Once you have generated data on satisfaction, learning acquisition, and behavior and practice changes and, ultimately, the outcomes you have identified as relevant for your training, you must analyze and interpret those data. In addition, you need to report your evaluation findings in a meaningful way to potentially varied audiences. This Chapter of the Guide covers the steps involved in analyzing and interpreting evaluation data, including providing suggestions for how best to present the results of your training evaluation.
In this Section, we will cover some of the most common quantitative analysis procedures that are used in training evaluations. Analyzing quantitative and qualitative data is often the topic of advanced research and evaluation methods, and you may need the assistance of experts. While a detailed discussion of analysis is beyond the scope of this Guide - there are certainly basics which can help to make sense of reams of data that may be generated from your data collection process. Descriptions of these basics follow.

Whether you have collected qualitative or quantitative data (and ideally you have collected both), your analysis must be logical, thorough, and systematic. Your analysis should also be as simple as possible. For example, many training programs may only need to report descriptive statistics to demonstrate change (i.e., frequencies or percentages), and may have insufficient sample sizes to permit standard tests for significance. For other training evaluations with larger sample sizes and quasi-experimental designs, quantitative data can be analyzed using tests to determine whether there are statistically significant differences between pre- and post-test measures and between training and control groups.

**Always Start with your Evaluation Goals and Objectives**

When analyzing data (whether from questionnaires, interviews and focus groups, case file reviews or management information systems), always start from a review of your evaluation goals and objectives (i.e., the reason you undertook the evaluation in the first place). This will help you organize your data and focus your analysis. For example, if you wanted to improve your training program by identifying its strengths and weaknesses, you can organize data into program strengths, weaknesses and suggestions to improve the program. If you are conducting an outcomes-based evaluation, you can categorize data according to the indicators for each outcome.

**Quantitative Analysis**

Quantitative data analysis is helpful in evaluation because it provides quantifiable and easy to understand results. In training evaluation you could have generated “quantifiable” data from a number of data sources, but almost surely you generated quantifiable data from your survey process. These quantitative data can be analyzed in a variety of different ways.

**Identify the Type of Data you Have**

Because the type of data you have influences the type of analysis you can use, before you begin your data analysis you must determine the level of measurement, or type of data, you have generated in your data
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collection process. There are four types of data:

- **Nominal Data** - nominal data are basic classification data (e.g., “male,” or “female”). There is no order associated with nominal data. With nominal data you would assign each category with an arbitrary value (male = 1, female = 0).
- **Ordinal Data** - ordinal data have a logical order but the differences between the values are not constant (e.g., “small,” “medium,” “large”).
- **Interval Data** - interval data are continuous and have a logical order. There are standardized differences between the values, but no natural zero (e.g., items expressed on a Likert scale where individuals are asked to rank their choice from 1-5 with 1 being “very dissatisfied” and 5 being “very satisfied”).
- **Ratio Data (scale)** - ratio data are continuous, ordered, have standardized differences between values, and have a natural zero (e.g., age, length, time).

Once you have identified your type(s) of data, you can begin using some of the quantitative data analysis procedures outlined below. If you have a small sample size, the types of quantitative methods at your disposal are limited. However, there are several procedures you can use to determine what your data are telling you.

**Tabulate your Data**

- Data tabulation (frequency distributions & percent distributions)
- Descriptive data
- Data disaggregation
- Moderate and advanced analytical methods

The first thing you should do with your data is tabulate your results for the different variables in your data set. Tabulating your data involves creating frequency and percent distributions. This process will give you a comprehensive picture of what your data look like and assist you in identifying patterns. The best ways to do this are by constructing frequency and percent distributions.

A frequency distribution is an organized table of the number of individuals or scores located in each category (see the table below). A Frequency distribution table will help you determine if your scores are entered correctly; if scores are high or low; how many scores are in each category; and the spread of scores.
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Table 6-1
Sample Frequency Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Size = 50 completed and returned training surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge = 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecuting Attorney = 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jurisdiction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County = 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County = 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participated in the Workshop on Permanency Hearings Best Practices</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No = 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfied with Overall Training Program Experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied = 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied = 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied = 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied = 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table “Title”, you can see that of the training participants who completed and returned a survey, 40 expressed satisfaction with the overall training program experience (with 25 noting that they were “very satisfied”).

