



EVALUATION STUDY OF A TRAINING PROGRAMME

A CASE STUDY OF THE STUDENTS OF DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES, BHIMTAL

Sumit Prasad

Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies
Uttarakhand Open University, Haldwani
Uttarakhand, India

Anupa Chaudhary

Assistant Professor, Management Studies
Seemant Institute of Technology, Pithoragarh
Uttarakhand, India

Abstract— Depending upon the training needs which were identified by the team of Head of Department and Faculty Members, for students, of Department of Management Studies (DMS) Bhimtal, one evaluation study of a specific training programme on Confidence, Communication, Presentation, Language and Body Language is done. The evaluation includes pre and post training competency evaluation, post training reaction evaluation and intermediate outcome evaluation. The evaluation process will take about two weeks.

Keywords- training; development; training and development; evaluation; training evaluation; confidence; communication; presentation; language; body language

I. INTRODUCTION

The process of evaluation of a specific in-house training programme on Confidence, Communication, Presentation, Language and Body Language, which is conducted for the students of Department of Management Studies, starts with a pre-training evaluation of the identified trainees. The training programme is conducted on the topic based on Soft-Skills which are required by the students in their daily professional communication which is related to the knowledge and awareness of Confidence, Communication, Presentation, Language and Body Language and their role in Professional Communication.

The students identified for the training programme are MBA 2nd semester students from MBA 2 Year Programme, 4th and 2nd semester students from MBA 5 Year Integrated Programme, the detail of which is mentioned in coming pages.

The process of pre-training evaluation starts with the identification and formation of a responsible team who will be responsible for the conducting and evaluating the training programme. The team comprises of our Head of Department, Faculty members and Staff members who are in direct contact with the students. On the basis of interviews conducted for the students and their class performance the team had performed a pre-training evaluation for them. The process of pre-training evaluation has taken a week to get compiled scores of the students on a 5 point scale, detailed in coming pages.

The process of training programme evaluation comprises of Pre and Post Training Learning or Competency Evaluation and

a Post Training Reaction Evaluation and ultimately Intermediate Outcome Evaluation.

The process used for Pre and Post Training Learning or Competency Evaluation is Interviews and Class Performance. Whereas, the Post Training Reaction Evaluation and Intermediate Outcome Evaluation is done using Training Evaluation Sheet (Annexure. I). For obtaining a feedback of the entire training programme a Trainer Evaluation Sheet (Annexure. II) is also filled by the students (trainees), which will serve as a benchmark for inculcating further improvement in our upcoming training sessions for better and improved learning.

II. EXPLAINING EVALUATION PROCESS

The process of Evaluation of training programme is as:

A. Step 1

A Pre-Training Evaluation, using interview and class performance of the students, is conducted for all the students by the appointed team for measuring their present competencies under the categories of identified attributes which are Confidence, Communication, Presentation, Language and Body Language.

B. Step 2

On the scheduled day of training and during the entire training programme, the behaviour and performance all the trainees had been monitored by the team and on the completion of training programme, conducting an Interview a Post-Training Competency Evaluation is performed.

C. Step 3

On the completion of the training programme and during the feedback session, different feedback forms are filled by the trainees for serving various purposes as:

- i. Training Evaluation Form: The training evaluation form is divided into two sections which are Post Training Reaction Evaluation and Intermediate Training Outcome Evaluation. The post training evaluation sheet is filled by the trainees themselves

indicating their experience and their self-evaluation of the training effectiveness.

- ii. Trainer Feedback Form: The overall response of trainees toward the training programme is measured using a Trainers Feedback Form. The trainer feedback sheet includes information about trainer, training programme, tools and techniques used.

D. Step 4

After completion of two weeks the Training Evaluation Sheet is forwarded to the appointed team headed by Head of Department for intermediate training outcome evaluation. The intermediate training outcome is measured based upon their class room and other personality based performances.

III. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

A. Pre and Post Training Competency Evaluation Sheet (MBA 2 year Programme)

Analysis and Interpretation of the Competency Evaluation Sheet:

- On the complete study of Pre and Post Training Evaluation sheet it can be observed that the Average Skill Up-gradation, on a 5 point scale, for the students of 2nd semester of MBA 2 Year Programme has reported an up gradation of Average Confidence as 0.9591, Average Communication as 0.98, Average Presentation as 0.96, Average Language as 0.9795 and Average Body Language as 0.9592 respectively.
- It can also be observed that some of the students are unable to have any improvement in their skill set in some of the key results areas identified such as Mr. Pawan Punetha has shown no improvement in any of the KRA's and Ms. Shraddha Bhatt has shown no improvement in Confidence, Presentation and Body Language, which means that they are required to retrain on the following KRA's.
- The results obtained above are required to cross checked with the intermediate training outcome evaluation and reaction evaluation.

