

Education and Training for Market Transformation Programs: Keys to Success

Marge Anderson, Energy Center of Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

Energy program designers know that education and training are key elements of market transformation programs. Energy “geeks” think that if everyone knew what they knew, everyone would do what they do. Yet this is not the case.

Training should be done at the right time, deliver the right stuff, and be taught the right way. Program designers often roll out education and training programs too early in the program and are disappointed by lack of results. As energy geeks, our focus on content ignores the educational design elements needed to convert information to behavioral change. Specific techniques – built on adult learning theory – give us immediate results in energy education, if we know how to incorporate them appropriately into technical program design.

The Energy Center of Wisconsin has designed and implemented several highly successful energy training programs in public-private partnerships – programs resulting in demonstrated behavioral changes. The changes these programs have caused are due to a variety of factors – the application of theory to the design of education and training programs, successful adaptation of adult learning techniques to technical subject matter and technical instructors, appropriate integration of training into program design, and the incorporation of evaluation results into subsequent program design.

This paper will draw upon examples from the Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes training series, which targets home builders, and the Daylighting Collaborative, a commercial buildings program targeting architects and engineers.

Introduction

Since its beginnings in 1990, the Energy Center of Wisconsin (ECW) has managed training programs. Before 1996, we emphasized delivering the results of research projects, primarily to utility DSM staff. We managed less than 20 events for 300 participants annually. In 1996, ECW collaborated with a group of architects, engineers, universities, and government officials to implement statewide training on Wisconsin’s new commercial energy code. This effort to reach beyond DSM professionals and deliver self-sustaining training to market players has led to an annual training agenda of over 60 events in multiple sectors, reaching over 4,000 attendees with a budget of over \$1.5 million. The majority of these programs are fully integrated into market transformation programs.

Through seven years of formal and informal evaluation, customer steering group feedback and learning opportunities (known as mistakes in common parlance), ECW has discovered five keys to success. This paper will examine these five key concepts in detail, and then outline their application and results in the Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes program and the Daylighting Collaborative.

Keys to Success

1. Design For Behavior Change, Not Information Transfer

Many training program plans begin with market transformation program managers (us energy “geeks”) and Subject Matter Experts (SME’s) diagnosing knowledge barriers to energy efficient practice in the market place. Training is often prescribed as the antidote for lack of knowledge.

Market transformation program goals are really about energy savings – savings that cannot be achieved through increased knowledge alone – but only through the application of knowledge in changed behavior. Yet the vocabulary we use for our training often captures only the passive transfer of knowledge: “technology transfer,” “information programs.”

The result? Typical content-driven, lecture-style training results in the participant’s loss of 90% of the content over a few weeks (BCAL, 1995). Market transformation program designers can use education theory to improve our participants’ knowledge retention in order to move them to changed energy use behavior.

In 1956, Benjamin Bloom published Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, which has been revised and widely applied in the field of education. This taxonomy identifies six progressive levels of learning which build upon one another. Higher levels of learning cannot be achieved by a training participant until each lower level has been mastered. Table 1 below illustrates Bloom’s taxonomy and subsequent revisions.

Table 1. Bloom’s Taxonomy

Category (Level of Learning)	Cognitive Processes / Examples
1. Knowledge	<i>Remember.</i> Retrieve knowledge from long-term memory
2. Comprehension	<i>Understand.</i> Construct meaning from instructional messages.
3. Application	<i>Apply.</i> Carry out or use a procedure in a given situation.
4. Analysis	<i>Analyze.</i> Break material into parts; determine how parts relate to each other.
5. Evaluation	<i>Evaluate.</i> Make judgments based on criteria and standards.
6. Synthesis	<i>Create.</i> Put elements together to form a coherent or functional whole; reorganize elements into a new pattern or structure.

Sources: Bloom et al. 1956, Anderson et al. 2001

The question SME’s and market transformation program designers often ask is “what do we want students to know?” or “what content do we need to cover?” SME’s with deep technical knowledge often aim to transfer all of their knowledge to the student. This knowledge-transfer model focuses training design on levels one and two (knowledge and comprehension). The ubiquitous use of PowerPoint text slides also drives training design to focus on flashing information at a passive student. The SME attempts to deliver knowledge

gained - through years of practical experience – to students by means of passive lecture and visual aids in a few hours.

