

Meeting Date:	19 June 2002	Open Gov. Status:	Fully Open
Type of Paper:	Above the line	Paper File Ref:	
Exemptions:	No		

HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE**The HSE Board****Evaluation of Training and Development****A Paper by Richard Hillier****Adviser(s): John Gould****Cleared by Richard Hillier on 13 June 2002****Issue**

1 The evaluation of training and development in HSE

Timing

2 Routine. The Board is due to review HSE's Training and Development (T&D) Strategy in the autumn. The main purpose of this paper is to present an initial evaluation of some elements of the centrally managed training and on the basis of this, to seek advice on what support the Board will require for the autumn review.

Recommendation

3 No specific recommendations. The paper seeks a steer from the Board on the inputs they will require for the autumn review of their T&D Strategy.

Background

4 HSE spends substantial sums on the T&D of its staff. Research carried out for the CSR in 2001 produced an estimate of around £6.5m per annum. About a quarter of this was spent by Personnel on centrally managed T&D and the remainder by D/ds. To ensure that this investment is properly focussed on the needs of HSE's business, in October 2001 the Board approved a T&D strategy for HSE. The strategy set out the underpinning principles for all T&D in HSE and identified specific areas of mandatory training and other T&D priorities for the three years to October 2004. It also defined roles and responsibilities for ensuring that

T&D activities are properly and efficiently identified, planned, delivered, monitored and evaluated.

5 According to the strategy, it is for D/ds to “monitor and evaluate how well training and development is meeting D/d and corporate business needs.” The HSE Board has the task of reviewing the strategy on an annual basis and more specifically, for assessing progress against the T&D priorities outlined within it. The first review is due to take place this autumn.

Argument

6 In their discussion on the T&D Strategy on 3 October 2001, the Board acknowledged the importance of having effective evaluation procedures in place for T&D. There was recognition that this not only makes good business sense, given the considerable amount HSE invests in T&D each year, but also that such procedures are a prerequisite for HSE to achieve corporate status as an Investor in People. The importance of evaluation was given renewed emphasis more recently in the decision to adopt a balanced scorecard approach to assessing HSE’s performance. The proposed scorecard identifies HSE’s ability to “sustain..[an]..ability to learn and improve” as a key measure of business performance.

7 At present, the evaluation of training takes place at several levels in HSE. In October 2001, the Board asked Personnel to look at what additional measures needed to be put in place for the evaluation of centrally managed training. This work is ongoing. We already collect and analyse a wide range of information about the effectiveness of the various courses we offer, a good deal of it based around whether these courses meet the needs and expectations of trainees. With the growing importance of evaluation though, we are committed to improving our approach. We are working towards a position where we also have for each training course, a defined set of learning outcomes the course is expected to achieve. This is a considerable undertaking and is likely to take some months to complete, but it will help to provide a sharper view of the business benefits of the training.

8 The development of our approach to evaluation is therefore set to continue for some time and it is likely that it will be next year before all the necessary pieces are in place. However, we recognise that as part of the autumn review, the Board will want to assess the contribution of the centrally managed T&D to HSE’s business and we are keen to make sure we can provide information of a quality which will help the Board to do this. As a foretaste of what we can provide we have therefore set out at Annex 1, an initial evaluation of some elements of the priority training set out in the T&D Strategy. **We would welcome feedback from Board members on this information, along with any observations they may care to make on the outcomes of the evaluation.**

9 As a result of the work we are doing to develop our approach to evaluation and any steer the Board may choose to give as a result of this paper, we should be well placed to provide an analysis of the outcomes of the centrally managed training. However, we are aware that this is only part of the T&D picture in HSE. About three quarters of the amount spent on T&D is spent by D/ds. Although D/ds evaluate the outcomes of their own training plans, Personnel do not have sight of these and they are not pulled together to provide an HSE view. Clearly, if the autumn review is to cover all areas of the T&D Strategy, this gap needs to be filled. As things stand, all

Personnel could do would be to conduct a desk based review of the evaluation reports produced by D/ds. **Is this sufficient to meet the needs of the Board or is there something more the Board would want?**

Consultation

10 The material used for the evaluation exercises described in the annex have involved consultation in various forms and with various groups across HSE.

Presentation

11 N/a

Costs and Benefits

12 N/a

Financial/Resource Implications for HSE

13 None for this paper.

Environmental Implications

14 None

Other Implications

15

Action

16 The Board are invited to:

- i) comment on the findings and the approach taken to the evaluation of the T&D contained in Annex 1;
- ii) provide a steer on their requirements for the autumn review of the T&D strategy

Evaluation of Training and Development: Some initial findings

Essential Training for Managers (ETM) Programme

The ten modules which make up the ETM programme have been brought on stream over the last two years or so. The latest module - Resource Management - was piloted last summer.