A percent distribution, on the other hand, displays the proportion of participants who are represented within each category (see the Table “Title” below).

Table 6-2
Sample Percent Distribution Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Size = 50 completed and returned training surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge = 60% (n=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecuting Attorney = 40% (n=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jurisdiction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County = 80% (n=40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County = 20% (n=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participated in the Workshop on Permanency Hearings Best Practices</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 50% (n=25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No = 50% (n=25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfied with Overall Training Program Experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied = 50% (n=25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied = 30% (n=15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied = 14% (n=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied = 6% (n=3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table “Title” above, you can see that 80% (n=40) of the training participants who completed an evaluation survey reported being satisfied with their overall training experience.

Run Descriptive Data

A descriptive refers to calculations that are used to “describe” the data set. Depending on the level of measurement or type of data you have, you may not be able to run descriptive for all of the variables in your dataset. The most common descriptives used are:

- **Mean** – The mean is the numerical average of scores for a particular variable. A meaningful mean can only be calculated from interval or ratio data.
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- **Range** – A range express the minimum and maximum values for a variable—the highest and lowest value for a particular variable. A minimum and maximum value can be calculated for all levels of measurement.

- **Median** – The median is the numerical middle point or score that cuts the distribution in half for a particular variable. A meaningful median can only be calculated from ordinal, interval, and ratio data.
  - Calculate the median by:
    - If the number of scores is odd, the median is the number that splits the distribution
    - If the number of scores is even, calculate the mean of the middle two scores

- **Mode** – The mode is the most common number score or value for a particular variable. A mode can be calculated for all levels of measurement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-3</th>
<th>Sample Descriptive Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample size = 50 completed and returned surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the Overall Training Program Experience</td>
<td>Mean = 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range = 1 (min) 4 (max)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mode = 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median = 3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Same change as with other tables....From the table above, you can see that the average satisfaction level of the participants who completed an evaluation survey (n=50) was 4.0, with a range from 1 “very dissatisfied,” to 4 “very satisfied.” The most commonly occurring rating (the mode) was a 3 indicating “satisfaction” with the training program.

**Disaggregate your Data**

Continue to explore your data by disaggregating, or in other words sorting data by different variables and subcategories of interest. Running crosstabs, for example, allows you to stratify data across multiple categories. You may want to break up your data by professional role, by attendance at a particular workshop, by gender or ethnicity, by level of reported experience (such as years on the bench or years of practice), or by jurisdiction.

Using data from the training program evaluation survey example above, we can explore the participants’ role by the jurisdiction they represent. By looking at Table “Title” below, you can clearly see that most of the training participants who returned an evaluation survey were judges (60%; n=30) while just under half of the participants (40%, n=20) were attorneys. The majority of judges (83%) attending the training were from Clark County, while half of the attorneys were from Clark County and half of the attorneys were from Washoe County.

---

72 Disaggregating data is a common exercise of breaking data into subgroups to examine how one group differs from another. Disaggregate and stratify are used interchangeably.
You can also disaggregate the data by creating subcategories within a variable. This allows you to take a deeper look at the units that make up that category. From our sample data, 10% of training participants reported that they were dissatisfied with their overall training experience. This subcategory can be explored in more depth to find out more about the make-up of those individuals reporting dissatisfaction with their overall training experience.

From this table, you can see that all of the participants who expressed dissatisfaction with their overall training experience were attorneys (n=10). In fact half (50%; n=10 of 20) of all of the attorneys responding to the survey reported that they were dissatisfied. These respondents were equally divided between attorneys from Clark (50%) and Washoe Counties (50%). None of the participants who attended the workshop on best practices for Permanency Hearings reported dissatisfaction with their overall training experience.

