ESSAY 2

THE MEASUREMENT TRAP

*Why What We Track Is
Killing What Matters*

SHAURAV SEN

———

This essay is part of
Training Is Broken: Learning Doesn't Have to Fail.
Download the complete book and all 12 essays at
shaurav.org

The Measurement Trap

Why What We Track Is Killing What Matters

———

We've become experts at measuring training activity. We've forgotten how to measure actual learning.

SYNOPSIS:

Training departments everywhere celebrate the same milestones: courses completed, attendance tracked, feedback collected, hours logged. Dashboards glow with upward-trending graphs that reassure executives their investment is paying off. But beneath this data-driven confidence lies an uncomfortable reality: we're measuring everything except the thing that matters. We've become masters at tracking activity while remaining willfully blind to outcome. The numbers tell us people showed up and clicked through—they don't tell us if anyone actually improved. This isn't just a reporting problem; it's a philosophical one. The metrics we choose don't just reflect our priorities—they shape them. When satisfaction scores drive design decisions and completion rates determine success, we've built a system optimized for looking busy rather than getting better. With AI now capable of tracking real performance improvement in real time, our addiction to vanity metrics isn't just outdated—it's becoming indefensible. The question isn't whether we can measure what matters. It's whether we're brave enough to look at what the data would reveal if we did.

The Dashboard Illusion

Every quarter, training teams present beautiful dashboards to leadership.

10,000 hours of training delivered. 95% completion rate. 4.7/5 average satisfaction. Engagement up 23% versus last year.

Executives nod. Budgets get renewed. Everyone feels vaguely reassured.

Then someone asks the only question that really matters:

"Did anyone actually get better at their job?"

Silence.

We've become extraordinarily sophisticated at measuring training *activity*. We've almost completely forgotten how to measure actual *learning*. Worse, we've built a measurement infrastructure that creates a comforting illusion of progress while systematically ignoring the one thing that justifies any of this: behavior change that improves real work.

What We Measure vs What Actually Matters

Look at what most L&D dashboards obsess over: Did people attend? Did they complete the modules? Did they like it? Did they pass the quiz? How long were they "engaged"?

Now compare that to what almost never shows up: Are they doing anything differently three months later? Can they apply the skill under pressure, in messy, political reality? Did performance on real work actually improve? Did key business outcomes move in the right direction? Would their manager say they're noticeably more capable?

We've known for decades this is the wrong balance. The Kirkpatrick Model—Reaction, Learning, Behavior, Results—has been around since 1959. In theory, it tells us to move beyond "Did they like it?" and "Did they pass?" toward "Did anything in the real world change?" In practice, we almost never get there.

A 2024 LinkedIn Workplace Learning Report found that while 77% of learning leaders say demonstrating impact on business goals is a top priority, only 18% are actually tracking the ROI of learning programs. The vast majority—over 90%—stop at satisfaction scores and completion rates.

Why? Because measuring satisfaction is easy. Measuring completion is easy. Measuring whether someone can actually do something better three months later is hard.

So we optimize for what we can measure easily—and then wonder why training doesn't drive results.

How Bad Metrics Create Bad Behavior

Metrics don't just describe reality. They shape it.

When we choose the wrong measures, we design the wrong experiences, reward the wrong behaviors, and then declare the wrong things "successful."

When completion is the goal — We make training mandatory and as frictionless as possible. People click through slides during meetings. They speed-watch videos at 2x. They memorize quiz answers. The metric goes up. The learning goes nowhere. Research by the NeuroLeadership Institute found that mandatory training is 50% less effective than voluntary learning, yet completion rates make mandatory training appear successful.

When satisfaction scores drive decisions — We optimize for entertainment, not transformation. We avoid discomfort, challenge, and honest feedback because they lower smile-sheet scores—even though they're often where the real learning lives. A 2018 study in the *Journal of Applied Psychology* found that learner satisfaction has almost no correlation with actual learning outcomes or transfer to job performance.

When time on platform is the proxy for impact — We pad content, stretch modules, and celebrate "hours of learning" as if time spent equals capability gained. As learning scientist Will Thalheimer notes, "Time spent does not equal time learned."

When quiz scores matter most — We test recall instead of application. We measure what's easy (definitions, multiple choice) rather than what actually matters (judgment under pressure, messy decision-making). The Association for Talent Development reports that knowledge retention drops to 10% within 90 days when learning isn't applied to real work.

Each of these metrics creates a system optimized for looking productive while avoiding the actual work of learning.

The Dangerous Illusion of Progress

Perhaps the most insidious aspect of our current measurement approach is how it creates a convincing illusion of progress.