1. Throughput and Cost (Sept 00 - August 01)

Module Title	Number Run	Attendees by band	Cost
Module 1 HSE's Expectations of its Managers	12	B1 - 4, B2 - 33, B3 - 30, B4 - 25, B5 - 48	£20,100
Module 2 The Legal Policy Framework	9	B1 - 2, B2 - 20, B3 - 15, B4 - 15, B5 - 29	£11,400
Module 3 Appraisal	6	B1 - 3, B2 - 14, B3 - 16, B4 - 7, B5 - 28	£20,100
Module 4 Development and learning	6	B1 - 3, B2 - 15, B3 - 14, B4 - 7, B5 - 29	£9,750
Module 5 Getting the best from your staff	5	B1 - 3, B2 - 2, B3 - 11, B4 - 6, B5 - 17	£6,600
Module 6 Management Communications Part 1	4	B1 - 2, B2 - 9, B3 - 9, B5 - 20	£4,800
Module 7 Management Communications Part 2	4	B1 - 2, B2 - 8, B3 - 9, B5 - 3	£7,800
Module 8 Selecting Staff: Level Moves	2	B1 - 2, B2 - 5, B5 - 3	£1,800
Module 10 Managing Resources	Pilot Only		
Module 11 Developing Your Management Style	1	B2 - 2, B3 - 2, B4 - 1, B5 - 1	£2,100
Module 12 The Appraisal Manager's Role	4	B1 - 3, B2 - 4, B4 - 10, B5 - 5	£6,500
Totals	53	496	

2. Outcomes

A. Student Evaluation:

Evaluation sheets completed by students at the end of every course reveal a generally good level of satisfaction with ETM courses and the approach of mixing bands and staff from different specialisms has been particularly welcome. Students are asked to rate: whether courses have fulfilled the objectives set out in the course prospectus; have met their personal objectives; whether the content of the course was relevant to their work; and the pace and style of the delivery. Responses from students have generally been in the range of 85 - 95% positive.

B. Industrial Society Evaluation Report

This was a specially commissioned assignment carried out by a consultant from the Industrial Society in February and March 02. It consisted of some desk research and focus groups with students and their line managers. The research was based on a very small sample so the findings are limited in their usefulness. However, the key findings are:

- There was a view amongst students and their managers that the ETM programme is most effective for band 5 staff who are new to management. Those recruits who had been managers in other organisations and who had received some prior management training, were less positive, because they felt that the ETM did not sufficiently acknowledge and value their previous experience [This is deliberate. The ETM is an important induction event for staff who are new to HSE and as well as some basic skills training is designed to introduce staff to HSE's approach to management issues];
- The ETM does not sufficiently deal with issues of managing staff at a distance, or where staff are managing others who do not directly report to them. The programme needs to address these needs;
- The level of support given to students by their managers seems to vary considerably and this has a bearing on the effectiveness of the training. The consultant recommends various ways in which D/ds can ensure that students receive an appropriate level of support;
- The behavioural elements of the ETM programme seem to be more effective than the procedural modules which are essentially about providing information. The consultant suggests that this information based modules may be better delivered through other means, such as e learning.
- Finally, the report concluded that there is a need to improve the way in which the ETM programme is evaluated [this forms part of the work we have in hand].

3. Staff Survey: Management Skills in HSE

The Staff Survey does not attempt to measure the overall quality of management or the specific impact of the ETM, but it does provide some insights into certain aspects of management in HSE.

In 2002, 75 % of managers with less than one year of experience in HSE were able to say that they knew what HSE expected of them in managing their staff. This

compares with 86% for those with between 1 - 2 years experience and 81% for those with 4 or more years experience.

There is a strong correlation between staff perceptions of the efforts HSE makes to bring on talent and the quality of leadership. In terms of helping staff with their development, 54% of staff reported that their line manager always discusses objectives with them before they undertake learning or development activities. Managers with less experience (under 1 year) do slightly better, with 61%. However the involvement of line managers after the T&D event tends to decline. 49% of managers review the impact of the learning immediately after their member of staff returns to work and only 35% do so after 3 - 6 months. Overall, 37% of line managers review the impact of learning opportunities on performance.

2. The Personal Challenge: Diversity Training for Staff

A. Throughput and cost

The “Personal Challenge” presentations were delivered during the period September 01 - April 02. There were 38 sessions in total, held across the country and attended by 2623 staff - about 65% of HSE’s total compliment. The costs was estimated at £100,000.

B. Student Evaluation

All staff who attended the event were asked to complete an evaluation sheet - 2179 (83%) were returned. Key findings were as follows:

Questions	Satisfaction Rate
Understand how biases, prejudices and assumptions can impact on behaviour towards you and/or others	97%
Ability to identify one or more actions that you can personally take forward	88%
Did you find the presentation thought provoking and stimulating?	92%

In addition, staff were asked to provide any written comments on the event. Most of these were complimentary, although a small minority were not. A recurring theme amongst those who did not find the presentation worthwhile was that they failed to see what diversity issues had to do with them or how it was relevant to their work.

C. Staff Survey

Belief in HSE’s commitment to equal opportunities has risen significantly since 2001 from 67% to 75%. This compares favourably to the Government benchmark of 69%.

In comparison, 58% of respondents with a disability believe HSE to be an equal opportunities employer. This group also held less favourable views on being

respected as an individual (51% compared with 66% for HSE overall) and being treated with dignity and respect by others (58% compared with 73% for HSE).

14% of respondents had experienced unacceptable behaviour during the year, a drop from 18% in 2001. However, 95% of these staff identified others in HSE as the source of the behaviour.