Disaggregating data by subcategories within a variable can be helpful in revealing findings that you may not see immediately. For instance, by exploring “dissatisfaction” in more depth in the example above, you may infer that the training program did not meet the needs of the attorneys that attended, with 50% of the attorneys reporting being dissatisfied with their overall training experience. This result would have been masked if you only reported the average or mean satisfaction level of all training participants, which in this example was a 3.5 on a scale from 1 to 4, indicating satisfaction with the program. It also would have been masked if you had only reported that the majority (80%) of all of the survey respondents reported being satisfied with their training experience. Qualitative responses provided by the attorneys on their survey forms should be explored for any reasons offered as to why they were dissatisfied with their training experience (e.g., perhaps they felt that the curriculum was tailored more to judges and not as relevant to their own professional
Another finding worth exploring is the fact that none of the individuals who attended the workshop on best practices in Permanency Hearings reported dissatisfaction with their overall training experience, providing some indication that this was a successful workshop.

**Basic Analysis of Quantitative Data**

- Tabulate the information (add up the number of ratings, rankings, yes’s or no’s for each evaluation question).
- For ratings and rankings, compute a mean (or average) for each question.
- Also consider reporting the range of answers to an item (e.g., 60% of respondents ranked an item as a “top priority,” while 40% of respondents ranked that same item as a “low priority”).
- Run cross-tabulations
  - Cross-tabulation is a statistical technique that examines an interdependent relationship between two tables of values but does not identify a causal relationship between the values. For example, a cross-tabulation might show that training participants from a specific stakeholder group were less satisfied with the training content.
- Run statistical tests of significance to compare groups.
  - When you are comparing your training group to a control, or conducting a before or after comparison, the preliminary results are usually summarized into means or scores for each group. Once you’ve summarized this data, statistical tests of significance should be applied to determine if the observed differences between the two groups’ mean scores are real or just a chance difference caused by the natural variation within the measurements (e.g., independent group t-tests or paired t-tests).73

In addition to the basic methods described above there are a variety of more complicated analytical procedures that you can perform with your data. These include:

- **Correlation** A correlation is a statistical calculation which describes the nature of the relationship between two variables (i.e., strong and negative, weak and positive, statistically significant). An important thing to remember when using correlations is that a correlation does not explain causation. A correlation merely indicates that a relationship or pattern exists, but it does not mean that one variable is the cause of the other. For example, you might see a strong positive correlation between participation in the training program and substantive permanency hearing practice. However, the correlation will not tell you if the training program is the reason that permanency hearings have become more substantive. Correlation can imply causation when the data from which the correlate

---

73 It is beyond the scope of this Guide to provide a primer on statistical techniques. The reader should consult the references at the end of this section for assistance. In addition, consultation with research experts on analytic methods may be required.
was computed were obtained by experimental means with appropriate care to avoid confounding and other threats to the internal validity of the experiment.

- **Regression** is an extension of correlation and is used to determine whether one variable is a predictor of another variable. A regression can be used to determine how strong the relationship is between your intervention (i.e., your training) and your outcome variables. More importantly, a regression will tell you whether a variable (e.g., participation in the training) is a statistically significant predictor of the outcome variable (e.g., timely permanency). A variable can have a positive or negative influence, and the strength of the effect can be weak or strong. Like correlations, causation cannot be inferred from regression.

- **Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)** is used to determine whether the difference in means (averages) for two groups is statistically significant. For example, an analysis of variance will help you determine if the mean time to permanency for jurisdictions who received training on permanency hearing best practices is significantly different from jurisdictions who did not receive training on permanency best practices.

**Qualitative Analysis**

Qualitative data analysis involves the identification, examination, and interpretation of patterns and themes in textual, narrative or “open-ended” data (e.g., respondents' verbal answers in interviews, focus groups, or written commentary on questionnaires), and explores how these patterns and themes help answer the research questions at hand. Qualitative analysis is (NSF, 1997):

- Not guided by universal rules;
- Is a very fluid process that is highly dependent on the evaluator and the context of the study; and
- Likely to change and adapt as the study evolves and the data emerges.

