SAND2020-4647R

Metaevaluation Final Report: Sandia National Laboratories Recorded Information Management Training Program Evaluation

Black, Lee Ann E.

April 2020

Sandia National Laboratories is a multimission laboratory managed and operated by National Technology and Engineering Solutions of Sandia, LLC, a wholly owned subsidiary of Honeywell International Inc., for the U.S. Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration under contract DE-NA0003525.

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION

For my internship project, I chose to evaluate the training program for the Sandia National Laboratories (SNL) Recorded Information Management (RIM) Program. The purpose of the evaluation was to identify:

- Where the current training meets federal and corporate requirements and if not, what gaps exist
- If the training is accessible in a consistent location
- If the training contains a consistent message about the responsibility of managing documents
- If the training is organized by records management subject areas

1.1. Scope of the Internship

This internship only applied to the training provided by the RIM department to the Sandia members of the workforce (MOWs).

1.2. Objectives of Internship

1. To ensure the records management training meets federal and corporate requirements
2. To develop a consistent location or access point for all records management training materials
3. To ensure all training has a consistent message about the responsibility of managing records through the entire document lifecycle
4. To ensure training is organized by the following subjects:
   - General Records Management
   - Retention and Disposition
   - Inactive Records Storage
   - Creating File Plans and File Naming Conventions
   - Managing Controlled Documents
   - Vital and Essential Records Protection Awareness
   - Review and Approval prior to the release of information

1.3. Products of Internship

- An Evaluation Plan documenting the data collection methods, plan, and budget for evaluating the RIM Training Program
- A Final Evaluation Report, which will provide analysis of current training materials

2. METAEVALUATION

2.1. Purpose

The purpose of the metaevaluation was to understand the effectiveness of my evaluation by reviewing how I planned, implemented, and communicated the evaluation. The review focused on the following areas of my evaluation to ensure stakeholder satisfaction and validation of data:

- Evaluation Rationale
- Evaluation Purpose
- Key Questions
- Implementation of Evaluation
- Data Collection
- Data Analysis
- Evaluation Communication

Reviewing these areas of the evaluation will allow me to understand what aspects of the evaluation went well and what aspects may need improvement.

2.2. Metaevaluation Design

The metaevaluation had two parts:
<u>Part 1:</u> Focused on the stakeholder satisfaction with the results of the survey. This part will help understand if the results of the evaluation met its purpose.
<u>Part 2:</u> Focused on the design of the evaluation. The evaluation team will review the data collection methods and analysis to determine how the design choices impacted the evaluation results.

3. PART ONE: PRIMARY STAKEHOLDER SURVEY

The primary stakeholders were surveyed to determine the effectiveness and stakeholder satisfaction of the results of the evaluation. The original delivery method for the survey was a SharePoint Survey. However, due to unforeseen constraints with the SharePoint design, I chose to create a MS Word document. The stakeholders responded to the questions in the Word document, saved the file, and emailed the complete survey back to me. The stakeholder responses to these questions provided evidence of effectiveness and possible areas of improvement for future evaluations.

3.1. Evaluation Rationale

Stakeholders reviewed the rationale of the RIM Training Program Evaluation and respond to the follow-up questions.

Rationale of RIM Training Program Evaluation:

The Sandia National Laboratories Recorded Information Management (RIM) department is required by the Department of Energy to train Sandia National Laboratories employees on requirements and methodologies associated with managing records. Recent changes in program management and corporate policies sparked interest in evaluating the RIM training program to ensure the department continues to meet requirements for training. Additionally, there is interest in understanding the extent in which the RIM program supports the workforce by providing accurate training and guidance.

Questions and Stakeholder Responses Summaries:

1. **Is any information missing from the rationale? Such as background information or history of the training program?**
   All stakeholders felt the rationale contained all the pertinent information.

2. **If there is information missing, would it have influenced the direction of the evaluation?**
   None. Stakeholders felt the rationale had sufficient information.

3.2. Evaluation Purpose

Objective: Primary stakeholders will review the purpose of the evaluation and respond to the follow-up questions:

Purpose: To ensure the evaluation provided the information it was intended to.

