IT 8150

Needs Assessment Project

Prepared for Dr. Diroff

July 28, 2005

Submitted by Tim Boileau and Alan Pangburn

Table of Contents

Introduction

This report covers a needs assessment completed for a privately held performance improvement company. The needs assessment was undertaken to determine performance gaps and causes related to the organization's application of rapid prototyping for producing and delivering eLearning to their clients. Specifically, costs and timing for delivery of Web-based training are out of line with expectations based upon investments in process, tools and technology, and training that has been provided. For purposes of anonymity, the company will be referred to as ABC Corporation. The process used includes a pre-assessment phase, an assessment phase, and a post-assessment phase. Organization and treatment of information includes elements of Rossett's model for needs assessment (i.e., optimal, actual, feelings, causes, and solutions.)

A variety of techniques were employed during the assessment including a review of extant data, interviews and survey, and benchmarking other eLearning companies.

Pre-assessment

Overview

The drivers for this needs assessment are organizational development and culture change required for ABC to become more competitive in the design and delivery of eLearning performance interventions. Specifically, the organizational challenge is to create a small company culture (in terms of nimbleness, flexibility, and efficiency) within a large global organization. The needs assessment was designed to address the ongoing need for change in process (how the *work* gets done), environment (the *workplace*) and the performer (the *worker*). The need for change is ongoing since technology and client requirements for training are continually evolving.

Background

Two years ago, ABC completed a reengineering effort and provided tools and training for employees in order to move eLearning development to a rapid prototyping model. The **optimal** stated goals were to:

- Reduce the time and cost to produce a Web-based training (WBT) course by leveraging technology,

- Reduce the size of the delivery team, and

- Change roles and responsibilities of the individual performers.

Work. Leveraging technology, ABC adopted a content authoring tool called Lectora. This tool uses a familiar outline approach (similar to PowerPoint) to create content. The tool with associated processes should allow instructional designers and writers to move direct from design to prototype, without the need to produce a separate storyboard/script. Because the tool generates Web artifacts

(i.e., HTML files, scripts, and interfaces), additional savings were anticipated in programming hours.

Workplace. Reducing the size of the delivery team is linked to reducing the number of deliverables, combining roles within the team and taking out project management tasks due to compressed lifecycles achievable with rapid delivery.

Worker. Changes to the tools and processes require workers to develop new skills along with the ability to adapt to new workflows. The biggest change here is that there are fewer handoffs, and greater personal accountability for the finished product.

Training

Training was provided for the team in January of 2005. Training consisted of three elements:

- A half-day workshop covering the Lectora toolset and rapid prototyping process

- Mentoring by pairing team members with an SME for eLearning development using Lectora

- Practice using the toolset to develop skills through hands-on experience

A total of 16 team members were trained, representing the following stakeholders:

Stakeholder	Number Trained
Project Manager	2
Instructional Designer	3
Editorial	8
Programmer	2
Producer	1

There was a perceived need for training by management as most team members did not have previous experience with an eLearning authoring tool. The training was effective in terms of knowledge retention as evidenced by a quiz, however, there was limited transfer of new skills to the jobs being performed.

Current State

A review of the **actual** performance indicates that ABC has fallen short of their goals (after implementing the training) in two major areas:

- They did not achieve efficiencies and, in some cases, the amount of time to complete a web-based training (WBT) course has actually increased, due in part to rework needed to meet client expectations. In those instances,

> stakeholder reviews were either not conducted or were undocumented as the team did not follow the process.

- Technology requirements have changed. Specifically, one major client for eLearning has mandated that all WBT courses be delivered in100% Flash format, rather than HTML. The impact is that the primary authoring tool selected by ABC (i.e., Lectora) is no longer a viable tool for work performed for this particular client.

A review of the extant data supports the general conclusion regarding efficiencies. Specifically, the assessment team reviewed six projects that were completed using the new process. This data was compared with six projects completed before implementation of the rapid model. Data reviewed was for projects of similar scope and complexity, within the same curriculum. No adjustments were made to account for running scope changes as these tended to occur at the same level of frequency with both processes.

