

## Forum – Measuring What Matters Metrics Workshop

---

### Background

Darel Hall provided an overview of why the TEC has emphasised employer metrics in that last 15 months. This includes linking the employer's productivity opportunity or problem that has its root in lower literacy and numeracy to the EWLN programme. This goes back to the purpose of the EWLN Fund which is equally about improving productivity as well as improving literacy and numeracy.

Anne Alkema's work has noted strong themes in EWLN programme reports:

- > greater engagement with what is happening at work
- > improved spoken and written communication
- > improved understanding of written documentation

The ITF Skills Highway team have produced a resource: Measuring What Matters: How to Pick a Good Metric.

The outcome from the workshop was input to a simplified reporting system for employer metrics that still allows individual brilliance.

Mark Heslop from Alma Consulting which does a lot of work on metrics was invited to contribute to the workshop.

### Discussion

The consensus is that the drop down XL report sheet **and** the qualitative narrative report are valuable. The reports allow the individual circumstances of employers to be reported.

There was a discussion about the importance of outcomes for individual employees. These can be captured in Individual Learning Plans which can be reported on. Some of those goals include getting further training or a different/ higher work role.

Mark Heslop suggested that metrics could be looked at in four areas: people, process, customer, finance. He also suggested the use of SMART metrics.

One of the features of EWLN is that the programme is applied to a sub unit of an employer, or part of a production process, or even individuals within an employer rather than an identifiable group for work organisation purposes. This poses challenges for determining the unit of analysis for metrics.

Employers will have general and specific goals of a programme, some of which could emerge from employees, and the goals can change in priority during a programme. For example during the course of a programme an employer can better understand what they want, or change priorities eg from a hard metric like waste reduction to a subjective assessment of employee engagement or happiness (which may be a convenient proxy for hard measures).

We also need to keep in mind the different incentives facing the CEO / Senior Management Team to the leader of the HR function compared to the leaders of production.

There can be positive and negative goals. There can be input, output and outcome goals.

We should prefer existing company and individual information.

There was a view that metrics can be developed from higher level attitudes and behaviours.

There is no intention to use these metrics as a funding condition. That will drive out innovation to be replaced by compliance. Failure to achieve 100% success in the metrics may deliver great lessons for the employer and the employees.

This is not a science experiment (attributing causation ranges from challenging to heroic), but some rigour is desirable.