Purpose of RIM Training Evaluation:

The purpose of this internship is to conduct an evaluation on the training program for Sandia National Laboratories RIM department to determine:

- Where the current training meets federal and corporate requirements and if not, what gaps exist
- If the training is accessible in a consistent location

- If the training contains a consistent message about the responsibility of managing documents
- If the training is organized by records management subject areas

Questions and Stakeholder Response Summaries:

1. **Did the purpose flow naturally from the evaluation's rationale?**
   Overall, stakeholders felt the rationale flowed; however, one stakeholder pointed out that the evaluation did not truly determine the effectiveness of the training.

2. **Is there key information missing from the purpose?**
   None of the stakeholders felt there was information missing from the key purpose.

3.3. Stakeholders

Objective: Primary stakeholders will review the list of overall stakeholders and respond to follow-up questions.

Purpose: To determine if all stakeholders were included in the evaluation as necessary.

Stakeholders for RIM Training Program Evaluation:

Primary Stakeholder	**Justification**
RIM Manager	Management is responsible for ensuring the implementation of regulatory and corporate requirements.
Records Analysts	Responsible for the planning, development, and implementation of training materials.
Secondary Stakeholder	**Justification**
Members of the Workforce (MOWs)	The training materials help MOWs meet requirements. MOWs do plan, develop, nor implement training; however, the quality and accessible of training impacts MOWs ability to meet requirements.
Tertiary Stakeholder	**Justification**
Sandia Directors	Sandia directors do not plan, develop, nor implement training; however, they have a vested interest in ensuring MOWs know and meet requirements.

Department of Energy (DOE)	Funding from DOE is contingent upon Sandia's ability to meet requirements.

Follow-up Questions:

1. **Are the justifications for the list of stakeholders accurate?**
   Some of the stakeholders stated that tertiary stakeholders were missing, such as sub-contractors. Others felt that the Department of Energy should be a primary stakeholder since they drive requirements. However, the exclusion of the sub-contractors did not change the results of the evaluation because sub-contractors typically do no follow the same requirements as direct Sandia employees. As for including DOE as a primary stakeholder, the primary stakeholders were determined by their ability to drive the execution of requirements. DOE sets requirements but does not dictate how those requirements should be met. Therefore, the primary stakeholders are those who make decisions on execution of a training program based on requirements set forth by DOE. Perhaps, the justification verbiage could have made that decision clearer. Despite those two comments, the stakeholders for the evaluation were overall satisfied with the justification of stakeholders.

2. **Were all the relevant stakeholders identified for the evaluation? If not, who are the missing stakeholders?**
   As stated in the previous question, some stakeholders felt sub-contractors should be included in the list of stakeholders. However, sub-contractors are usually held to different standards and requirements to the laboratory.

3.4. Key Questions

Objective: Primary stakeholders will review the key questions and respond to follow-up questions.

Purpose: To determine if the key questions appropriately guided the evaluation

Key Questions for RIM Training Program Evaluation:

- What training on records management is available for Members of the workforce (MOWs)?
- How do current RIM staff train MOWs?
- To what extent do MOWs use the current and available training?
- How do MOWs implement RIM requirements and guidance?

Questions:

1. **To what extent were the key questions clear and comprehensive enough to address the evaluation's purpose?**
   All stakeholders felt the key questions were clear and comprehensive.

2. **To what extent were the key questions responsive to the stakeholder' needs for information?**
   All stakeholders were satisfied with the key questions and felt they provided information needed regarding the training program. One stakeholder did mention that they would have liked to know the current cost of training.

3.5. Communication of the Evaluation

Objective: Primary Stakeholders will review the communication plan

Purpose: To ensure the evaluation team provided transparent and timely communications.

Communication Plan for the RIM Training Program Evaluation:

- Provide weekly updates to the management who commissioned the evaluation
- Provide bi-weekly updates to primary stakeholders
- Provide a final report to the management who commissioned the evaluation and the primary stakeholders
- Provide a summary of the results to the MOWs who completed the survey

To understand Stakeholder satisfaction with the implementation and management of the evaluation, the following questions will be considered:

Questions:

1. **To what extent were stakeholders updated on current status of the evaluation?**
   All stakeholders felt satisfied with the amount of communications regarding the status of the evaluation.