When analyzing qualitative data you must continually reflect back on your evaluation’s purpose and goals. The questions to ask throughout the analysis process are (NSF, 1997):

- **What patterns/common themes emerge around specific items in the data?**
  - How do these patterns (or lack thereof) help to shed light on the broader study question(s)?
- **Are there any deviations from these patterns?**
  - If, yes, what factors could explain these atypical responses?
- **What interesting stories emerge from the data?**
  - How can these stories help to shed light on the evaluation questions?
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- Do any of the patterns/emergent themes suggest that additional data need to be collected?
  - Do any of the evaluation questions need to be revised?
- Do the patterns that emerge support the findings of other corresponding qualitative analyses that have been conducted?

Basic Analysis of Qualitative Data

Qualitative data can produce a wealth of information but not all of it is meaningful. You will need to examine your raw qualitative data to determine what is significant and transform the data into a simplified format that can be understood in the context of your evaluation objectives (Krathwohl, 1998; Miles and Huberman, 1994; NSF, 1997). After you have reduced your qualitative data to its meaningful pieces you will need to group it into meaningful patterns or themes. This process is generally conducted via **content and thematic analysis**.

- **Content Analysis** is carried out by coding the data for certain words or content, identifying their patterns; and interpreting their meanings. This type of coding is done by going through all of the text and labeling words, phrases, and sections of text that relate to your research questions of interest (e.g., “skill acquisition,” “satisfaction,” “behavior change,” etc.). After the data are coded you can sort and examine them for patterns.
- **Thematic Analysis** involves grouping the data into themes that will help to answer your evaluation questions. Once themes have been identified it is useful to group the data into thematic groups so that you can analyze the meaning of the themes and connect them back to the research question(s).

The Basics of Qualitative Data Analysis

- Read through all of the qualitative responses.
- Organize comments into similar categories (e.g., concerns, suggestions, strengths, weaknesses, similar experiences, training program inputs, recommendations, outcome indicators, etc.).
- Label the categories or themes (e.g., concerns, suggestions for improvements, etc.).
- Identify patterns or associations and relationships in the themes (e.g., all people who attended the training who had no previous dependency court experience had similar concerns).

See the Chapter Six Tools and Resources for a summary of the questions to ask throughout the qualitative data analysis process.
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Interpreting Data

Attempt to put the data obtained in perspective; this could be accomplished by making comparisons. For example, compare results to what you expected or promised and/or original training program goals. You will want to highlight any indications of accomplishing outcomes (especially if you're conducting an outcomes evaluation). In addition, you could provide a description of the training program's experiences, strengths, weaknesses, etc. Consider recommendations to help improve the training program and any conclusions you can draw about program operations or whether training goals were met, etc. Record your conclusions and recommendations in a report document, and associate interpretations to justify your conclusions or recommendations.

In some evaluations, the findings consist of narratives that describe the history of events. In other cases, evaluation findings are descriptions of the way things are without explanations or judgments. In still other cases, evaluations seek to answer questions of cause and effect or the relationships between methods and outcomes. As useful as these findings may be, they do not in themselves help us to judge the worth of a training program’s efforts. How do we know that a training program deserves praise? This can occur only when the findings are judged in relationship to several judgment perspectives, some of which are briefly discussed below.

**Standard-Referenced Judgment Perspective** – Findings regarding a particular training program’s effectiveness can be compared with examples of excellent achievement by using agreed upon criteria established by experts as "state of the art." For instance, such experts could describe excellence as (1) promotion of strategies that are readily applied in the field; (2) recognition of local knowledge and cultural practices; (3) high participation of training participants in designing behavioral change strategies; (4) high inclusion of stakeholders from all system partners; and (5) achievement of targeted behavior and policy changes.

**Cohort-Referenced Judgment Perspective** – Findings from a training program evaluation can be compared with similar training programs. For this judgment, we ask how a particular training or aspect of a training program would compare to similar training programs elsewhere. External evaluators are most prepared to do this since they may be knowledgeable about training practices and impacts elsewhere. This approach is limited because few places are truly similar in training resources, political and economic contexts, and other conditions that can affect program outcomes. However, a failure to make judgments using external cohort comparisons may result in a false sense of achievement and self-satisfaction. Such training programs, when compared, may be mediocre, outdated, poorly conceptualized, and wasteful while being considered excellent or acceptable by local practitioners and their funders.

