

APPENDIX G: ASSESSMENT OF WBI'S ACTIVITY INITIATION SUMMARY FORMS

This analysis evaluated the content of the World Bank Institute's (WBI) Activity Initiation Summary (AIS) forms.¹ A random sample of AIS forms was reviewed to examine the level of detail and specificity of information on training design, content, and objectives in mandatory WBI course-planning documentation.

Data and methodology: From the master list of all 168 fiscal 2006 WBI training activities—in the evaluation's 10 desk-review countries that are also WBI focus countries²—a random sample of 61 in-country training activities was generated.³ The following information was taken from the AIS forms:

- **Diagnosis**—organizational and/or institutional capacity gaps to be addressed through training, and the reasons why training was determined to be the appropriate response for filling the gaps;
- **Training-needs assessment**—training needs of the target population;
- **Participant selection**—desired participant profiles;
- **Client participation**—information on client consultation in design of training;
- **Target numbers**—number of individuals to be trained;
- **Learning outputs**—knowledge and skills to be taught;
- **Workplace performance outcomes**—behavioral or performance changes that can be expected as a result of the training;
- **Development impact**—the larger development objective that the training will contribute to (where applicable); and
- **Monitoring and evaluation**—performance indicators for measuring the achievement results of the course (where applicable).

AISs were rated as having information in any the above categories even when there was only a vague reference. The scores were then collectively tabulated. Table G.1 provides a quantitative breakdown of the various aspects of the results chain of a training program.

Main Messages

There is poor quality control of AISs and lack of a clear results chain. Of the 61 AISs that were reviewed, only two (3 percent of the sample) showed a clear results chain leading from inputs to expected outcomes, outputs, and impacts. Most course details in AISs lacked adequate information about how objectives would be achieved and how to measure the impacts. Only three courses provided monitoring and evaluation indicators to measure results.

The objectives of courses are not realistically defined. The course objectives are very broadly defined and present goals that are beyond the scope of what the course can realistically achieve.

Table G.1: AIS Counts and Percentages, by category

	AIS number (N=61)	Percentage of AIS
Diagnosis	30	49
Training-needs assessment	10	16
Participant selection	2	3
Client participation	56	61
Target numbers	8	13
Learning	47	77
Performance	9	15
Impact	22	36
Monitoring and evaluation	3	5

The diagnostic exercises before the start of courses are insufficient. Although 49 percent of the courses made some reference to capacity gaps, none of them explained why training was the appropriate means to address the capacity gaps or how training

could contribute to the expected outcome. Less than 20 percent indicated that a training-needs assessment was planned or implemented to ensure that the training delivered was the most relevant to the given situation or context.