If we want participants to achieve energy savings goals, we must aim for level three – application. Greater energy savings result when students can analyze, evaluate and synthesize information and tailor the application of knowledge in their energy work. It is only by designing training to level three and above can program managers have a realistic hope that students will achieve energy savings when they return to work. With application as the goal, the question we should begin with is “what do we want students to do?” We can then design training that emphasizes behavioral outcomes. Participants who practice what they have learned during training and review what they have learned can retain up to 90% of what is taught (BCAL 1995).

Participants consistently report higher satisfaction with training programs that build skills and incorporate frequent activities to reinforce learning (ECW 2000-2002). Program managers must remember that we design programs to change the market, but participants come to training improve their on-the-job performance. Knowledge without immediate application that improves performance is not valued highly by program participants (ECW 2000-2002).

Designing training for application, analysis, evaluation and synthesis requires that training design be driven by participant-centered actions and behavioral outcomes rather than by transferring a body of knowledge. ECW has been successful with the following techniques:

- Begin with a list of behaviors you want from students when they leave the training. Any content not related to behavioral outcomes can be included as reference for students but should not be included in the training.
- Balance lecture (information delivery) with student practice. When deciding what to emphasize in training, give more time to skills practice and less to information delivery. Ideally, students will participate in a learning activity each hour they are in training. Activities ECW has found most successful with technical audiences include case studies, calculations, solo problem-solving, and group discussion.
- Assign pre-work, such as gathering energy use data from students’ experience, or post-training projects in order to receive credit for training.¹
- For training that heavily emphasizes skills, limit class size to maximize student participation opportunities.

2. Balance Content Experts with Education Experts

SME’s are SME’s for a reason – because they have built a career around expertise and success in their chosen field. ECW has had some success training SME’s how to master educational design techniques, but not all SME’s have time or interest to devote to this subject. There are several ways to use SME’s and still maintain focus on effective instructional design.

ECW assigns every training program two project management staff – a technical project manager with expertise in the target market sector and an education project manager

¹ The Northwest Energy Efficiency Council has been very successful in incorporating student projects into the Building Operators Certification Program (Putnam, et al. 2000).

with expertise in education, program design, and customer service. The technical project manager acts as an advocate for the overall program goals and insures the integrity of the technical content. The education project manager advocates for the learner, learning styles, and the quality and frequency of learning activities. This model makes sure that we deliver the right stuff and teach it the right way.

In the past, this project management team then contracted with a SME to develop a training program. ECW's antidote for too much dependence on lecture was to include instructional standards in the SME's contract. Examples of standards included a minimum number of participant activities, minimum number of review periods, maximum number of text-based slides, etc. We then scheduled multiple reviews of curricula and coached SME's in instructional design techniques.

This model had some success if a SME had adequate interest and time to devote to experimenting with instructional design. However feedback from instructors and student evaluation data from a wide variety of training programs indicated that while SME's were eager to move participants to application and beyond, many lacked experience designing learning activities and were uncomfortable with or unskilled in facilitating activities other than passive lecture (ECW 2000-2002).

ECW now encourages the pairing of an instructional designer with a SME during the program development stage. This is achieved in one of two ways; either by releasing a list of pre-qualified instructional designers and technical firms with the RFP to encourage teaming, or by pre-selecting SME's and instructional designers and pairing them after the project begins.²

The cost implications of this pairing can range from a 5% - 25% increase in the contractual program design budget. Student evaluations indicate significantly higher levels of satisfaction with these dual-design programs (ECW 2000-2002), and follow-up evaluations to measure a change in energy use behavior indicate persistence of behavioral effects (PA Consulting, 2001).

3. Integrate Training into Market Transformation Programs Appropriately

For training to be most successful in helping a market transformation program achieve its goals, it must be integrated and timed appropriately in the program. In ECW's early experience, we were less successful when we made these mistakes:

Using training too early. When we design market transformation programs, we identify knowledge gaps in standard practice. However, it is important to determine whether the market is ready for training as an intervention to cure the knowledge gap. Attending workshop requires a high level of commitment from professionals with many other demands on their time. If market players do not perceive that they lack knowledge, or that a lack of knowledge impairs their success, they are unlikely to attend training. Other kinds of market preparation – marketing, advertising, broad-based industry education, etc. – may be needed to create an interest in training.