Comparison of Efficiencies in eLearning using Standard vs. Rapid Process

Project Completed using Standard Process		Projects Completed using Rapid Process	
Time (hours)	Cost ($)	Time (hours)	Cost ($)
310	28,000	300	26,000
307	27,240	311	26,400
319	29,100	296	25,850
304	27,300	297	25,940
317	28,700	306	26,200
305	27,600	301	27,100

The average time and cost for completing a course using the standard process was:

> 310 hours at $27,990

The average time and cost for completing a course using the rapid process was:

> 301 hours at $26,248

There was a slight reduction of effort (3%) and cost (6%) when using Lectora in the rapid process, as less time is used to create storyboards.

The impact of technology on performance varies greatly by individual and project within the organization depending on:

- Availability and access to tools
- Training on new tools

- Ability of performers to adapt to change

- Individual skills and ability

In reviewing the project information with key performers, efficiencies appeared linked more to individuals rather than process, since best practices were not documented and institutionalized. For that reason, there were isolated cases where projects had been completed ahead of schedule and within budget in Flash, however, this capability was not uniform across different parts of the organization.

Stakeholders (Who)

There are various functional roles represented in the process, which are impacted by changes. These roles were the focus of the assessment in terms of their **feelings**, attitudes, and opinions. The essential roles include the project manager, instructional designer, creative lead, editorial, and programming. With complex technical and instructional requirements, there is an integrated role of producer, which combines several of the roles discussed. Definitions of the roles are as follows:

Project Manager

The primary role of the Project Manager is to ensure that client expectations are being met or exceeded in terms of timing, budget, and milestone deliverables. This includes administrative support in scheduling review meetings, and overall responsibility for managing the budget and timeline.

Instructional Designer

The role of the Instructional Designer is to analyze business requirements for performance improvement, environment, and learner characteristics. Based upon this analysis, the Instructional Designer provides a detailed design covering appropriate instructional strategies, delivery medium, and assessment methods to ensure that learning and performance objectives are met.

Creative Lead

The role of the Creative Lead is twofold. First, it is to ensure that thematic decisions regarding the Web look and feel are aligned with the client culture, provide a memorable learner experience, and support the learning objectives for the project. Second, it is to provide production level support during development by creating and managing the library of assets to be included in the instructional content.

Editorial

The editorial role is primarily manifested in the Content Author. The Content Author researches the content identified in the analysis, and develops the content 'pages' for the course with strict adherence to the design document. A secondary, though extremely important, editorial role

is that of the Proofreader to ensure correctness, accuracy, and appropriateness to the audience.

Programming

The Programmer is a technologist providing programming support for the Lectora, and for any required custom development to implement the instructional strategies (e.g., Flash interactions, games, simulations, etc.). During the implementation phase, the Programmer is responsible for 'publishing' the course to create the software artifacts, and to verify suitability of the program elements in the client's hosting environment (i.e., alpha testing).

Producer

The Producer is traditionally not a separately defined role. The closest we come to this is in the IT Project Lead. The role of the producer is to provide oversight and integration of the other roles to make sure that the Instructional Designer, Creative Lead, Content Author, and Programmer are all talking to each other to produce the course as it was designed. The Producer works in concert with the Project Manager to ensure that budget and timing constraints are adhered to.

Stakeholder groups impacted by the process include internal stakeholders, clients, and project staff. A brief definition of each is provided below.

Internal Stakeholders

A primary group of stakeholders includes the sales team and financial teams. This group has a vested interest in the profitability of the projects that are delivered, and in expanding the client relationship by increasing the business opportunity. This group was not targeted directly by the assessment methods since they are not direct participants in the eLearning development process.

Internal stakeholders invited to participate in the evaluation are those individuals supporting the roles described in the program components section above.

Clients

Clients are materially affected by the outcomes of the program being evaluated. This includes the quality of the deliverables, the number of different people they need to interact with, and the ultimate effectiveness of the training products being produced. Therefore, client attitudes and perceptions with the process have been included in the assessment.

Needs Assessment Committee (NAC)

The NAC for the needs assessment includes one primary assessor, and two senior level training managers who have reviewed and validated the instruments prior to conducting the evaluation.