---

74 Swanson, Benz & Sofranko (1998).
Difficulty-Referenced Judgment Perspective – This perspective takes into consideration the difficulty of what is being attempted when making judgments regarding training program achievements. For example, a training program that is addressing training for systems change with few staff members in the midst of organizational upheaval must be given credit for achievements under these difficult circumstances compared with training programs that have a large staff who are designing and implementing training with relatively rich resources and high motivation for implementing the strategies recommended by the training. Achievement must be judged relative to difficulty and conditions.

Progress-Referenced Judgment Perspective – This perspective on the interpretation of findings gives credit and recognition to progress from past to present. Before-and-after descriptions are essential to making these judgments. Training programs that collect and emphasize “baseline” data usually want to use it to make progress-referenced judgments.

Alternative-Referenced Judgment Perspective – This perspective considers present descriptions of a training program in comparison with what could have been accomplished with the same resources used in alternative ways and places or with different people. This perspective asks, "How else could these resources have been spent with better or different results?" For example, would improved permanency hearing practice that results in shortened timeframes to permanency be more evident today if the training had focused on “front-loading” strategies? What would have been the results if the training program had incorporated all systems stakeholders rather than just court-based stakeholders? Sometimes answers to these questions can be generated by projecting results based on pilot efforts or by alternative approaches that have already been tried in limited form in other trainings.

These judgment perspectives also are helpful in evaluation of learning by individual participants themselves. Learners can judge their learning in comparison with expert standards, performance by their peers, their external difficulties, their own progress from past to present, and what they would have found more important to have learned or done with their time. Often a combination of these judgments provides a balanced evaluation.
Above all, results need to be presented in a user-friendly or consumable way. If you are leading a training evaluation project, there is nothing more frustrating than finishing your project and finding the comprehensive report you wrote gathering dust on someone’s desk. While a comprehensive report might be required and particularly informative for a small number of key stakeholders (e.g., your training organization team, the evaluation team, the funder), a PowerPoint presentation, snapshot or “dashboard” report that summarizes your findings will be more likely to be widely distributed and viewed by many. Sufficient thought and time needs to be spent on the different communication tools that you might need for different audiences. Taking a moment before drafting your report to identify your audience will also assist during the process of writing a report. Maybe your report is only intended for internal stakeholders, or maybe you want to make it available to the public.

Typically, a single report provided to stakeholders neglects the interests of many other participant groups. One solution is to consider the findings, interpretations, and judgments of a training evaluation as constituting a pool from which a variety of reports and styles of reporting can be fashioned to serve specific purposes and different users. Forms of reporting can include formal written reports, written executive summaries, letters to individuals and organizations, exhibits and pictorial displays, bulletins, and public meetings. Stakeholders can then be given the information to which they are entitled in the form that best suits their purposes and best encourages learning.

**Sample Training Evaluation Report Outline**

There are many possible report formats to consider - a snapshot or “dashboard” report of key findings may be most suitable for certain audiences (i.e., your training participants or system partners), for example, while a comprehensive and detailed report of findings and lessons learned about training program improvement is most suitable for training managers and for funders. Typical sections of a full summary or comprehensive report are noted below.

**Title and Opening Pages**

The title and opening pages to a comprehensive training evaluation report should provide the following basic information: 1) Name of the training program evaluated; 2) Time-frame of evaluation and date of report; 3) Names and organizations of evaluators; 4) Name of the organizations funding or commissioning the evaluation; 5) Acknowledgements; and 6) Table of contents.
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Executive Summary
The Executive Summary is an abbreviated version of the most important parts of your evaluation report. The busy reader should come away with an understanding of what the evaluation was about, the main evaluation questions, key findings, and major conclusions and recommendations. Everything in the Executive Summary should be based directly on what is in the report. No new information should be presented in the Executive Summary. The balance of successes and problems documented in the full report should be evident to someone who only reads the Executive Summary. Generally, an Executive Summary should be between two and three pages.

Introduction
The introduction should inform the reader about the context in which the training took place. This would include a summary of the history of curriculum development, the audience for the training, as well as the issues or problems that the curriculum is designed to address. This section of your report should describe the training program (its content and delivery), as well as how it was designed (e.g., whether a needs assessment was used) and identified learning objectives.