² It is important to use educators with experience developing short training programs for professional audiences. Academics whose primary experience is teaching undergraduates do not always have the ability to condense subject matter in a way that busy working attendees find satisfactory in a one- or two- day training.

In 1997, when the Home Energy Rating System program was in early development in Wisconsin, ECW partnered with the U.S. Department of Energy and the Wisconsin Department of Administration – Division of Energy to develop a training program for residential home builders called “Profiting from Energy Efficiency.” The training was widely marketed through home building associations and a mailing that included thousands of home builders. The curriculum included the business case for energy efficient home building and demonstrated marketing techniques that had been successful in other states. Only seven builders attended the training.

Feedback from builders indicated two issues: home builders perceived that their current practice was energy efficient, and home builders did not perceive market demand for further improvements in efficiency (ECW 1997). The discussion of Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes below addresses how these issues have been successfully addressed in the current residential public benefits program.

Substituting program marketing for training. In our experience, program designers frequently want to use breakfast meetings or short training programs to raise customer awareness about a new energy efficiency program. Program designers see this as training because it is training people how to participate in the program. Program designers can disseminate information more efficiently to a group than to individuals. This strategy usually results in one of two responses from customers – so few attendees that the program must be cancelled, or dissatisfaction with the program. Program designers may find information about their programs interesting, but customers often do not unless attendance is the only way to qualify for program financial incentives.

Again, in order for a customer to choose an event over other priorities demands a high level of commitment. An event does not make a good substitute for a cold call. Participants do not view these types of events as worth their time.

Ideally, programs will *push* customers to training by building market demand for energy efficiency and the skills required to apply energy efficiency in the workplace. Training can also *pull* satisfied customers into deeper levels of commitment to program activities. The use of this push-pull strategy has been effective in both the Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes program and the Daylighting Collaborative, discussed below.

4. Provide Value to Participants By Treating Them as Customers

Value added services and a customer-friendly approach can be as important to a training program’s success as a sound technical foundation and effective learning activities. Some specific approaches that have been successful in Wisconsin include:

Industry-specific continuing education credits. It is important to understand what continuing education is required in target markets. ECW found that becoming a Certified Provider through the American Institute of Architects (AIA) Continuing Education Service increased architect attendance at programs significantly, as architects need a minimum number of AIA Learning Units to maintain membership in AIA. It is also possible for organizations to become certified to provide continuing education units by the International Association of Continuing Education and Training (IACET). ECW also obtains certification from the Wisconsin Department of Commerce for programs affecting electricians and other

professionals with licensure requirements. Advertising the appropriate type of credit with a training program can help participants choose your energy efficiency program over other professional development options.

Becoming certified to provide by organizations like IACET and AIA require an organization to prove that it uses appropriate educational theory in program design. Certified organizations are often audited for compliance. Qualifying for certification is one way to maintain competency in instructional design.

Industry-led steering committees. Using a steering committee comprised of your target audience brings two key benefits to a training program. First, it helps program designers determine what kinds of skills relating to energy efficiency are in demand by participants. Second, steering committees can connect program marketers with industry affiliations and other partnerships that lend credibility to the training program and help it gain momentum in the market. Industry-led steering committees can help program designers focus on the participant as a customer rather than as an agent of energy efficiency.

Avoid captive audience syndrome. Participants who are satisfied with the new skills they learn at a training program are likely to view other program elements favorably. Information can then be provided on site if requested, mailed, or a lead generated for the program. However, using significant amounts of training platform time to market program elements or explain program details raises the ire of participants (ECW 2000-2002). Customers often report feeling hoodwinked or that their time was wasted. Again, it may be efficient to dedicate an hour of platform time to sharing program information with a captive audience, but customers may find it offensive. The focus of training programs needs to be on skills that can help customers perform better in their jobs.

5. Evaluate Appropriately

Two types of evaluations have aided ECW in continuously improving its training programs.

On-site evaluations. ECW uses a standard evaluation form for every training program, with learning objectives customized by program. The evaluation asks customers to grade the program on how well it achieved each learning objective, grade instructors on both content and training skills, and also asks participants to self-report on how much they feel they learned using a numeric scale. Customers give the program an overall grade. On-site evaluation data is then compiled and used to improve the program design. Staff with experience in evaluation and survey design – not administrative or customer service staff – prepare the evaluations for programs.

