survey Data	District Director Director of Staff Development GDOL Learning Council	Output values may be factored or adjusted if they appear to be unrealistic	Due to specific, immediate need of data item, analysis is not planned for intangible benefits

Evaluation Results

Level 1: Reaction

Reactions to both of the employee coaching and development training sessions were in the positive *Agree* to *Strongly Agree* range. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where 1 is *Strongly Disagree* and 5 is *Strongly Agree*), the average rating of four feedback items for “*Developing Your People*” was 4.05, while the average rating for “*Coaching Your Staff for Success*” was 4.45. Table 1-1 shows the session averages for each of the feedback items.

<i>Feedback Items</i>	<i>“Developing Your People”</i>	<i>“Coaching Your Staff for Success”</i>
<i>Relevance of coaching and employee development during the full cycle of the performance management process</i>	4.0	4.5
<i>Importance of coaching and employee development as a “success factor” for current leadership role</i>	4.2	4.5
<i>Practical value of coaching and employee development as “tools” for improving individual productivity and improving organizational results</i>	4.0	4.2
<i>Overall “effectiveness” of training session delivery (content materials, instructor facilitation skills, learning methodologies)</i>	4.0	4.6

Table 1-1. Participant Reactions to Training Session (*Numerical Ratings*)

Although there was a .4 difference in the overall quantitative scores, both sessions had a similar variety of positive qualitative comments. Table 1-2 shows participant comments for each of the training sessions.

<i>“Developing Your People”</i>	<i>“Coaching Your Staff for Success”</i>
<i>“Enjoyed it!”</i>	<i>“Great information and tools—excellent instructor”</i>
<i>“Discussion and comments from group were helpful.”</i>	<i>“Very practical strategies!”</i>
<i>“Very good.”</i>	<i>“A lot of very important information. Wish I had this sooner.”</i>
<i>“This was great. I’ll be signing up for more workshops like this one.”</i>	<i>“Training was informative and well presented”</i>
<i>“I found out that development issues are normal”</i>	<i>“Verified what I’m doing right and helped fill-in the gaps”</i>
<i>“Very important topic. Need more sessions!”</i>	<i>“Worthwhile session and the instructor made it more interesting.”</i>
<i>“Good dialogue and examples”</i>	<i>“Helpful ideas on ways to develop employees”</i>
<i>“Case study and discussion was helpful.”</i>	<i>“Very interesting session.”</i>

Table 1-2. Participant Reactions to Training Session (*Comments*)

Level 2: Learning

The managers attending both sessions completed two self-assessments titled the “*Developmental Effectiveness Checklist*” (A. Daniels and J. Daniels 2004), intended to gauge individual levels of awareness, knowledge, and skills regarding the coaching and development process. Table 2-1 shows six items with pre and post inputs averaged from participants of both sessions. For this level, it was considered appropriate to collect the data directly from the managers, indicating their perception of improvement.

<i>Assessment Items</i>	<i>“Developing Your People”</i>		<i>“Coaching Your Staff for Success”</i>	
	<i>Pre-score</i>	<i>Post-score</i>	<i>Pre-score</i>	<i>Post-score</i>
<i>Recognizing and reaching agreement on the developmental need</i>	3.4	3.8	3.2	4.0
<i>Clearly stating the developmental objectives in terms that are specific and measurable</i>	3.0	3.6	3.0	4.2
<i>Preparing an effective and realistic plan for achieving the development objectives</i>	2.6	3.2	2.4	3.8
<i>Determining what resource assistance will be needed to support the employee’s efforts</i>	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.6
<i>Identifying and overcoming potential obstacles the employee may face</i>	2.0	3.0	2.6	4.0
<i>Establishing an appropriate schedule and method for review of the employee’s progress</i>	2.6	3.6	3.0	4.0

Table 2-1. Learning from Training Session

According to the assessment results, the average degree of improvement for the “*Developing Your People*” session was .63, compared to 1.03 for the “*Coaching Your Staff for Success*” session. This shows an overall difference of .4 in Level 2 data between the two sessions.