Assessment

The assessment was completed over a six-week period between May 19 and June 30. Subsequent to the assessment, two weeks were taken to analyze the data and to prepare a final report.

Methods (What and Where)

The methods used in the assessment included interview, survey and benchmarking.

Interviews – were conducted with SMEs to understand the eLearning team training requirements to make them more effective with the process and the technology. Questions asked included:

1. Are the topics consistent with the behaviors we are attempting to create and reinforce? Where are there inconsistencies?

2. Is the amount of time allocated, and level of detail in the instructional materials appropriate for the intended audience (i.e., Instructional Designers and Writers)? Please explain.

3. Is the order of presentation for the topics logical and understandable? How would you reorder the material?

4. Is the selection of topics appropriate for the objectives set for learners, relative to the overall process for developing web-based training?

Survey – a survey questionnaire was created and administered to stakeholders who participated in training. The survey was intended to cover three dimensions of performance related to rapid prototyping with Lectora. The performance dimensions are:

- Training effectiveness of Workshop – Individual Capacity

- Best Practices – Tools and Resources

- Organizational Change – Role Integration

Benchmarks – were performed on two other companies to compare best practices and the change process they underwent to become high performing eLearning services providers.

Instruments (How)

Interviews

Interviews were conducted with the eLearning SMEs, who were also stakholders in the process. Questions focused on training needs and the extent to which those needs had been met in the training that was conducted earlier in the year. Interviewees included: designers, writers, creative directors, and programmers. A total of six interviews were completed over a two-week period, May 20 – June 3, 2005. All interviews were conducted 1-on-1, and took place between the

interviewee and the lead assessor. Interviews were strictly limited to one hour each, with no more than ten questions which were provided to interviewees in advance.

Survey

The survey was three pages long and consisted of 5 sections with a total of 25 questions. The questions were scored on a Likert scale and a verbatim response was available at the end of each section to capture qualitative feedback. A copy of the survey used is included in the appendix.

Benchmarks

Benchmark studies were conducted at two competitors of ABC. The format for collecting benchmark data was a questionnaire, focusing on key elements required for organizational change to occur. Responses to the benchmark questions were summarized by phase of the change process, and also by team roles necessary for the change to occur.

The interviews we did with people from other organizations outside of ABC started with a list of initial questions to ensure that basic information was gathered. As the interviews progressed, follow-on questions were asked based on responses given to these initial questions.

Findings from benchmarking investigations conceptually identified four areas: organizational readiness, change team roles, the implementation process, and making it personal. Making it personal is interwoven among these three areas and cannot be separated out and stand on its own.

One of our respondents stated that "it is ultimate hypocrisy to demand of your organization things that you won't do yourself, but changing yourself is absolutely one of the hardest things on earth to do." This statement really indicates that the individual or team responsible of a change, either large or small, has to believe in what they are trying to accomplish is the right thing to do.

All of the people we talked to outside of ABC Corporation indicated the need for change was usually identified initially by management as something is not right. This was closely followed by an individual or small group identifying a problem and proposing a solution. A consistent problem that had to be overcome was convincing parts of the organization that they were right, and getting buy-in on the solution. In one case, upper management completely reorganized a group that did not want to participate in the change because in their mind the status quo was working just fine.

Communication with all parties involved was high on the list of most important in successful implementations and also high on the list of problems that got in the way. Generally getting people involved early in the process whenever possible and keeping others informed made change more palatable.

Interview Data (What did they tell us?)

SMEs were consulted prior to and during development of the training content, so for the most part believed that the training met the needs of the user groups. The material presented was reflective of the learning objectives. Similarly, the level of detail was appropriate to the job titles represented in the two training sessions.

Inconsistencies among the learners were most apparent in the relative lack of real world experience. The training assumed a basic level of understanding adult learning theory in general, and synchronous learning specifically. This proved not to be the case, as many participants lacked prerequisite knowledge in designing and writing instruction for the web. The training covered how to use the tool but did not cover how to be a better instructional designer for the web.