B. Reaction and Intermediate Training Outcome Evaluation (MBA 2 year Programme)

Analysis and Interpretation of the Reaction and Intermediate Training outcome Evaluation Sheet:

- On continuation of the post training evaluation result of Mr. Pawan Punetha and Ms. Shraddha Bhatt, it is observed in their reaction evaluation and intermediate training outcome evaluation that there is a higher level target setting of self or reaction evaluation of Mr. Pawan Punetha for himself i.e. 2. However during his intermediate training outcome evaluation he is not able to meet these standards and that's why his evaluation is only 1, and he requires a retraining. Where else for Mr. Shraddha Bhatt her self

evaluation meets her intermediate training outcome evaluation, which can be interpreted as for the beginner level of training which she has presently under gone is already her strength and she require training on higher level of modules.

- Rest other students has attained an intermediate performance level which they have self assessed for themselves during reaction evaluation phase.
- Based upon the above information of Post Training Evaluation and Intermediate Training Outcome Evaluation next training session can be planned accordingly.

C. Pre and Post Training Competency Evaluation Sheet (MBA 5 year Integrated Programme, 4th Semester)

Analysis and Interpretation of the Competency Evaluation Sheet:

- On the complete study of Pre and Post Training Evaluation sheet it can be observed that Average skill Up gradation, on a 5 point scale, for the students of 4th semester of MBA 5 Year Integrated Programme has reported an up gradation of Average Confidence as 1.231, Average Communication as 1.2051, Average Presentation as 1.2564, Average Language as 1.0769 and Average Body Language as 1.2435 respectively.
- The above results are an indicator to the successful accomplishment of training objective and a benchmark for upcoming training programmes. The results found above are well indicator that average skill up gradation in any key responsibility area is more than 1. It is also an indicator that on successful accomplishment of basis level of training we can proceed further for an advanced level of training programme.

D. Reaction and Intermediate Training Outcome Evaluation (MBA 5 Year Integrated Programme, 4th Semester)

Analysis and Interpretation of the Reaction and Intermediate Training outcome Evaluation Sheet:

- All the students have attained an intermediate performance level which they have self assessed for themselves during reaction evaluation phase which means that their reaction evaluation is equivalent to their intermediate training outcome evaluation.
- Based upon the above information of Post Training Evaluation and Intermediate Training Outcome Evaluation next training session can be planned accordingly with advanced training modules.

E. Pre and Post Training Competency Evaluation Sheet (MBA 5 Year Integrated Programme, 2nd Semester)

Analysis and Interpretation of the Competency Evaluation Sheet:

- On the complete study of Pre and Post Training Evaluation sheet it can be observed that Average skill Up gradation,

on a 5 point scale, for the students of 2nd semester of MBA 5 Year Integrated Programme has reported an up gradation of Average Confidence as 1.4464, Average Communication as 1.4821, Average Presentation as 1.5, Average Language as 1.589 and Average Body Language as 1.446 respectively.

- The above results are an indicator to the successful accomplishment of training objective and a benchmark for upcoming training programmes. The results found also represents that average skill up gradation in any key responsibility area is more than 1.4 which is a qualitative improvement. It is also an indicator that on successful accomplishment of basis level of training we can proceed further for an advanced level of training programme.
- However, while observing Post Training Evaluation Sheet we can see that the performance of Mr. Kartik Bhatt does not show any improvement in any Key Result Area (KRA). So, for deducing any conclusion we have to be dependent on Reaction Evaluation and Intermediate Training Outcome Evaluation of the students.

F. Reaction and Intermediate Training Outcome Evaluation (MBA 5 Year Integrated Programme, 2nd Semester)

Analysis and Interpretation of the Reaction and Intermediate Training outcome Evaluation Sheet:

- On continuation of the post training evaluation result of Mr. Kartik Bhatt, it is observed in his reaction evaluation and intermediate training outcome evaluation that his reaction evaluation and intermediate training out evaluation are quite very low, but still he is able to implement what he had learnt during the training programme. He is low level performer and might be the training objectives which are defined for him are quite difficult for him. So, for an effective learning implant in him, we require to retrain him which will help in improving his reaction evaluation and hence resulting into improved intermediate performance.
- While studying the other results also we have found another case of Mr. Gaurav Goswami, whose Post Training Competency Evaluation Sheet has shown an average improvement of more than 1 point in a 5 point scale but his self reaction evaluation does not matches with his intermediate training outcome evaluation. Which means that, what he had learnt during his training programme he is quite able to grasp it, but he is not able to implement it effectively. Failure of its implementation has resulted into a gap in his intermediate training outcome evaluation.
- Rest other students has attained an intermediate performance level which they have self assessed for themselves during reaction evaluation phase.
- Based upon the above information of Post Training Evaluation and Intermediate Training Outcome Evaluation next training session can be planned accordingly.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ahemad, M., Chaudhary, Anupa, and Karush, D., "A Review of Quality of Work Life Balance for Women Employees: A Casestudy of working women in academics", International Journal of Trends in Economics Management and Technology (IJTEMT), Vol II Issue 1, February 2013, ISSN: 2321-5518.
- [2] Anderson, A.H., (2000): Training in Practices: Successful Implementation of Plans, Infinity Books.
- [3] Baird, J.R. (1988). Quality: What should make higher education "higher"? Higher Education Research and Development.
- [4] Cave, M., and Hanney, S., (1992): Performance Indicator in B.R. Clark & G.R.Neave (Eds.) The encyclopedia of higher education. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- [5] Chaudhary, Anupa, "To Identify the Training and Development Practices followed in Organization: A case study of Birla Cement Work, Rajasthan", International Journal of Trends in Economics Management and Technology (IJTEMT), Vol III Issue I, February 2014, pp 30-34, ISSN: 2321-5518.
- [6] Chaudhary, Anupa, Prasad, Sumit (2010), Human Resource Financial Management, IJTEF, Vol. 1, No. 4, Dec, 2010, 2010-023X, pp. 342-344.
- [7] Chaudhary, Anupa, Prasad, Sumit, Training for Development of Professional Education, IJIMT, Vol. 2, No. 2, April, 2011, ISSN: 2010-0248, pp. 162-165.
- [8] Dey, E.L., Astin, A.W., and Korn, W.S. (1991). The American freshman: Twenty-five year trends, 1966-1990. Los Angles: Higher Education Research Institute, Graduate School of Education, Univeristy of California.
- [9] Gaff, J., (1975): Towards faculty renewal, San Fransico: Jossey Bass.
- [10] Green, Diana, (1991) Ed, What is quality in Higher Education? Society for Research into Higher Education Ltd, London.
- [11] Hasanaj, Rezarta, and Manxhar, Mimoza, "Employee Reaction to Change: A Case of the Directorate of Public Works in Albania", International Journal of Trends in Economics Management and Technology (IJTEMT), Vol V Issue III, June 2016, ISSN: 2321-5518.
- [12] Keane, J.G. (1992). The case for teaching and teacher renewal. In T.J. Frecka (Ed.), Critical thinking, Interactive learning and technology: Reading for excellence in business education, Arther Anderson Foundation.
- [13] Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1976): Evaluation of Training. In R.L. Craig and L.R. Bittel (eds), Training and Development Handbook, New York: ASTD/McGraw-Hill.
- [14] Mishra, P.N., (2002): Sturcturing management education and faculty development. Univeristy News.
- [15] Nandean, G.G., Donald, J.G., & Konrad, A. (1992, April). Criteria and indicators of Quality and excellence in Canadian college and university. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- [16] Parwal, R., Verma, S., Chaudhary, Anupa, and Pandey, Udit, "Corporate Social Responsibilities- Past Indian Scenario in the Year 2012", International Journal of Trends in Economics Management and Technology (IJTEMT), Vol I Issue VI, December 2012, pp 28-33, ISSN: 2321-5518.
- [17] Prasad, Sumit, Analyzing and Identifying Training and Development Needs of Department of Management Studies, Bhimtal, ISTD Report, 2013.
- [18] Prasad, Sumit, and Chaudhary, Anupa (2013), Evaluation of Benchmark Practices of Training and Development of Professional Education Educators in India: A Proposal with respect to Aspirants, International Journal of Trends in Economics Management and Technology (IJTEMT), Vol II Issue 1, February 2013, pp 37-43, ISSN: 2321-5518.
- [19] Prasad, Sumit, and Chaudhary, Anupa, (2011), "Training System for Education Industry-An Outline", International Journal of Trade Economics and Finance, Vol. 2, No. 3, June 2011, pp 200-203, 2010-023X.

