



The new basis programme lay out

From 2027

WHY

The original skill audit from 1996 (“the classic”) is back. Why?

For two main reasons:

1/ the **acceptance** is higher,

2/ despite contract, organisations want to view reports, so we'd better make **reliable and valid** ones.

- We initially shortened the classic skill audit to two simulations with one rater: one audit at the start, and one audit at the end of the training. The two got integrated in an individual training. This integration has an advantage: participants don't have to travel an extra day to do the skill audit in a central place where three roleplayers, six raters, and some fellow participants are present. In this central place raters and roleplayer rotate across participants, in order to make them benefit from multiple rater and multiple simulation reliability.
- We then did some comparison pilots, and it appeared that participants had far more confidence in the classical ‘*triple-simulation-double-rater*’ skill audit because it has multiple simulations, and multiple raters. Multiple raters appeared the most important for participant's trust.
- Furthermore, participants in the pilot for reliability reasons preferred the classical skill audit at the start, over a repeated (= one at the start, and one at the end) ‘*double-simulation-single-rater*’ skill audit.
- Finally, we observed that commissioning organisations want to view the skill audit reports quite often, despite the fact that they signed for the participant's confidentiality. We never send reports to the organisation, but we cannot control what happens after the training is completed. When it is evident that reports might be used by the organisation, we'd better make sure then, that these reports have the same reliability and validity as the classical skill audit that was used in high stake personnel selection in lay offs.
- **For all the reasons above we reintegrated the classic skill audit.** We however updated the lay out to make it more cost efficient and more tailored to developmental need diagnosis. How? Read below.

HOW

We updated the lay out of the skill audit (“the classic”).

We:

1. **skipped the written report,** and saved rater's time, which makes rotation over participants more efficient
 2. **increased roleplayer's elicitations,** which is more tailored to developmental need diagnosis
 3. **focussed on the “chain of influence”** that most urgently needs strengthening: it offers quick prioritisation
 4. also integrated the other main finding of our longitudinal research: **consistency**
- Before we did our longitudinal research, we did not even know about the chains of influence, and that *all* people have these four of these chains in their social style. Let alone, that the main reason for disfunctioning in work is either one single, across all audit simulations *low scoring* chain, or one single *inconsistent scoring* chain, even within the positive realm of a rating scale. Inconsistency is so to speak an new developmental need.
 - These longitudinal findings enable quick focus in development: identify the weak or the inconsistent chain, and start the training there.
 - The younger generation of trainers/raters has less culture and training in writing, so the reporting time we gave them in the past appeared insufficient. A report generator as alternative was perceived as unpersonal. So, we skipped the written report: a video recording and immediate feedback do quite more!
 - This ample, immediate feedback is given by the same trainer that is going to conduct the training later. The chain of influence with most urgent developmental need is discussed by this trainer right after the audit, and a train plan is made on the spot. This saves time during the training dayparts: time we use for extra practicing.