Responses provided to the questions were consistent among the interviewees, and tended to move into other areas of discussion around culture. In retrospect, a focus group would have provided better insights to the training needs by having the different SME points of view in a single forum.

Survey Data (What did we see?)

Surveys were sent out to sixteen people in the roles described above, via email. The number of responses was four, or 25%. The distribution and return is summarized in the table below.

Title	Surveys Sent	Surveys Returned
Project Manager	2	0
Instructional Designer	3	1
Creative Lead	0	0
Editorial	8	2
Programmer	2	0
Producer	1	1
Total	**16**	**4**

The actual survey responses are summarized in the following table, for each question and category. The score for each question is on a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest. Verbatim comments have also been included.

Training - Workshop	
I understood the purpose of the training session prior to attending.	4.5
I had the necessary skills and experience to understand the instruction presented.	4.75
The amount of material covered was appropriate for the time allowed.	4
The examples provided covered most of the things I need to do with Lectora.	3.5
The hands-on exercises helped me to become comfortable using the tools in Lectora.	3
As a result of the workshop, I felt confident that I could begin working on my own.	3.5
	3.8

Comments:

I would like to see a tutorial designed specifically for workshop application. There was too much switching between the built-in Lectora Tutorial and the TVA course. We couldn't do any hands-on experimentation with the TVA course.

Would have been to have the image files needed to actually craft a pop-up and roll-over… that's the only part that was tough to practice on until the course template and associated files were received.

Less time about philosophy and process, more hands-on time needed in the training.

Training - Mentoring	
The mentoring model for getting coaching and assistance was explained to me.	3.5
When I called my mentor/coach, I was able to get my questions answered promptly.	4
I was able to obtain examples of different interactions (e.g., rollover, pop-up) to use in my course.	3.5
I am comfortable learning new skills (i.e., Lectora) as long as I have someone I can go to for help.	5
Getting answers to my questions by calling a mentor is quicker than trying to figure it out on my own.	5
At the end of development of my course, I will feel comfortable enough with Lectora to mentor other users.	3.5
	4

Comments:

Our development timelines have been so short that I've been trying to keep things simple enough so I can do it without calling a mentor.

What would be useful (given the time) is some guidance on when it's instructionally most appropriate to use certain actions or features (e.g., a click vs. a rollover, or a drag-and-drop exercise vs. a matching exercise, etc.)

Other than you offering to take calls with questions, I can't say as I remember this part at all?

The Mentoring process was not clear to me from the training. Two hours with a mentor, one-on-one, would have been more effective for me.

I obtained my own samples through my own diligence. None were provided to me.

Training - Prototype	
I understood the requirement to build a prototype and what was expected in the prototype delivery.	3.5
Working with the other team members (i.e., creative and programming) helped to increase my comfort and skill level with Lectora.	3
Building the prototype helped me to better understand the workflow in rapid application development of Web-based training.	1.5
Building the prototype gave me a greater sense of ownership in the course development process.	2
	2.5

Comments:

Is this referring to the practice we did in the training? If so, I would hesitate to call it "a sample module." Not enough time spent on this.

In my particular case, it has been quite difficult to spec art to meet the requirements of the Creative department and still stay within budget parameters. We have been proceeding on the basis of the client's preference for illustration vs. text.

Turns out that there aren't enough hours spec'd for either:

The writer to design the screens so they don't need an illustration to engage the learner

The artist to find and prepare artwork for every screen to engage the learner.

Don't think this applies to me… other than your up-front explanation for "why" Lectora and the sequence of events (who does what), I don't think we did this and if we did, I don't think it was couched in these terms… does adding the text boxes and practicing with some of the other functionality what this is?

Best Practices	
Working with my mentor and/or Trivantis support, I was informed of best practices to include in the course I was working on.	2
I learn better by observing and finding out how others may have solved a particular problem.	5
There are tips and hints that I've discovered that would be beneficial to others working in Lectora.	3.5
I am willing to capture and share best practices based upon my experience to help benefit others.	5
I have made inquiries on my own to ask other people what has worked best for them.	3
	3.7

Comments:

I created and distributed my own best practices list.

I did not receive best practices from anyone else.