Level 3: Application

For the learning to be translated into application, all managers had to complete an “Employee Development and Growth Plan”. One week after attending the coaching and development training, plans were submitted to the District Director and evaluated according to the following criteria:

1. Completion of an Individual Development Plan (IDP) for each staff member, which clearly identifies two to three specific coaching goals and links to a.) Enhancing an employee strength, b.) Remedying an employee weakness, or c.) Addressing an organizational need.
2. Detailed description of the developmental assignment and method to complete the goal (*On-the-job, Off-the-job, or Alternative to Classroom*),
3. Specific timeline for completion of goal and measures for follow-up.

Based upon degree of completion and quality of work, each plan was rated as “Meets expectations”, “Exceeds expectations”, or “Needs Improvement”. A sample plan submitted by one of the manager’s, Kenneth Wyatt, is shown in figure 3.1 (p. 16). Of the thirty managers registered for the two training sessions, 100% completed the assigned plan by the deadline. Although there were a total of four “Needs Improvement” ratings, the District Director was still very satisfied with the results. Until this year, employee development plans have been recommended as opposed to required. Compared to last performance year’s development plan completion rate of 40%, the District managers have significantly improved. A breakdown of the manager evaluation results is shown for each of the training sessions in Table 3-2. Managers who attended the “Coaching Your Staff for Results” session had overall better application results for each of the three rating categories.

<i>Coaching/Developing Training Session</i>	<i>Needs Improvement</i>	<i>Meets</i>	<i>Exceeds</i>
<i>“Developing Your People”</i>	3	10	2
<i>“Coaching Your Staff for Results”</i>	1	11	3

Table 3-2. Application of Manager Coaching & Development

Level 4: Business Impact

Specific business impact measures were consistent for all participants. The main category utilized was anticipated “budget increase” for each manager in the area of “employee training and development”. Due to the increasing importance of talent recruitment and retention, the department added a strategic goal regarding succession planning. The goal emphasized the need for structured employee development plans, and linked manager coaching responsibilities to the statewide performance management process. According to the established rating scale, performance results are evaluated according to pre-defined expectations at the “Meets” Level. Performance “above and beyond” the established level is defined as “Exceeds”, while performance below the expected level is defined as “Does Not Meet”. For the purposes

of this ROI project, the District Director chose to use the “Needs Improvement” rating in lieu of “Does Not Meet” (the intention was to allow a learning curve for improvement.)

Tables 4-1 and 4-2 (p. 15) show the evaluation results for all thirty managers separated out by session attended. Each manager’s plan is identified by the area of measurement, the total annual value, the basis of the assigned rating, the method for converting the monetary value, the contribution factor from the training session, the participant’s confidence estimate of the contribution, and the adjusted value.

Kenneth Wyatt (Manager #9) earned a rating of “Meets Expectations”, which translates to a projected 2% budgetary allocation for employee development in Jan. 2007. According to the HR estimate, the annual amount awarded increase for Performance Year 2007/2008 equals \$4,000. Mr. Wyatt reported that the contribution factor of the training session was 55%, with a confidence level of 100%. Therefore, the total adjusted value equals \$2,200. The overall business impact values for both training sessions are highlighted in Table 4-3.

<i>Coaching/Developing Training Session</i>	<i>Overall Business Impact Values</i>
<i>“Developing Your People”</i>	<i>\$20,783</i>
<i>“Coaching Your Staff for Results”</i>	<i>\$27,855</i>

Table 4-3. Overall Business Impact Values

Between the two sessions, “Coaching Your Staff for Results” had a \$7,072 higher impact value than “Developing Your People”.

Isolating the Effects of Training

The training effects were isolated according to the manager’s estimate of the “contribution factor” for the training session. Each manager allocated an amount (on a percentage basis) directly attributing the degree to which the training session contributed to the completion of their “Employee Growth and Development Plan”. Then, on a scale of 0% to 100% (0% = no confidence; 100% = total certainty), managers provided the confidence for the estimate. The “Adjusted Value” column in Table 4-1 was calculated by multiplying the “Annual Value” by the “Contribution Factor” and the “Confidence Estimate”.

Costs

The costs were fully loaded, including travel expenses (mileage), manager time (one 8-hour day), facilities (training room and lunch), administrative support/overhead, and evaluation. The training session

contract fees for each vendor were based on a “flat rate”, which included all costs for instructor facilitation, program materials, and needs assessment/development. Table 1-7 shows the actual cost for each training session.