- [20] Prasad, Sumit, and Joshi, Atul, "To Study The Influence Of Benchmarking On Training & Development Practices Of Management Education Educators In India, W.R.T., Aspirants", International Journal of Trends in Economics Management and Technology (IJTEMT), Vol IV Issue VI, December 2015, pp 05-17, ISSN: 2321-5518.
- [21] Prasad, Sumit, Chaudhary, Anupa, & Prasad, Subodh, Training System-A Perspective. IJMT, Vol. 2, No. 1, February, 2011, ISSN: 2010-0248, pp.69-72.
- [22] Pulla Rao, D., (2009): Development of Teachers Education in India: An Historical Perspective.
- [23] Punia, B.K., and Kundu, S.C. (2005). Management education in India: Towards quality standard and global competitiveness. New Delhi: Deep & Deep Publication.
- [24] Rajasingh, S., and Rajasekaran, B., (2009): Perceptual Difference Between Industry and Academic Leaders.
- [25] Record Files of Department of Management Studies, Bhimtal.
- [26] Singh, A.K., & Pethe, S., (2003): Subordinate development: The third strand of Leadership. Management and Labour Studies.
- [27] Singh, K.A., (2010): Faculty Development: Issue and Challenges in Management Education.
- [28] Smith, B.O., (1966): Towards a Theory of Teaching Teachers College Press, Columbia University, Columbia.
- [29] Truelove, S., (2000): Training for Development: A Handbook, Infinity Books.

AUTHORS PROFILE

Authors Profile ...



(Annexure. I)

Department of Management Studies, Bhimtal

Training Evaluation Sheet

Name of Trainee:.....

Topic of Training Programme:.....

Course Name:.....Year/Semester:.....

Duration of Training Programme: From.....to.....

Self Assessment (Reaction Evaluation):

Please tick (√) the point which you find most suitable to your training outcome:

(4) I am able understand and explain it, also find out how it will help me to improve my complete performance in my personal life. ()

(3) I am able to understand and also able to explain it & its advantages to my colleagues. ()

(2) I am able to understand but unable to explain it to others. ()

(1) I am able to understand a little bit of the training objective and content. ()

(0) I did not understand anything and it is wastage of time. ()

Any other comment:**Training Intermediate Outcome Evaluation by Head of Department:**EFFECTIVENESS OF TRAINING

RATING	OBSERVATION
4	Understood concept and can very well explains as well as show practicality, and have groomed his personality in totality.
3	Understood concept and can very well explain to others.
2	Understood the concept but is not in a position to explain.
1	Understood the concept.
0	Did not understand at all.

To: Student File and Future Record.

Name	Previous Skill Level	HOD's Present Rating (0, 1, 2, 3, 4)

Signature of HOD

(Annexure. II)

Department of Management Studies, Bhimtal
Trainer Feedback Form

Training Title: _____	Your Name: _____
Trainer Name: _____	Training Duration: From _____ to _____

The Trainer Feedback Form is intended to capture your reactions to the training you have just completed.

1. On a scale of 1-5 how would you rate the following for this training:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The training met my expectations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. I will be able to apply the knowledge learned.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. The training objectives for each topic were identified and followed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. The content was organized and easy to follow.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. The materials distributed were pertinent and useful.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. The trainer was knowledgeable.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. The quality of instruction was good.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. The trainer met the training objectives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Class participation and interaction were encouraged.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Adequate time was provided for questions and discussion.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. Please describe specific issues and/or special circumstances that were raised in this training

3. Did you need to deviate at all from the curriculum? If so, how and why?

4. Please highlight factors that had a positive effect on this training and on accomplishing the learning objectives. This includes the learning environment, group dynamics, Partnership coordination and support, pre-training preparation by supervisors, curriculum issues, and trainer related issues:

Suggestions for enhancing the positive effects?

5. Please highlight factors that had a negative effect on this training and on accomplishing the learning objectives. This includes the learning environment, group dynamics, Partnership coordination and support, pre-training preparation by supervisors, curriculum issues, and trainer related issues:

Suggestions for correcting the negative factors?

6. Were the following adequate?

	Yes	No	If no, why not?
AV Equipment			
Facility			
Handouts			
Other Training Materials			

7. Please answer the following questions related to transfer of learning activities:
- How much time did you devote to Action Planning? If none, why not?
 - What 3 concepts from the training content or key issues that were raised in the training sessions would you choose to highlight as suggestions for supervisors to review with their staff after training?
 - _____
 - _____
 - _____
8. Please comment on the support provided to you by the Partnership and offer suggestions for any ways we can help you in our shared goal of providing a high quality training program.

