



Insuring Successful Training at MedIns

MedIns, a medical insurance company, successfully employed the Predictive Learning Analytics™ (PLA) methodology to pinpoint the underlying causes of scrap learning associated with their highly visible and crucial continuous process improvement training program.

BACKGROUND MedIns is a Texas-based medical insurance company, with 350 employees. The training department consists of two full-time L&D professionals who develop and deliver both elearning and classroom-based learning programs.

THE CHALLENGE As healthcare costs skyrocket, medical insurance companies are challenged to increase efficiencies to keep customer premiums as low as possible. In this environment, it's more important than ever to make sure the time and money invested in training yield the desired outcomes.

For MedIns this presented two challenges:

- 1) reduce the number of errors made on paperwork associated with customer medical claims and shorten claims processing time by improving the efficient flow of paperwork between departments, and
- 2) measure, monitor and manage the amount of scrap learning associated with the continuous process improvement training program as a way to maximize training transfer and the value of the learning investment.

THE SOLUTION To address the first challenge, the MedIns L&D team designed and developed a continuous process improvement training program to make employees aware of the high cost of mistakes and to teach them techniques on how to avoid and catch errors before passing along paperwork to another department.

As for the second challenge, the MedIns L&D team used the Predictive Learning Analytics™ (PLA) methodology to pinpoint the underlying causes of scrap learning associated with the continuous process

improvement training so that targeted corrective actions could be taken to mitigate or eliminate the causes. The MedIns L&D team chose the PLA methodology because of its reliance on predictive analytics and data, not personal opinion, to pinpoint the causes of scrap learning.

PLA IN ACTION Seventy-four employees participated in an instructor led, 1.5 hour continuous process improvement training program.

Participant Survey

Immediately following the program, participants completed a questionnaire measuring the presence of twelve research-based factors known to contribute to training transfer. Data collected from the survey was used to calculate the following three sets of scores:

- **Learner Application Index™ (LAI) Scores**
LAI scores predict which participants are “Most Likely” to apply, “At Risk” of not applying and “Least Likely” to apply what they learned in the continuous process improvement training program back on the job.
- **Manager Training Support Index™ (MTSI) Scores**
MTSI scores predict which managers of the learners are likely to do a “good” or a “poor” job of supporting the continuous process improvement training.
- **Training Transfer Component Index™ (TTCI) scores.**
TTCI scores assess the contribution to training transfer made by three research-based training transfer components. The three components, Learning Program Design, Learner Attributes, and Learner Work Environment, also have a multiplicative relationship so that if any one of them is deficient, training transfer will suffer.

Focus Groups

Thirty-days post-program, additional data was collected from a random sample of 23 program participants, thru a series of focus groups, to calculate the amount of scrap learning associated with the continuous process improvement program and to identify obstacles to training transfer.

During the focus group sessions, participants answered two questions regarding their use of the material taught in the program:

- 1) “What percent of the material taught in the continuous process improvement training program are you applying back on the job?” and
- 2) “How confident are you that this is an accurate estimate where 0 = no confidence and 100 = complete confidence?”

A third question also was posed to those participants who reported that they were applying less than 100% of what they learned in the program back on the job to identify the obstacles that prevented them from using what they learned.

- 3) “Earlier you indicated that you that you weren’t applying 100% of the continuous process improvement program material back on the job. What obstacles prevented you from applying everything you learned?”

WHAT MedIns LEARNED FROM PLA

LAI: The LAI score data provided the MedIns L&D staff with predictions regarding which of the continuous process improvement program participants were “most likely,” “at risk” and “least likely” to apply what they learned back on the job. With this information, the L&D staff could target those participants in the “at risk” and “least likely” to apply categories for a series of reinforcement activities to help move them into the “most likely” to apply category.

MTSI: The MTSI score data predicted that only one manager was likely to do a good job of supporting the training, three managers might do a good job, and the remaining eight managers were inclined to do a poor job. With this information, the L&D staff could target those managers likely to do a poor job for help in

improving their approach to supporting the continuous process improvement training.

TTCI: The TTCI data indicated that the Learner Attributes and Learning Program Design components scored significantly higher than the Learner Work Environment component. These results show that these two components, along with their associated training transfer factors, are contributing more significantly to training transfer than the Learner Work Environment component and its training transfer factors. With this information, the MedIns L&D staff knew which of the twelve training transfer factors were contributing to transfer and which were not.

Scrap Learning Baseline Percentage Score

Results obtained from the first two focus group questions were used to calculate Best Case, Most Likely Case and Worst Case scrap learning scores. The results for MedIns indicated that there likely was between 57% and 74% scrap learning associated with the continuous process improvement training, which represents a significant waste of time and money.

Obstacles to Training Transfer

The barriers to training transfer identified with the third focus group question were organized according to common themes and patterns, and eight different types of training barriers emerged. For MedIns the data clearly showed that management issues and policies and procedures (which are established by management) are the top two obstacles preventing participants from applying what they learned in the continuous process improvement program back on the job

WHAT’S NEXT?

With these five key measures, MedIns had the information needed to pinpoint the underlying causes of scrap learning associated with the continuous process improvement program and were now positioned to take targeted corrective actions to address each cause.

To learn what actions MedIns took to address each underlying cause, contact Ken Phillips and request the full MedIns case study.

For more information about Predictive Learning Analytics™, download the PLA ebook and PLA articles from: www.phillipsassociates.com.

For more information contact Ken at Ken@phillipsassociates.com or (847)231-6068