<i>Items</i>	<i>“Developing Your People”</i>	<i>“Coaching Your Staff for Success”</i>
<i>Training Session Contractor Fee</i>	\$2000	\$4,500
<i>Travel Costs</i>	\$750	\$750
<i>Manager Time</i>	\$7000	\$7000
<i>Facilities (Marriott Evergreen Conference Center)</i>	\$2,500	\$2,500
<i>Administrative Support</i>	\$500	\$500
<i>Administrative Overhead</i>	\$250	\$250
<i>Evaluation (Staff Dev., Dist. Director, & HR Time)</i>	\$3,500	\$3,500
<i>Total Amount</i>	<i>\$16,500</i>	<i>\$19,000</i>

Table 4-4. Costs of Training 15 Managers per Session

Level 5: Return on Investment (ROI)

Using the total monetary benefits and total costs of each coaching and development session, the BCR and ROI values were calculated. The results are illustrated in Table 5-1.

<i>Coaching/Developing Training Session</i>	<i>Cost/Benefit Ratio</i>	<i>Return on Investment</i>
<i>“Developing Your People”</i>		1.3:1 26%
<i>“Coaching Your Staff for Results”</i>	1.5:1	47%

Table 5-1. Return on Investment Calculations

Both training sessions resulted in a positive CBR and ROI. Although “Coaching Your Staff for Results” started out with higher initial costs, the final ROI value surpassed the “Developing Your People” session by 21%. As indicated in the initial “Data Collection Plan”, the final ROI values are interpreted within the framework of the “chain of impact”. Considering results from the other evaluation levels, both training sessions are well within the “successful” range. The comprehensive ROI project results will be communicated to the District Director and Director of Staff Development in the form of a hard-copy report. An executive summary of the project results will be presented to the GDOL Learning Council at the January ’07 monthly meeting.

Final Project Recommendations

According to a 2006 article titled “Best Practices in Learning Governance”, the co-creation of programs at the learning council level is critical for ensuring that the “enterprise learning strategy is in lockstep with business strategy” (Beckstrom p. 29). The tactical goals for reporting on the ROI project involve soliciting input on the following: what future learning initiatives to consider based on a prioritized view, when to launch initiatives in relation to the budget cycle, who should execute initiatives based on business unit participation, and how initiatives should be measured regarding business metrics (Beckstrom, 2006).

Final recommendations for next year’s distribution of outsourced management training will be to split the funding as:

- *40% for Vendor A: Provider of “Developing Your People” Training Session*
- *60% for Vendor B: Provider of “Coaching Your Staff for Success” Training Session*

This approach supports two key “win-win” benefits which take into account quality and quantity of training delivery. The quality-based benefit is derived from awarding the majority of the budget to the provider who demonstrated a stronger probability of delivering positive ROI. The second quantity-based benefit still allows the organization to maximize funding for the total number of sessions provided (due to the significantly lower contractor fee).

Although it is important to weigh the financial implications of training investments, “payback alone—specifically ROI—is not the sole convincing argument to gain management support...C-level executives require performance indicators that think ‘outside of the course’ and in terms that connect business concerns with strategic objectives” (Pangarkar and Kirkwood, 2006, p. 36). The recommendation to continue utilizing both training providers in the future is in alignment with the department’s high-priority to foster strategic Workforce Development partnerships.

Appendix

Table 4-1 Business Impact from “Developing Your Staff” Participants

Mgr. #	Measurement	Total Annual Value	Basis (Evaluation Rating Scale)	Method for Data Conv.	Contribution Factor	Confidence Estimate	Adjusted Value
1	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	35%	75%	\$ 1,050
2	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	30%	85%	1,020
3	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	40%	80%	1,280
4	Budget Increase	5,000	Exceeds Expectation 2.5%	HR Estimate	50%	95%	2,375
5	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	35%	75%	1,050
6	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	40%	80%	1,280
7	Budget Increase	5,000	Exceeds Expectation 2.5%	HR Estimate	45%	95%	2,138
8	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	30%	90%	1,080
9	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	55%	100%	2,200
10	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	45%	80%	1,440
11	Budget Increase	3,000	Needs Improvement 1.5%	HR Estimate	30%	60%	540
12	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	45%	80%	1,440
13	Budget Increase	3,000	Needs Improvement 1.5%	HR Estimate	40%	85%	1,020
14	Budget Increase	3,000	Needs Improvement 1.5%	HR Estimate	60%	75%	1,350
15	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	40%	95%	1,520
						TOTAL	20,783