Thank you for taking the time to provide your feedback.

Table 1: Pre and Post Training Competency Evaluation Sheet (MBA 2 year Programme)

Course: MBA 2 Year Programme									2 nd Semester							
S. No.	Student Name	Confidence-Pre	Confidence-Post	Skill Up gradation	Communication-Pre	Communication-Post	Skill Up gradation	Presentation-Pre	Presentation-Post	Skill Up gradation	Language-Pre	Language-Post	Skill Up gradation	Body Language-Pre	Body Language-Post	Skill Up gradation
1	Mr. Arun Kumar Duhan	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1	2	1	1	2	1
2	Mr. Bhaskar Palariya	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1	2	1	1.5	2.5	1
3	Mr. Dharendra Singh	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1	2	1	1.5	2.5	1
4	Mr. Govind Singh	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1
5	Mr. Hem Chandra Bhatt	1.5	2.5	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1.5	2.5	1
6	Mr. Hemant Suyal	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1
7	Mr. Himanshu Joshi	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
8	Mr. Khushal Singh	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
9	Mr. Maninder Singh	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1

10	Mr. Mitul Binwal	2.5	3.5	1	2.5	3.5	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2.5	3.5	1
11	Mr. Mohd. Wasif Khan	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
12	Mr. Monis Kaleem Ansari	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1
13	Mr. Narendr a Singh Dhami	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1
14	Mr. Neeraj Singh Dewari	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1
15	Mr. Pankaj Bhakuni	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2.5	3.5	1
16	Mr. Pankaj Singh Mehra	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1
17	Mr. Pawan Punetha	3	3	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	3	3	0
18	Mr. Piyush Pandey	2.5	3.5	1	2.5	3.5	1	2.5	3.5	1	2.5	3.5	1	2.5	3.5	1
19	Mr. Ratnesh Kumar	2	3	1	2.5	3.5	1	2	3	1	2.5	3.5	1	2	3	1
20	Mr. Salman Khan	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1

21	Km. Alka Khanayat	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
22	Km. Anchal Tamta	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1
23	Km. Chandra kala	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
24	Km. Bhawna Sirari	1	2	1	1.5	2.5	1	1	2	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
25	Km. Bhawna Bisht	1	2	1	1.5	2.5	1	1	2	1	1.5	2.5	1	1	2	1
26	Km. Deepika Dhaila	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1
27	Km. Deeksha Bhagat	1	2	1	1.5	2.5	1	1	2	1	1.5	2.5	1	1	2	1
28	Km. Garima Negi	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
29	Km. Garima Pandey	1	2	1	1.5	2.5	1	1	2	1	1.5	2.5	1	1	2	1
30	Km. Himani Tewari	2.5	3.5	1	2.5	3.5	1	2.5	3.5	1	2.5	3.5	1	2	3	1
31	Km. Janki	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
32	Km. Jyoti Dayal	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1

33	Km. Jyotsna Arya	2.5	3.5	1	2.5	3.5	1	2.5	3.5	1	2.5	3.5	1	2.5	3.5	1
34	Km. Kamini Deopa	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
35	Km. Kavita Joshi	1.5	2.5	1	2	3	1	1.5	2.5	1	2	3	1	1.5	2.5	1
36	Km. Kiran Harbola	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
37	Km. Manju Kumari	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
38	Km. Meera Mehra	1	2	1	1.5	2.5	1	1	2	1	1.5	2.5	1	1	2	1
39	Km. Pooja Kandpal	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
40	Km. Preeti Pandey	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
41	Km. Priya Rautela	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
42	Km. Priyanka Bisht	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1
43	Km. Rajveer Kaur	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1	2	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
44	Km. Rupali Chaudhary	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1

45	Km. Saloni Pandey	2	3	1	2.5	3.5	1	2.5	3.5	1	2	3	1	2	3	1			
46	Km. Shradha Bhatt	3	3	0	2.5	3.5	1	3	3	0	2.5	3.5	1	3	3	0			
47	Km. Sonali Verma	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1	2	1			
48	Km. Sonu Rautela	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1			
49	Km. Sushma Bisht	1.5	2.5	1	1	2	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1	2	1			
50	Km. Yogita Bhatt	2.5	3.5	1	2.5	3.5	1	2	3	1	2.5	3.5	1	2	3	1			
51	Km. Yashoda Rai	2	3	1	2.5	3.5	1	2	3	1	2.5	3.5	1	2	3	1			
Average Skill Up gradation				0.9591				0.98				0.96				0.979 5			0.959 2