The theory of change and logic model for the training program should also be summarized. The reader should know all that is necessary about the context and the problem the training was designed to address. Now, the reader wants to know what the training tried to do – laying out the training design and implementation structure helps the reader to understand your evaluation findings and conclusions.

What was the training activity or program about? In this section the evaluator should provide the reader a concise picture of:

- What the training was going to do;
- What the objectives were;
- How it was to be done;
- Where it was to be done;
- Who was going to do it; and
- At what cost (who was funding it)?

Methodology
The credibility of any evaluation’s conclusions rests on the quality of the evidence that supports them. This, in turn depends on the appropriateness of the research design and methodology for data collection and analysis.
used by the evaluation team. It is important that your report clearly explain the methods used to collect the data in an evaluation.

In this section of your report, the evaluation design (quasi-experimental, mixed methods, etc.) and the methods used to collect data should be presented in summary form. The description should include the unit of analysis, selection of samples (if any), data collection instruments, types of data collected, analytic techniques used, who did it, and when it was done. This can become a rather lengthy description. If so, summarize it and place supplementary information on these points in an appendix. Include questionnaires, observation checklists, descriptions of sampling procedures, data analysis procedures, and other supporting materials in the appendix.

If space permits, a very useful summary chart can be displayed which aligns your evaluation questions with the data type and source(s) used to answer each question.

Limitations of your evaluation method should also be noted. It is important to identify in summary form any data limitations of which your evaluation team is aware. Most training evaluations are constrained by limited time and resources. These influence the overall research design and data collection methods and have an impact on the validity of the findings and conclusions. Other factors such as the timing of the evaluation, database limitations, and accessibility of data may affect the quality of the evidence an evaluation team gathers and the validity of the conclusions reached.

**Main Findings**

The data from each of your evaluation questions can be summarized from two perspectives. Summarizing topic-by-topic gives information useful for program improvement. Summarizing across all topics gives information more useful for accountability, such as reporting to stakeholders and funding sources.

*Topic-by Topic-Results*

- Are suited for instructors and curriculum designers.
- Are most useful for future program improvement.
- Help training coordinators to identify topics which may need improvement.

*Across Topics Results*

- Give a more succinct picture of the whole program.
- Are suited for reporting to stakeholders and funding sources.
- Lend themselves to simple pie charts for stakeholders or funders who may not be interested in all the details of the first type of training summary.
- Report on Participants’ Profile(s)
- Benefits Gained from Attending the Training
- Outcomes at the Individual Level
  - Behavior and Practice Change
- Outcomes at the Organizational Level
  - Impacts on Collaboration
- Training Influences on Outcomes of Interest
  - Training Influences on Outcomes of Interest Identified by Safety, Permanency, Timeliness, Due Process and Well-Being Impacts
Conclusion and Recommendations

Interpretations and conclusions drawn from your analysis of the data should be presented in this final section of your report. Conclusions involve judgments and emerge from evaluative reasoning. In the conclusion section, the evaluation team must set forth its deductions about why a training program succeeded or failed to achieve its intended results. Conclusions interpret what your findings mean.

Recommendations and lessons learned regarding what needs to be done to improve or replicate the training are also relevant for this section of your report. Prior to preparing a set of recommendations, you should review the purpose and goals envisioned by your training program. These purposes should be taken into account as you frame your recommendations for program improvement. Recommendations should:

- Follow directly from your evaluation findings and conclusions
- Be supported by thorough and sound analysis and evaluative reasoning
- Be actionable

Appendices

Your report appendices should include any supporting or explanatory materials that help to inform the reader about the evaluation. Appropriate items for the appendices include:

- Instruments used to collect data
- Data in tables or question-by-question if data are only summarized in Findings section of the report
- Qualitative comments provided by training participants
- The training logic model
- The evaluation plan with specified outcomes, sources for data, data collection methods, who will collect data, etc.
- Reference list and any related resource materials

See the Chapter Six Tools and Resources for an additional example of the contents of a comprehensive training evaluation report.
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Tools and Resources – Chapter Six

- Examples of the Contents of an Evaluation Report
- Questions to Ask Throughout the Qualitative Analysis Process
CHAPTER SIX: References and Resources


