**Course Reflection**

**Human Performance Technology: Abhay Juneja**

Human Performance Technology is a course I could relate to, as the day-to-day responsibilities in my previous workplace were managing educators and e-developers in an online education Startup, and performance improvement was an unsaid, but important responsibility in my role. The purpose of this course was to understand human performance technology(HPT) from a holistic perspective, wherein performance is driven by many factors, including learning derived from an instructional program. Before starting this course, I studied the fundamentals of instructional design in my previous semester, which focused on creating a learning program to help the learner improve their understanding of a phenomenon. HPT goes one step ahead; it discusses if the learning program leads to desired performance and continuous improvement, and additional measures to make sure the organizational objectives are achieved through effective performance.

During this course, I wrote three documents, viz. performance needs analysis (PNA), high-level design (HLD), and detailed design (DD). Here are my reflections on those documents:

1. **PNA**

The initial steps were like the needs analysis that I did in the previous instructional designing course, however, there were a few major differences in the analysis phase. While in ID, the analysis revolves around the idea of a learning program creation, during PNA, we are not even sure what intervention(s) are needed to resolve the problem at hand. I did however struggle in identifying the job one (end result) for my performance problem, but with the help of Prof. Bong, TAs, and my peers, I was able to clarify any issues. While writing the performance objectives of various performers, I was able to think of some possible interventions too, this contrasts with ID

needs analysis where you make it a point not to think about the solution(s) at this stage. I feel having as many interventions as possible is a good approach at this stage as in the later stages, and based on the complete needs analysis, we can then choose the interventions that suit our situation the best.

## 2. HLD

I have to say this is my favorite stage to work on, wherein I finalized and designed nine interventions to fix the performance issues in the organization. The performance issues that I chose to work on were from my previous workplace, so they were not entirely hypothetical. Thus, having first-hand experience with dealing with those issues gave me a clear picture. Also, since I was a core member of the organization, I knew the organizational structures and processes, thus it was easier for me to restructure those. The discussions on genre and communication mediums were a tricky part of this assignment and I am happy that I got it right. I should mention that I could learn more about this topic since I presented this topic along with Shahrom as part of a class presentation. Together, we created a framework and an extensive list and I hope it was helpful for the entire class.

## 3. DD

Detailed design is a challenging assignment, as it is an extensive document that emphasizes making sure no stone is left unturned. It required a significant amount of effort to gather information on how to create interventions, select appropriate tools, and follow best practices. Creating a first draft was an easy cake for me since I had to choose only two interventions out of the nine interventions I created in the previous phase. However, in my later meetings with Dr. Bong, I realized how extensive this document needs to be. In a real-world scenario, I believe I

could create a detailed design, but would rely on external resources for assistance, and/or need to enhance my skills in using design tools to speed up the process.

One of the biggest takeaways of this course was thus performance improvement competencies for instructional technologists. In a study on competencies related to HPT models, thirteen competencies were considered on a scale of very important to not important. The results of this study can be found in Table 1. Table 2 gives the results of ratings for competencies related to performance improvement interventions. This table explains how important a part knowledge and skills play in different types of interventions.

*Table 1. Ratings for competencies related to HPT model*

| Competency Statement | Average Rating |
|---|---|
| Distinguish between performance problems requiring instructional solutions and those requiring non-instructional solutions. | 3.90 |
| Conduct a performance analysis for a specific situation to identify how and where performance needs to change (performance gap). | 3.81 |
| Evaluate a performance improvement intervention to determine whether or not it solved the performance problem. | 3.78 |
| Conduct a cause analysis for a specific situation to identify factors that contribute to the performance gap. | 3.74 |
| Select a range of possible performance interventions that would best meet the need(s) revealed by the performance and cause analyses. | 3.72 |
| Assess the value of a performance improvement solution in terms of return on investment, attitudes of workers involved, client feedback, etc. | 3.67 |
| Define and describe human performance technology. | 3.64 |
| Identify and implement procedures and/or systems to support and maintain performance improvement interventions. | 3.52 |
| Describe the general model of human performance technology (the systematic combination of performance analysis, cause analysis, and interventions selection). | 3.46 |
| Describe the historical and conceptual underpinnings of human performance technology. | 2.80 |
| Identify the similarities and differences among a variety of specific performance technology models. | 2.72 |
| Describe a variety of specific performance technology models. | 2.71 |

Note. 4 = very important, 3 = important, 2 = somewhat important, 1 = not important

*Table 2. Ratings for competencies: performance improvement interventions*

| Intervention Category | Knowledge | Skills |
|---|---|---|
| Measurement & Evaluation | 3.51 | 3.49 |
| Instructional Technology | 3.42 | 3.42 |
| Feedback | 3.34 | 3.22 |
| Organizational Design & Development | 3.22 | 3.16 |
| Job & Workflow | 3.22 | 3.10 |
| Communication | 3.18 | 2.94 |
| Quality Improvement | 3.14 | 2.98 |
| Information | 3.03 | 2.94 |
| Rewards & Recognition | 3.03 | 2.75 |
| Documentation & Standards | 2.97 | 2.80 |
| Human Development | 2.91 | 2.71 |
| Management Science | 2.80 | 2.58 |
| Selection | 2.80 | 2.56 |
| Resource Systems | 2.80 | 2.55 |
| Career Development | 2.58 | 2.35 |
| Ergonomics | 2.57 | 2.18 |

Note. 4 = very important, 3 = important, 2 = somewhat important, 1 = not important

"The study suggests that graduates from IDT programs should have knowledge and skills related to the performance improvement process". Thus, having a clear understanding of why and how this course is a useful tool for an ID motivated me to extend my boundaries of learning.

As a final disclaimer, I would like to admit, though I worked on resolving performance issues in my previous experiences, I did not go in this much depth of creating a needs analysis, followed by a high level as well as detailed design. The usual documents we created were related to research, followed by an implementation plan. I feel confident that the structure I learned during this course has the potential to help me resolve organizational performance issues at scale.

**References**

Klein, J. D., & Fox, E. J. (2004). Performance improvement competencies for instructional

technologists. *TechTrends : For Leaders in Education & Training*, *48*(2), 22–25.

https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02762539