Table 2: Reaction and Intermediate Training Outcome Evaluation (MBA 2 year Programme)

Course: MBA 2 Year Programme		2 nd Semester	
S.No.	Student Name	Reaction Evaluation (on a 0 to 4 Scale)	Intermediate Training Outcome Evaluation (0 to 4)
1	Mr. Arun Kumar Duhan	2	2
2	Mr. Bhaskar Palariya	2	2
3	Mr. Dharendra Singh	3	3
4	Mr. Govind Singh	2	2
5	Mr. Hem Chandra Bhatt	2	2
6	Mr. Hemant Suyal	2	2
7	Mr. Himanshu Joshi	Absent	Absent
8	Mr. Khushal Singh	2	2
9	Mr. Maninder Singh	3	3
10	Mr. Mitul Binwal	2	2
11	Mr. Mohd. Wasif Khan	2	2
12	Mr. Monis Kaleem Ansari	2	2
13	Mr. Narendra Singh Dhami	2	2
14	Mr. Neeraj Singh Dewari	2	2
15	Mr. Pankaj Bhakuni	2	2
16	Mr. Pankaj Singh Mehra	2	2
17	Mr. Pawan Punetha	2	1
18	Mr. Piyush Pandey	3	3
19	Mr. Ratnesh Kumar	3	3
20	Mr. Salman Khan	2	1
21	Km. Alka Khanayat	3	3
22	Km. Anchal Tamta	3	3
23	Km. Chandrakala	2	2
24	Km. Bhawna Sirari	2	2
25	Km. Bhawna Bisht	2	2
26	Km. Deepika Dhaila	3	3
27	Km. Deeksha Bhagat	3	3
28	Km. Garima Negi	3	3
29	Km. Garima Pandey	3	3

30	Km. Himani Tewari	3	3
31	Km. Janki	3	3
32	Km. Jyoti Dayal	3	3
33	Km. Jyotsna Arya	2	2
34	Km. Kamini Deopa	3	3
35	Km. Kavita Joshi	3	3
36	Km. Kiran Harbola	Absent	Absent
37	Km. Manju Kumari	3	2
38	Km. Meera Mehra	2	2
39	Km. Pooja Kandpal	2	2
40	Km. Preeti Pandey	2	2
41	Km. Priya Rautela	2	2
42	Km. Priyanka Bisht	3	3
43	Km. Rajveer Kaur	3	3
44	Km. Rupali Chaudhary	2	2
45	Km. Saloni Pandey	3	3
46	Km. Shradha Bhatt	3	3
47	Km. Sonali Verma	2	2
48	Km. Sonu Rautela	2	2
49	Km. Sushma Bisht	2	2
50	Km. Yogita Bhatt	3	3
51	Km. Yashoda Rai	2	2

Table 3: Pre and Post Training Competency Evaluation Sheet (MBA 5 Year Integrated Programme, 4th Semester)

Course: MBA 5 Year Integrated Programme								4 th Semester								
S.No.	Student Name	Confidence-Pre	Confidence-Post	Skill Up gradation	Communication-Pre	Communication-Post	Skill Up gradation	Presentation-Pre	Presentation-Post	Skill Up gradation	Language-Pre	Language-Post	Skill Up gradation	Body Language-Pre	Body Language-Post	Skill Up gradation
1	Mr. Abhay Kapkoti	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
2	Mr. Amaltas Dwivedi	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
3	Mr. Ankit Harnwal	2	3.5	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
4	Mr. Chandra Shekhar Arya	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5
5	Mr. Deepak Rahi	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	3	1.5
6	Mr. Deepanshu Bhatt	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5
7	Mr. Digvijay Singh Bisht	2	3.5	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5
8	Mr. Himanshu Joshi	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
9	Mr. Jayant Kandpal	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5

10	Mr. Kartik Bisht	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
11	Mr. Kaushal Pathak	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	3	1.5
12	Mr. Lokesh Karnatak	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
13	Mr. Manish Jalal	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
14	Mr. Mayank Bhatt	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	3	1.5
15	Mr. Rachit Khulbe	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1
16	Mr. Rajesh Pathak	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1
17	Mr. Shubham Budhori	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	3	1.5
18	Mr. Shubham Kumar Yadav	2	3.5	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1
19	Mr. Vijay Tamta	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
20	Mr. Vishal Shukla	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
21	Ms. Akanksha Tamta	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
22	Ms. Archana Dubey	2	3.5	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5