4. PART TWO: EVALUATION TEAM REVIEW

Upon completion of the evaluation, the evaluation team reviewed the design and implementation of the evaluation. The following sections map out the questions the team considered in order to guide the review of the evaluation design and implementation methodologies. The responses to these questions provided lessons learned for future evaluations.

4.1. Design of the Evaluation

Objective: The evaluation team will use follow-up questions to guide the review of the design of the evaluation.

Purpose: To determine if the design method chosen was appropriate for the evaluation.

Design of the RIM Training Program Evaluation:
The evaluation represents a summative evaluation with an emphasis on the outcome of the RIM training program. The evaluator will use a case-study design method to evaluate the RIM training program. The rationale for choosing the case-study design is to focus the evaluation on understanding the current training experience for both RIM staff and learners.
Follow-up Questions:

1. **Why was the case-study design chosen?**
   The case-study design was chosen because, the evaluation wanted to understand the current status of the training program and thus not manipulate any of the outcomes of evaluation. The case-study allowed for an in-depth analysis of quantitative and qualitative information.

2. **What problems were encountered in the design?**
   Overall, the design worked as intended. There were no issues with the design.

3. **What implications did these problems have on the evaluation results?**
   Since there weren't any problems with the design, there were not implications to consider.

4.2. Sampling Methodologies

Objective: The evaluation team will use follow-up questions to guide the review of the sampling methodologies of the evaluation.

Purpose: To determine if the sampling methods chosen represented the population of the MOWs.

Sampling Methodologies of the RIM Training Program Evaluation:
Snowball sampling will be utilized to capture a population of MOWs to participate in the MOW survey.

Snowball sampling will take place in four phases:

Phase 1: Communicate Evaluation and ask for Volunteers/Recommendations

The evaluator will:

- Contact records liaisons to request volunteer participation in survey
- Ask current records liaisons for recommendations for additional survey participants
- Contact managers who regularly work with RIM to seek recommendations or volunteer for survey participation

Phase 2: Collect the contact info of Volunteer/Recommendations
The Evaluator will:

- Keep a running list of all volunteers and recommendations

Phase 3: Lab-wide announcement of survey and request for volunteers
The evaluator will:

- Post a notice in the lab-wide daily news bulletin requesting volunteers for survey participation

Questions:

1. **Why was this particular sampling method chosen?**
This sampling method was chosen because the RIM staff are typically on the front lines when employees ask questions. They will have regular or repeat customers, and therefore can point out specific people who use the RIM training and guidance. The lab-wide bulletin would capture additional employees who may not contact the RIM department regularly, but who do manage records.

2. **What problems, if any were encountered in implementing the chosen sampling method?**
Overall the sampling method worked as intended. When the initial group of records mangers (those pointed out by the RIM staff) were emailed asking for their participation, many of them forwarded the email to other employees in their areas—thus maintaining the snowball methodology. However, despite both the sharing of the survey and the announcement in the lab-wide daily bulletin, there were only 32 participants out of a lab that employs 10,000+ individuals.

3. **What implications did the problems have on the results of the evaluation?**
The low volume of participants can have a couple implications on the evaluation. It could imply that the data collected for the survey is not complete. It could mean that there are many people who are completely unaware of requirements for managing records. However, despite the low turnout, the distribution among the 32 participants represented all major departments and work locations of Sandia Labs.

4.3. Data Collection Method

Objective: The evaluation team will use follow-up questions to guide the review of the data collection methodologies of the evaluation.
Purpose: To determine if the data collection methods chosen accurately captured useful information for the evaluation.
Data Collection Methods of the RIM Training Program Evaluation:

The data collection methods used for the case-study design will be, archival data, interviews with RIM staff and surveys of local records management liaisons (individuals who are not Records Analysts, but who are responsible for managing records in their departments). The case-study will be conducted in three parts:

Part One: Archival Data
Identify and review all RIM training materials available to the workforce. Including, but not limited to PowerPoint presentations, guidebooks, pamphlets, flyers, corporate sponsored training, etc.

Part Two: Interview RIM Staff
Interviews will focus on training materials available and how RIM Staff train MOWs

Part Three: Survey Records Liaisons
Survey liaisons to determine how and if RIM training is part of their records management practices.