It would have been better to receive this first!

I think best practices are only going to work for experienced users, or within the context of an example tutorial designed specifically for training.

Role Integration	
I understand my role and what I am responsible for delivering to the project team.	5
I have the tools and support necessary to do my job.	3.7
I understand the rolls of my other team members (i.e., designer, writer, creative, systems, project management) and where hand-offs need to occur.	3
I am comfortable stepping outside of my role to learn new skills or to help meet delivery deadlines.	4.7
	4.1

Comments:

It feels like the bugs are still being worked out. Also, internal interaction will probably be much different (for project managers and programmers) than working with external writers. And each project will vary slightly, of course.

Analysis of Survey Data

Overall, the responses indicate general support for the program, with an average overall score of 3.62 out of 5. Survey respondents felt most comfortable with the mentoring/coaching model for training in which they can consult with an 'expert' when they get stuck. Two areas found to be lacking are: 1.) A central repository or method for sharing best practices between content authors and projects, and 2.) Access to a library of other courses created in Lectora, to 'borrow' from. In general, having access to job aids and relevant examples provides reinforcement to the learning.

Survey respondents appear comfortable in knowing their role and what is expected of them. They are less clear on the roles and responsibilities of other team members, particularly the functional groups (e.g., creative and systems). A key takeaway is that all respondents appear willing to step outside of their boundary, and would like to learn more about the overall instructional design process.

The small group training sessions appear to fall short of expectations. This is consistent with the preference towards having a coach for one-on-one training interventions and concrete examples. Respondents did not view producing the prototype as a valuable learning experience for synthesizing the key concepts covered in training. This appears to be due to a combination of compressed project timelines and understanding of roles.

As noted earlier, an additional perceived area of weakness in the process and associated training is in identification and sharing of best practices. Part of the reason for this is that the concepts and tools are new to the majority of the survey respondents. However, improvement is clearly needed in documenting best practices, tips, and tools perhaps in a web site or with job aids.

Benchmark Data (What did we learn?)

Organizational Readiness

Provide a history of the change

- Inform end users fully, avoiding surprises
- Make a reasonable case for the change in end users' terms
- Spend more time talking
- Involve end users in diagnosing vulnerabilities
- Start implementation with receptive workers
- Start implementation with a small part of the change for quick, visible payoff
- Publicize success

Provide clarity of expectations

- Emphasize the benefits of the change to the organization, the unit, and end users
- Avoid surprises; specify possible impact, outcomes, and problems
- Make plans for change public
- Solicit both formal and informal feedback

Define the origin of the problem

- Specify who wants the change and why
- Clarify end users' concerns about the change
- Specify the effects of the change on day-to-day operations and work routines
- Presents potential problems clearly and completely
- Sets goals that conform end user problems first
- Use feedback as a barometer of how fast to proceed with the implementation plan

Support from top management

- Define top managing concerns
- Develop an influence network of top management allies, and informal coalitions
- Implement a small part of the change for quick results and good publicity
- Develop a formal management review from top management's perspective

Demonstrate compatibility of the change

- Frame the change in terms of present organizational values and goals
- Integrate the change into ongoing procedures when possible
- Make change plans overt common knowledge
- Start the change in an accepting environment
- Don't oversell the change

Change Team Roles

Inventor

- Make a wide search for change suggestions
- Review common organizational and social sources of the innovation
- Talk about potential future problems

- Discuss what-if implications of new technologies, market changes, etc.
- Use a team to review products and services periodically

Entrepreneur

- Work on tolerating partial answers, interim solutions, and mistakes
- Practice framing ideas so that they sell
- Develop change resources and influence networks
- Develop planning and goal-setting skills

Integrator

- Develop interpersonal skills
- Develop informal alliances and coalitions, as well as a formal team
- Protect the change project from the usual organizational pressures
- Confront conflicts and clarify distortions
- Inform and update key personnel

Expert

- Acquire knowledge and skills, or be responsible for finding experts
- Develop skill of working with outside consultants
- Develop presentation skills
- Update team members and end users
- Monitor change plans