23	Ms. Bhawna Chilwal	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	3	1.5	2	3.5	1.5
24	Ms. Chandrakala	2	3.5	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5
25	Ms. Divya Pant	2	3.5	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
26	Ms. Gunjan Bisht	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
27	Ms. Harshita Negi	2	3.5	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5
28	Ms. Himani Karnatak	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
29	Ms. Kanchan Punera	2	3.5	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5
30	Ms. Kanika Bhakuni	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
31	Ms. Kavita Khati	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5
32	Ms. Kavita Shah	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5
33	Ms. Monika Mer	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
34	Ms. Pallavi Joshi	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1
35	Ms. Pooja Kholia	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5

36	Ms. Prakriti Kaushik	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1			
37	Ms. Prerna Kharkwal	2	3.5	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5			
38	Ms. Priya Singh	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5			
39	Ms. Rupali Saxena	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1			
40	Ms. Somi Sangela	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5			
41	Ms. Srishti Nagar	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1			
Average Skill Up gradation				1.231				1.2051				1.2564				1.0769			1.2435

Table 4: Reaction and Intermediate Training Outcome Evaluation (MBA 5 Year Integrated Programme-4th Semester)

Course: MBA 5 Year Integrated Programme		4 th Semester	
S.No.	Student Name	Reaction Evaluation (on 0 to 4 Scale)	Intermediate Training Outcome Evaluation (0 to 4)
1	Mr. Abhay Kapkoti	2	2
2	Mr. Amaltas Dwivedi	Absent	Absent
3	Mr. Ankit Harnwal	2	2
4	Mr. Chandra Shekhar Arya	2	2
5	Mr. Deepak Rahi	1	1
6	Mr. Deepanshu Bhatt	2	2
7	Mr. Digvijay Singh Bisht	2	2
8	Mr. Himanshu Joshi	2	2
9	Mr. Jayant Kandpal	3	3
10	Mr. Kartik Bisht	2	2
11	Mr. Kaushal Pathak	3	3
12	Mr. Lokesh Karnatak	2	2
13	Mr. Manish Jalal	2	2
14	Mr. Mayank Bhatt	2	2
15	Mr. Rachit Khulbe	2	2
16	Mr. Rajesh Pathak	2	2
17	Mr. Shubham Budhori	2	2
18	Mr. Shubham Kumar Yadav	3	3
19	Mr. Vijay Tamta	3	3
20	Mr. Vishal Shukla	Absent	Absent
21	Ms. Akanksha Tamta	3	3
22	Ms. Archana Dubey	3	3
23	Ms. Bhawna Chilwal	2	2
24	Ms. Chandrakala	2	2
25	Ms. Divya Pant	3	3
26	Ms. Gunjan Bisht	2	2
27	Ms. Harshita Negi	3	3
28	Ms. Himani Karnatak	3	3
29	Ms. Kanchan Punera	2	2
30	Ms. Kanika Bhakuni	3	3
31	Ms. Kavita Khati	3	3
32	Ms. Kavita Shah	2	2
33	Ms. Monika Mer	2	2
34	Ms. Pallavi Joshi	2	2
35	Ms. Pooja Kholia	3	3

36	Ms. Prakriti Kaushik	2	2
37	Ms. Perna Kharkwal	2	2
38	Ms. Priya Singh	2	2
39	Ms. Rupali Saxena	2	2
40	Ms. Somi Sangela	2	2
41	Ms. Srishti Nagar	3	3



Table 5: Pre and Post Training Competency Evaluation Sheet (MBA 5 Year Integrated Programme, 2nd Semester)

Course: MBA 5 Year Integrated Programme							2 nd Semester									
S. No.	Student Name	Confidence-Pre	Confidence-Post	Skill Up gradation	Communication-Pre	Communication-Post	Skill Up gradation	Presentation-Pre	Presentation-Post	Skill Up gradation	Language-Pre	Language-Post	Skill Up gradation	Body-Lang uage-Pre	Body-Lang uage-Post	Skill Up gradation
1	Mr. Anil Kumar	1	1.5	0.5	1	2	1	1	2	1	0.5	1.5	1	1	2	1
2	Mr. Chetan Pandey	1	2.5	1.5	1	2.5	1.5	1	2.5	1.5	1	2.5	1.5	1	2.5	1.5
3	Mr. Chhatrapati Kandpal	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	1	2.5	1.5	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	3	1.5
4	Mr. Deepak Pandey	1.5	3	1.5	1	2.5	1.5	1	2.5	1.5	1	2.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5
5	Mr. Gaurav Rawat	2	4	2	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	3.5	2	1.5	3.5	2	1.5	4	2.5
6	Mr. Gaurav Goswami	1	2.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	1	2.5	1.5	1	3	2	1	2	1
7	Mr. Kartik Bhatt	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0.5	0.5	0	1	1	0
8	Mr. Kuldeep	1	2.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	1	2.5	1.5
9	Mr. Mayank Gurang	1.5	3.5	2	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	3.5	2	1.5	3	1.5
10	Mr. Neeraj Nayal	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	1	3	2	1.5	3	1.5