Questions:

1. **How successful was each method in obtaining the desired information**?
   Collecting and reviewing the archival data, or all the training materials was probably the most helpful in understanding the current training program. Many of the RIM staff were aware of the "current" training materials, but were unaware of how many different flyers, brochures, and other guidance material were available in a variety of locations.

   The RIM staff interviews revealed the methodologies and reasoning behind maintaining current training materials. For example, many expressed that although it would be nice to update training on a regular cycle, it is not always within their bandwidth to do so.

   Finally, the survey of the liaisons provided much of the quantitative information of the evaluation; which provided evidence for how the current training program is used by lab employees.

2. **What issues or challenges were encountered in implementing certain methods?**
   The evaluation team encountered two challenges in implementing the data collection methods. First, it was difficult to meet with one of the RIM staff members due to conflicting schedules. The evaluation team mitigated this issue by sending the staff member the questions and asking for a response. However, unbeknownst to the evaluation team, this staff member felt brushed off when the team could not meet in person. This resulted in staff member being unwilling to provide input for the metaevaluation.

   The second challenge was encountered during the records liaison survey. The evaluation team drafted the questions but neglected to review the survey questions with the stakeholders. Thankfully, there was only one implication to the evaluation. One stakeholder reviewed the questions after the survey was already in use and informed the evaluation team that one question was missing a service item, "Corporate Forms". The since this was at the start of the survey, it was easy to add the service item; however, this means that the couple of responses prior to that change did not include "Corporate Forms".

4.4. Data Analysis

Objective: The evaluation team will use follow-up questions to guide the review of the data analysis of the evaluation.
Purpose: To determine the extent in which data analysis methods were adequate.

Data Analysis Method of the RIM Training Program Evaluation:
The data collected was a combination of qualitative and quantitative data. The majority of the analysis was for the qualitative data, as the interviews and surveys provided rich, textual data. However, nominal data such as job titles and departments.

A brief description of the Data Analysis Procedures:
Archival Data: The data collected by this method is all the training and guidance material available in various locations (such as websites, hand-outs, brochures). The data was listed, then items with broken links or older than two years was highlighted.
Staff Interview: Staff responses to interview questions where collected in an excel spreadsheet. The responses were analyzed for common themes.
MOW Survey: Responses to the survey were captured via SharePoint survey. All responses are listed in an excel spreadsheet. Nominal data, such as departments and "yes/no" responses were converted to graphics for easy dissemination. All qualitative data was analyzed for common themes.

Questions:

1. **To what extent were the appropriate methods of data analysis used?**
   It appears that the appropriate data analysis was used for each data collection method. For example, when analyzing the archival data, a spreadsheet was created to list all training and guidance items. The items were organized by name, front-facing location, link, owner, and date updated. This helped display this issue that nearly all the training materials have a different point of entry. Additionally, listing the archival data in this method helped the RIM staff understand the variety of materials available.

2. **To what extent did the analyses reflect the key evaluation questions?**
   The data analysis answered the key questions. As a note, the original purpose of the evaluation as to determine the effectiveness of the training. However, upon beginning the evaluation, it was clear that it would not be possible to determine how effective training was if the training was not organized or easily accessible to begin with. Therefore, the evaluation scope, purpose, and plan were changed (with stakeholder buy-in) to determine the current status of training.

5. METAEVALUATION FINDINGS

The metaevaluation uncovered lessons learned for data collection validity. Because the evaluation team neglected to incorporate all stakeholders when determining the questions for the records liaison survey, there was missing information—thus impacting the results of one question. However, despite the misstep, the stakeholders felt the evaluation was clear, well communicated, and answered the key questions of the evaluation.
The stakeholders did note, that there were some tertiary stakeholders that should have been included in the evaluation, such as sub-contractors. However, it was not made clear how that would have impacted the results since sub-contractors are usually held to different requirements and standards.

Overall, both stakeholders and the evaluation team are pleased with the results of the evaluation. The next steps are to develop a training program for the group in which one member of the RIM staff will manage the training materials (organizing, updating, and publishing). Another evaluation will take place within one year of the start of the new RIM program.

REFERENCES

Russ-Eft, D. & Preskill, H. (2009). Evaluation in organizations: a systematic approach to enhancing learning, performance, and change. Boston: Perseus Books.