Manager

- Develop coaching skills
- Set goals
- Specify, review, and revise change plans
- Delegate responsibility
- Take responsibility for outcomes
- Keep morale high with frequent face-to-face feedback

Sponsor

- Seek support and resources from the highest levels of the organization
- Interpret the purpose of the change to top management
- Communicate where the change fits into the overall organizational vision

Implementation process

Clarify plans

- Make one person responsible
- Formulate clear, simple, timed goals
- Make specific plans with milestones and outcomes
- Make plans public
- Give and solicit face-to-face feedback

Integrate new practices

- Limit the amount of change introduced at one time
- Introduce the change to receptive users first
- Ensure the rationale and procedures for the change are well known

Provide education

- Involve end users and incorporate their experience
- Provide hands-on training whenever possible
- Design training from the end user perspective
- Train motivated or key end users first
- Evaluate the effect of training on work practices and user attitudes

Foster ownership

- Ensure the change improves the end users' ability to accomplish work
- Provide incentives for end users applying the change
- Specify milestones for getting user feedback
- Incorporate end user suggestions in the implementation plan
- Publicize end user suggestions

Give feedback

- Document and communicate the expected outcomes of the change
- Ensure frequent face-to-face feedback
- Identify clear milestones
- Make sure feedback includes the entire organization
- Acknowledge key successes

Post-assessment

Findings and Conclusions

The **causes** leading to the apparent lack of results, are tied to the maturity of the organization and culture. ABC is capable of producing effective web-based training, but often using a trial and error process. Investments in training and tools were expected to drive the changes necessary to gain efficiencies in the overall processes. Unfortunately, this did not happen. A summary of these causes are:

- A lack of prerequisite knowledge and skill in producing eLearning content, consistent across the organization

- Lack of individual accountability for the complete course—individuals felt a responsibility only for their piece

- Lack of emphasis on change management to create a culture of empowerment and willingness to take risks

- Lack of performance measurement and evaluative criteria

As determined in the current state discussion, ABC has not achieved their efficiency targets. Also, the process appears to be inflexible to changes in technology (e.g., moving from Lectora to Flash) due to lack of skills among the stakeholders. This requires greater involvement by specialists which increases overall program delivery costs.

There are key individuals within the organization that wear multiple hats in terms of skills and abilities. These individuals need to be tapped as mentors to assist in institutionalizing best practices.

Recommendations

Solutions need to focus on culture change and organizational development. The experience of ABC suggests that simply bringing in new technology will not increase efficiency. Indeed, introduction of new technology without a change strategy will likely decrease efficiency as the organization seeks a new equilibrium.

The specific interventions recommended for ABC have been summarized in the Benchmark Data. Some involve process change while others require culture change.

The change process recommended is summarized in four steps:

1. Assess Organizational Readiness

2. Define/Change Team Roles

3. Clarify the Implementation Process

4. Make it Personal

A performance analysis is needed to provide an organizational scan to determine the gap between the current and desired state.

Team roles must be examined to ensure that the necessary changes are able to take place.

The organization can not move forward unless the implementation plan has buy-in from all stakeholders.

Finally, all employees must be invested in the process by being willing to step outside of their comfort zone to acquire new skills and take on added responsibilities.

Appendix A

Interview Questions

1. Are the topics consistent with the behaviors we are attempting to create and reinforce? Where are there inconsistencies?

2. Is the amount of time allocated, and level of detail in the instructional materials appropriate for the intended audience (i.e., Instructional Designers and Writers)? Please explain.

3. Is the order of presentation for the topics logical and understandable? How would you reorder the material?

4. Is the selection of topics appropriate for the objectives set for learners, relative to the overall process for developing web-based training?

5. Are there a sufficient number and type of learning checks provided in order to test the learner's level of knowledge and understanding?

6. Is the type and amount of feedback appropriate to the amount and complexity of material covered?

7. What other information, besides what was covered, should be included in the content?

8. Was the amount of detail covered appropriate for all of the roles represented by the learners?

9. Was sufficient time allowed to practice the skills covered in a given topic, before moving on to the next topic?

10. Overall, what kinds of things should be done differently to improve the effectiveness of the training provided, and support after the fact?