11	Mr. Sandeep Jalal	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	3.5	2	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	3.5	2	1.5	3	1.5
12	Mr. Saurabh Kumar	1	2.5	1.5	1	2.5	1.5	0.5	2.5	2	1	2.5	1.5	1	2.5	1.5
13	Mr. Shubham Kumar Arya	2.5	4	1.5	2.5	4	1.5	2	4	2	2.5	4	1.5	2.5	4	1.5
14	Mr. Shyam Sunder Masiwal	2.5	4	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	2	3.5	1.5
15	Mr. Somesh Martolia	2.5	4	1.5	2.5	4	1.5	2.5	4	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	2.5	4	1.5
16	Mr. Sumit Dalakoti	1.5	3	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	1	2.5	1.5
17	Ms. Kirtika Tripathi	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	3.5	2	1.5	3	1.5	1	3	2	1.5	3	1.5
18	Mr. Siddharth Singh	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	1	2.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5
19	Mr. Vivek Lohami	2	3.5	1.5	2.5	4	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	2.5	4	1.5	2.5	4	1.5
20	Ms. Aastha Agarwal	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	2	3.5	1.5
21	Ms. Himani Sah	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	3.5	2	1.5	3.5	2	1.5	3.5	2	1.5	3	1.5
22	Ms. Kavita Tripathi	1	2.5	1.5	1	2.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	1	2.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5

23	Ms. Komal Bisht	2.5	4	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	2	3.5	1.5
24	Ms. Mansi Kaushik	1	2	1	1.5	2.5	1	1.5	2.5	1	1	2.5	1.5	1	2.5	1.5
25	Ms. Minakshi Pandey	2	3.5	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5
26	Ms. Sarika Bhatt	2	3.5	1.5	2	3.5	1.5	1.5	3	1.5	1.5	3.5	2	1.5	3	1.5
27	Ms. Shruti Gaur	1	3	2	1	2.5	1.5	1	3	2	1	3	2	1	2.5	1.5
28	Ms. Tanushree Mehra	2.5	4	1.5	2.5	4.5	2	2.5	4	1.5	2.5	4.5	2	2.5	4	1.5
Average Skill Up gradation				1.4464			1.4821			1.5			1.589			1.446

Table 6: Reaction and Intermediate Training Outcome Evaluation (MBA 5 Year Integrated Programme, 2nd Semester)

Course: MBA 5 Year Integrated Programme		2 nd Semester	
S.No.	Student Name	Reaction Evaluation (on 0 to 4 Scale)	Intermediate Training Outcome Evaluation (0 to 4)
1	Mr. Anil Kumar	2	2
2	Mr. Chetan Pandey	2	2
3	Mr. Chhatrapati Kandpal	3	3
4	Mr. Deepak Pandey	3	3
5	Mr. Gaurav Rawat	2	2
6	Mr. Gaurav Goswami	2	1
7	Mr. Kartik Bhatt	1	1
8	Mr. Kuldeep	2	2
9	Mr. Mayank Gurang	2	2
10	Mr. Neeraj Nayal	3	3
11	Mr. Sandeep Jalal	2	2
12	Mr. Saurabh Kumar	2	2
13	Mr. Shubham Kumar Arya	3	3
14	Mr. Shyam Sunder Masiwal	3	3
15	Mr. Somesh Martolia	3	3
16	Mr. Sumit Dalakoti	3	3
17	Ms. Kirtika Tripathi	3	3
18	Mr. Siddharth Singh	2	2
19	Mr. Vivek Lohami	3	3
20	Ms. Aastha Agarwal	2	2
21	Ms. Himani Sah	3	3
22	Ms. Kavita Tripathi	3	3
23	Ms. Komal Bisht	3	3
24	Ms. Mansi Kaushik	2	2
25	Ms. Minakshi Pandey	3	3
26	Ms. Sarika Bhatt	3	3
27	Ms. Shruti Gaur	3	3
28	Ms. Tanushree Mehra	2	2