

Introduction

Many businesses routinely conduct training for their staff and evaluate that training. A widely-accepted framework for training evaluation, Kirkpatrick's four-level model of training evaluation, can be aligned to support the business's AML/CTF objectives and through the evaluation of the training, provide a framework for monitoring and improving the training component of an AML/CTF program.

Background

Kirkpatrick's four-level model of training evaluation is widely used in vocational and corporate training. The four levels of Kirkpatrick's evaluation model measure:

- **Level 1: reaction of student** - what students thought and felt about the training (*reaction to training*)
- **Level 2: learning** - the resulting increase in students' knowledge or capability (*achievement of learning*)
- **Level 3: behaviour** - extent of behaviour and capability improvement and implementation/application (*application of learning*)
- **Level 4: results** - effects on the business or environment resulting from the trainee's performance (*organisational effectiveness*).

Evaluation of AML/CTF training can be expected to generate material for monitoring the AML/CTF program and provide records for the independent evaluation of the AML/CTF program.

The table on the next page describes the four levels of training evaluation and lists some examples of instruments and measures that can be used in a training evaluation framework.

The table also shows a top-down relationship between business planning and training and a bottom-up relationship between the training and its evaluation at the different levels. Using this relationship can link the AML/CTF program's planning, training and monitoring activities and contribute to continuous improvement of the program.

The worksheet on page 3 can help you plan to use this training evaluation framework in the implementation and monitoring of your AML/CTF program.

References

Since its creation in 1959, Donald Kirkpatrick's four-level model for evaluating training programs has become the most widely-used approach to training evaluation in the corporate, government and academic worlds. Kirkpatrick, D., *Evaluating Training Programs: the four levels*, 2nd edition, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco, 1998.

Using training evaluation for AML/CTF program monitoring



Organisational planning: top down process	Level of training evaluation (using Kirkpatrick's model).	Training evaluation: bottom up process.	Sample evaluation instruments.	Potential measures used in the instruments.
<p>SAQ analysis defines priorities for a specific entity to achieve compliance. Sets corporate AML/CTF standards.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p>	<p>Level 4 – Organisational effectiveness</p> <p>Organisational survey of AML/CTF: scope of implementation and effectiveness. Mapped against the Self Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ) or similar instrument.</p>	<p>Measure of corporate AML/CTF standards being met, especially to meet priorities identified in the SAQ analysis.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↑</p>	<p>Staff opinion surveys to assessing the AML/CTF culture in the organisation.</p> <p>Gap analysis to compare AML/CTF performance against corporate standards.</p>	<p>Staff perceptions of importance of AML/CTF processes, their capabilities, and or management support of AML/CTF.</p> <p>Statistical measures against standards, e.g. percentage of correct customer ID procedures.</p>
<p>AML/CTF standards define operational development goals in order to meet operational AML/CTF obligations.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p>	<p>Level 3 – Application of learning</p> <p>Post-learning survey to determine the how learners are applying their AML/CTF training in their work in order to meet operational AML/CTF obligations.</p>	<p>Measure of achievement of operational development goals and operational AML/CTF obligations being met.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↑</p>	<p>Post-training surveys (e.g. 3 months after training).</p> <p>Applied AML/CTF process statistics.</p> <p>AML/CTF critical incident reports.</p>	<p>Staff expressions of levels of importance, confidence and frequency of actually using training.</p> <p>Statistical measures of operational performance – including critical incidents of AML/CTF process failures.</p>
<p>Development goals define learning objectives for AML/CTF awareness or training sessions.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p>	<p>Level 2 – Achievement of learning</p> <p>Skill and knowledge checks at the conclusion of an AML/CTF awareness or training session.</p>	<p>Measure of learning objectives having been met.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↑</p>	<p>Reports from learning management systems – summary of student results and numbers trained</p> <p>Skill and knowledge checks at the end of the training session; achievement of learning objectives</p>	<p>Number of learners attempting learning evaluations.</p> <p>Numbers achieving pass marks.</p> <p>Assess Stages of Concern re levels of confidence and expectation to use training.</p>
<p>Learning objectives define individual learner's expectations of the training.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p>	<p>Level 1 – Reaction to training</p> <p>Reaction sheets to determine the learner's perception of the quality of the learning experience.</p>	<p>Measure of learner's expectations of training being met.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↑</p>	<p>Satisfaction surveys at the end of the training session.</p> <p>Paper-based surveys at the end of a presentation or workshop and online surveys for e-learning; administered by learning management system.</p>	<p>Numbers completing.</p> <p>Overall learner's rating for the training.</p> <p>Overall learner's recommendation score for the training.</p>

Worksheet

Describe where you will obtain your performance objectives at each level that will eventually define your AML/CTF training.	Level of training evaluation (<i>using Kirkpatrick's model</i>).	Training evaluation: bottom-up process.	Describe how you will evaluate the training at this level, type of instruments or methods.	Describe the measures you will use in your evaluation instruments or methods.
Corporate AML/CTF standards and strategic objectives.	Level 4 – Organisational effectiveness Organisational survey of AML/CTF: scope of implementation and effectiveness. Mapped against the Self Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ) or similar instrument.	Measure of corporate AML/CTF standards being met, especially to meet priorities identified in the SAQ analysis.		
AML/CTF operational objectives (for relevant units).	Level 3 – Application of learning Post-learning survey to determine how learners are applying their AML/CTF training in their work to meet operational AML/CTF obligations.	Measure of achievement of operational development goals and operational AML/CTF obligations being met.		
Course objectives for AML/CTF training.	Level 2 – Achievement of learning Skill and knowledge checks at the conclusion of an AML/CTF awareness or training session.	Measure of learning objectives having been met.		
Statements of purpose and relevance for AML/CTF training.	Level 1 – Reaction to training Reaction sheets to determine the learners' perception of the quality of the learning experience.	Measure of learners' expectations of training being met.		