ECW also performs a broader analysis of on-site evaluations at the end of every fiscal year. This analysis compares programs within market sectors (commercial, industrial, residential) and across sectors. This analysis allows us to discover trends and look for commonalities across programs.

Post-training evaluations. Surveys or interviews with attendees several months after training provide the most insight into the persistence of behavior change. These interviews

also give attendees a chance to report barriers to implementation that can be addressed in future training, as well as to report successes that can be used to market program efforts.

Program Results

Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes

Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes is managed by the Wisconsin Energy Conservation Corporation (WECC) for the Wisconsin Department of Administration – Division of Energy’s public benefits program. The program builds consumer demand for high performance homes through marketing and consumer education, provides consulting and training to builders and contractors, and recognizes homes that meet clearly defined and verified construction standards and a minimum home energy rating score. (Meunier, 2000). As a subcontractor to WECC, ECW manages the training of builders and contractors.

Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes offers various types of training. Developing training at different levels allows the program to reach builders at various levels of sophistication in their approach to high performance homebuilding. Training is certified by the Wisconsin Department of Commerce when appropriate and minimizes platform time spent on marketing.

One-day seminars for 60-80 attendees teach participants how to minimize callbacks and customer complaints by applying building science principles and approaching the house as a system. These programs are marketed widely throughout the building community and focus on exposing new program participants to key building science concepts. The training is designed around case studies. At the end, participants are briefly introduced to the Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes program and directed to an information clearinghouse. These events emphasize practical knowledge while generating leads to build overall program participation.

Builders who take the next step and become Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes builders are offered a series of monthly, skill-intensive training programs. The trainings focus on specific construction techniques necessary to meet Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes standards (framing, ventilation, combustion safety, etc.), as well as the sales techniques required to sell a high performance home. Classes minimize lecture and include equipment and technique demonstrations. Many include field trips to homes under construction in order to practice learned techniques. Class size is limited to 25 to provide for individual coaching. Curricula are reviewed by WECC for technical merit and by ECW for a focus on behavior change and active learning. Topics are determined in regular meetings with program participants to discover their building science challenges in the field, as well as areas in which subcontractors lack skills.

Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes has also offered two statewide conferences, *Building a High Performance Home*, in 1999 and 2000. These multi-day conferences targeted both the general building community and Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes builders, with breakout sessions designed for various levels of expertise. A trade show of high performance products and marketing exposure for the Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes program was also included. Program participants helped develop the agenda for this conference based on their experience with issues in the field and in the marketplace.

Training is only one component of the overall Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes program. A comprehensive marketing and advertising campaign, organized by WECC and aimed at consumers has raised the visibility of the Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes brand and demand for high performance homes. This market-building effort has created builder interest in the program, which drives demand for training. Conversely, the callback training and *Building a High Performance Home* are large events that solidify the program's credibility in the general building community by linking the program with training that solves problems for builders. In this way the training generates leads and support for the larger program, pulling in more participating builders.

Evidence of the push-pull effect from this integrated approach can be seen in attendance figures for *Building a High Performance Home*. Over 300 builders attended the 1999 event when the overall Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes program was in its infancy. The 1999 event generated many leads for the program. After the event, comprehensive program marketing began. Over 500 people attended the 2000 event, although the event design, marketing efforts, and location were comparable to the 1999 event. We attribute the jump in attendance to the other program activities throughout the year, which raised the awareness of and demand for high performance homes.

The integrated approach also provides the ultimate test of training effectiveness – whether participants' homes pass program standards and testing. The program supports skills learned in training through in-field coaching. As of May, 2002, 1051 Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes have been built and certified in Wisconsin, and 542 are under construction. This link between program-integrated training and measurable results is the reason the Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes program received the 2000 Exemplar Award from the International Association of Continuing Education and Training.

Training has been evaluated rigorously through individual on-site evaluations, analysis of all on-site evaluations together, and as part of an ongoing overall program evaluation. The overall program evaluators conducted follow-up interviews with training participants in both the general training and the in-depth training for participating builders. Evaluation results verify that skills learned in training are being practiced in the field (PA Consulting, 2001).