Table 4-2 Business Impact from “Coaching Your Staff for Success” Participants

Mgr. #	Measurement	Total Annual Value	Basis (Evaluation Rating Scale)	Method for Data Conv.	Contribution Factor	Confidence Estimate	Adjusted Value
16	Budget Increase	5,000	Exceeds Expectation 2.5%	HR Estimate	40%	70%	\$ 1,400
17	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	55%	70%	1,540
18	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	60%	80%	1,920
19	Budget Increase	5,000	Exceeds Expectation 2.5%	HR Estimate	80%	100%	4,000
20	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	75%	70%	2,100
21	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	75%	60%	1,800
22	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	60%	50%	1,200
23	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	50%	90%	1,800
24	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	55%	90%	1,980
25	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	65%	80%	2,080

Table 4-2 Business Impact from “Coaching Your Staff for Success” Participants

Mgr. #	Measurement	Total Annual Value	Basis (Evaluation Rating Scale)	Method for Data Conv.	Contribution Factor	Confidence Estimate	Adjusted Value
26	Budget Increase	5,000	Exceeds Expectation 2.5%	HR Estimate	50%	90%	2,250
27	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	75%	80%	2,400
28	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	50%	80%	1,600
29	Budget Increase	4,000	Meets Expectation 2%	HR Estimate	40%	75%	1,200
30	Budget Increase	3,000	Needs Improvement 1.5%	HR Estimate	30%	65%	585
						TOTAL	27,855

Figure 3-1. Completed “Employee Development and Growth Plan”

Section 9: Individual Development Plan

Instructions: List developmental goals or areas for improvement that will be addressed by on-the-job development assignments and/or by formalized training experiences. Indicate actions to be taken by manager and/or employee and specify the time frame for their completion. At the end of the performance period, describe any progress the employee has made in meeting development or improvement goals.

Developmental Goals <i>(Employee's and Manager's Input)</i>	Planned Development Activities/Methods <i>(Agreed Upon by Employee and Manager)</i>	Timeline/Progress Measures
Cynthia is interested in further developing her presentation skills in order to take on increased responsibility with Employer Information Seminars. Due to recent layoffs and increase in work volume for the Rapid Response Unit, this is an organizational need.	Attend “Effective Presentation Skills” 2-day course in Atlanta January 18-19, 2007. Present summary of learning at All Staff Meeting on February 5 th , 2007. Complete understudy of EIS session with experienced presenter in mid-February, and prepare to present first session toward the beginning of March.	Satisfactory completion of training course. Staff feedback on summary presentation after meeting. Attendee evaluation feedback from EIS presentation in March.

Employee/ Manager Information				Assigned Rating	
Last Name, First Name M.	Employee ID	Position No.	Performance Period	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met Expectations <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded Expectations*	
James, Cynthia	304785562	048003	Jan. 15, 2006 to June 30, 2007		
Mgr. Last Name, First Name M.	Employee ID	Mgr. Position No.	Job Code	Reviewing Manager Signature	Date
Wyatt, Kenneth	300421598	048010	60603	B. Johnson, District Director	11/25/06
Agency Official to whom request for review of the contents of this form should be submitted. (SPB Rule PAR 13.305)			*Rating of "Exceeds Expectations" must be submitted to Agency Designated Review Official (DRO) for review and signature.		

References

Beckstrom, M., (August 2006). Best practices in learning governance. *Chief Learning Officer*, 5(8), 28-31.

Daniels, A. and J. Daniels (2004). *Performance Management*, 4th Ed.

Pangarkar, A., and T. Kirkwood (November 2006). Beyond ROI: Alternate Measures of Success. *Chief Learning Officer*, 5(11), 36-43.