Appendix B

Survey Form
Training for Rapid Application Development of WBT Using Lectora
Participant Questionnaire

Instructions: For each of the statements listed below, please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement by placing an X in the appropriate box. The numbers go higher, based on your level of agreement as follows:

1	Strongly Disagree	4	Agree
2	Disagree	5	Strongly Agree
3	Neither Disagree or Agree	NA	Not Applicable

Training

Workshop (4-Hour Lectora Training Session)

Statement						
I understood the purpose of the training session prior to attending.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
I had the necessary skills and experience to understand the instruction presented.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
The amount of material covered was appropriate for the time allowed.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
The examples provided covered most of the things I need to do with Lectora.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
The hands-on exercises helped me to become comfortable using the tools in Lectora.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
As a result of the workshop, I felt confident that I could begin working on my own.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Please provide additional comments on things you liked, things you didn't like, and ways to improve the Lectora training workshop.

Mentoring (Expert Assistance Using Lectora)

The mentoring model for getting coaching and assistance was explained to me.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
When I called my mentor/coach, I was able to get my questions answered promptly.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
I was able to obtain examples of different interactions (e.g., rollover, pop-up) to use in my course.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
I am comfortable learning new skills (i.e., Lectora) as long as I have someone I can go to for help.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Getting answers to my questions by calling a mentor is quicker than trying to figure it out on my own.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
At the end of development of my course, I will feel comfortable enough with Lectora to mentor other users.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Please provide additional comments on things you liked, things you didn't like, and ways to improve the Lectora mentoring model for user support.

Prototype (Sample Module Built in Lectora)

I understood the requirement to build a prototype and what was expected in the prototype delivery.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Working with the other team members (i.e., creative and programming) helped to increase my comfort and skill level with Lectora.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Building the prototype helped me to better understand the workflow in rapid application development of Web-based training.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Building the prototype gave me a greater sense of ownership in the course development process.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Please provide additional comments on things you liked, things you didn't like, and ways to improve learning using Lectora in the prototype phase of the project.

Best Practices

Working with my mentor and/or Trivantis support, I was informed of best practices to include in the course I was working on.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
I learn better by observing and finding out how others may have solved a particular problem.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
There are tips and hints that I've discovered that would be beneficial to others working in Lectora.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
I am willing to capture and share best practices based upon my experience to help benefit others.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
I have made inquiries on my own to ask other people what has worked best for them.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Please provide additional comments on things you liked, things you didn't like, and ways to improve the process of sharing best practices using Lectora.

Role Integration

I understand my role and what I am responsible for delivering to the project team.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
I have the tools and support necessary to do my job.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
I understand the rolls of my other team members (i.e., designer, writer, creative, systems, project management) and where hand-offs need to occur.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
I am comfortable stepping outside of my role to learn new skills or to help meet delivery deadlines.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Please provide additional comments on things you liked, things you didn't like, and ways to improve the communication and integration of different roles within the development team.

Thank you for your participation and cooperation by completing this questionnaire!

Appendix C

Benchmark Questions used

1. It is our understanding that your organization has made large changes in the way you approach development of web based / online training. Would you describe some of the reasons your company undertook this change effort?

2. How was the need for this change identified?

    a. Did the organization as a whole recognize the need or just one part?

    b. If it was a grassroots effort what type of things did you need to do to get the organization and/or management to recognize the need?

    c. How did you prepare the rest of the organization for the change?

    d. If you had to do this again, what would you do differently?

3. What type of support from management did you receive initially?

    a. Was this the support you needed to be successful?

    b. If not, how did you go about getting the support you needed?

    c. If you had to do this again, what would you do differently?

4. Was this an individual or a team effort?

    a. What types of individuals or leaders are necessary for success?

    b. What roles or functions did they perform?

5. Once the decisions were made to go forward with the change and you started with the implementation what things worked for you and what did not?

6. Was there one thing that stood out that made this a success?

7. Was there one thing that stood out that got in the way of being successful?

8. How would you rank communication or lack thereof on a list of importance to success?

9. If you had to do this again, what would you do differently?