Training dashboards look impressive. Executives see charts trending upward. L&D teams present evidence of "impact." Budgets get approved based on activity metrics that have almost nothing to do with whether anyone actually got better at their job.

This isn't just inefficient—it's actively harmful. It allows organizations to believe they're investing in capability development while that investment produces minimal return. It creates what researcher Laura Overton calls

"the learning scrap heap": billions spent on training that never translates to performance.

The data on this is damning:

- Only 12% of learners apply new skills learned in training to their jobs (Saks & Burke, 2012)

- 70% of employees report they don't have mastery of skills needed for their jobs despite unprecedented access to training (Gartner, 2020)

- The training industry is valued at over $370 billion globally, yet most organizations struggle to demonstrate clear ROI (Training Industry Report, 2024)

- Less than 25% of respondents believe training measurably improved job performance (McKinsey, 2023)

Think about what this means: We've built a $370 billion industry that largely measures the wrong things, optimizes for the wrong outcomes, and then wonders why it can't prove its value.

The AI Revolution Makes This Crisis Urgent

In the age of AI, the measurement illusion becomes even more dangerous—and more obvious.

AI can provide real-time feedback on actual skill application. It can track progress on authentic work tasks. It can measure the gap between knowing and doing. It can identify exactly where someone gets stuck when applying knowledge under pressure.

Yet we're still measuring seat time and satisfaction scores.

When a knowledge worker asks ChatGPT how to analyze a dataset and then successfully completes the analysis, that's measurable learning and immediate application. When they sit through a data analytics workshop and pass a quiz, we measure completion—but have no idea if they can actually analyze data three weeks later.

The contrast couldn't be starker. AI-enabled learning *can* measure what matters: Did the person solve the problem? Did their work improve? Did they successfully transfer learning to a novel situation? Traditional training measurement systems *can't*—or more accurately, *won't*—because asking those questions would expose how little impact most training actually has.

What Would We Measure If We Actually Cared?

Here's the uncomfortable question that should haunt every training executive: If we actually measured behavior change and business impact, would most of our current training survive the scrutiny?

The evidence suggests: no. When only 12% of skills learned in training get applied on the job, that means 88% of what we're measuring as "success" is actually failure.

So what would we track if we genuinely cared about learning outcomes rather than training activity?

- **Time to competency on real tasks** — How long does it take someone to perform a skill independently and well in their actual work context? This matters far more than how long they spent in training.

- **Quality of work output** — Has the quality of their analyses, presentations, code, designs, or decisions measurably improved? This is what managers and clients actually care about.

- **Frequency of skill application** — Are they using the skill regularly in their work? Or did they take the training and never apply it? Frequency is a leading indicator of whether learning has transferred.

- **Performance improvement trajectory** — How are they progressing over weeks and months? Learning isn't an event—it's a trajectory. We should measure the curve, not just the initial completion.

- **Transfer to novel situations** — Can they apply what they learned to problems they haven't seen before? This is the true test of understanding versus mere memorization.

- **Manager-observed capability change** — Do the people who actually work with this person daily notice a meaningful difference in their capability? If not, what did the training accomplish?

None of these metrics fit neatly into an LMS dashboard. None of them are easy to automate. All of them matter infinitely more than completion rates.

The Choice We Face

The measurement trap isn't just about bad metrics. It's about using measurement to avoid a harder truth: that most corporate training doesn't work, and we've built an entire industry on pretending otherwise.

As long as we measure activity rather than outcomes, we can maintain the illusion. The moment we start measuring what actually matters—behavior change, performance improvement, business impact—the illusion collapses.

But we can't hide behind convenient metrics forever. The AI revolution is making the gap between activity and learning impossible to ignore. When learners can get personalized, just-in-time help that measurably

improves their work, why would they sit through scheduled training that we can only prove they completed?

We have two paths forward:

We can continue measuring what's easy—completion rates, satisfaction scores, time on platform—and watch as our training becomes increasingly irrelevant compared to AI-enabled learning that actually changes behavior.

Or we can do the harder work of measuring what matters—behavior change, skill application, performance improvement—and redesigning our training to actually deliver those outcomes.

The first path preserves our budgets in the short term while making our profession obsolete in the long term.

The second path forces us to confront uncomfortable truths but gives us a chance to build something that actually works.

The choice seems obvious. Yet somehow, most of the industry keeps choosing the first path.

How much longer can we afford to measure the wrong things?

When you look at your organization's training metrics, what are they actually measuring? Completion or competency? Activity or learning? Participation or performance? And more importantly: if you measured what actually matters, what would the data reveal?

SHARE THIS ESSAY