Another result of the integrated program and training approach has been the development of a Wisconsin infrastructure of construction experts. The program is now pairing these "home-grown" experts with instructional designers to develop new training programs that have an even sharper focus on Wisconsin experience, construction issues, and market influences. In this way, the program will reduce its reliance on out of state SME's as trainers and build the credibility and skills of local participants. This local infrastructure is part of the program's plan to become self-sustaining over time. Table 2 summarizes how the five keys to success are integrated into the Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes program.

Table 2. Wisconsin ENERGY STAR® Homes Education & Training Keys

Education & Training Key	Program Elements
1. Design for behavior change, not information transfer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Training designed around case studies ▪ Monthly training focuses on skill-building, equipment and technical demonstrations ▪ Training includes field trips ▪ Class size limited to maximize participation ▪ Participant-built homes undergo diagnostic testing
2. Balance content experts with education experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prospective training programs are reviewed for both technical merit and educational design
3. Integrate training into market transformation appropriately	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Program includes an overall marketing campaign to create market demand for high performance homes ▪ Training is staged for various levels of market players – general training on building science to recruit more program partners as well as skill-intensive regular workshops for program participants
4. Provide value to participants by treating them as customers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Training registered for credit with Wisconsin Department of Commerce ▪ Focus is on helping contractors solve building problems; “air time” for marketing messages is limited ▪ Program participants provide input into training topic selection and conference formats
5. Evaluate appropriately	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Both on-site and long-term follow-up evaluations are used ▪ Post-training evaluations occur four months and twelve months after some trainings ▪ Evaluation results feed future program design

The Daylighting Collaborative

The Daylighting Collaborative was founded by Wisconsin’s utilities and State of Wisconsin to incorporate daylighting into mainstream design and construction. The collaborative brings together utilities, designers, product manufacturers, state agencies, design and construction professionals, and other organizations dedicated to promoting the human, environmental and economic benefits of cool daylighting (ECW, 2001).³ As of May, 2002, the Daylighting Collaborative has influenced the design of 48 buildings in Wisconsin. The Daylighting Collaborative is managed by ECW.

The Collaborative’s program activities center around education, training, demonstrations, and various levels of design assistance. Education and training integrates

³ Cool Daylighting is a daylighting design approach that maximizes the use of daylight without increasing heating or cooling loads. Cool Daylighting is a concept developed by Steve Ternoey of Light Forms, LLC, the former Technical Director of the Daylighting Collaborative.

completely into the program, with programmatic activities pushing participants towards training and training pulling participants toward other program services.

When the Collaborative began, market research showed that Wisconsin architects and engineers (A/E's) were interested in daylighting in buildings, but had concerns that daylighting would cause glare or heat gain (ECW, 2001). In evaluations from ECW daylighting seminars before the Daylighting Collaborative was established, architects also expressed concern that daylighting strategies increased building first cost (ECW, 1997). Despite these concerns, some Wisconsin architects were implementing daylighting and other green building strategies, and had founded the Wisconsin Green Building Alliance in order to support energy efficient and green building practices.

As different levels of acceptance and practice of daylighting existed in the market, the Collaborative developed different levels of education and training.

The Collaborative delivers its first level of education through marketing to building owners and A/E's. We emphasize the benefits of daylighting in human, economic and environmental performance through print collateral, short seminars (under two hours) presented at association meetings, trade shows, and other professional gatherings.

The Collaborative also delivers "how-to" workshops that focus on technical detail, skills practice, and case studies to help early adopters up the learning curve. Education and marketing activities feed more participants into this training. The skills-based workshops are designed for two levels – fundamental and advanced. Instructional designers worked with SME's to insure the inclusion of a minimum number of case studies and learning activities. Participants spend over one hour of a one-day training completing design calculations and other activities in a student workbook. All training offers AIA Learning Units⁴.

The training and education activities are integrated into the program in a number of ways. First, all training participants are eligible for design assistance on future projects. Many of the leads for design assistance come from training programs. Evaluation activities after training included follow-up calls to participants to identify specific buildings influenced by the training. This follow-up indicated that participants were not always communicating to the Collaborative about how they used their new skills, so we found that many more buildings had been influenced than were voluntarily reported to the Collaborative (PA Consulting, 2001; ECW, 2001).

The Collaborative is currently preparing for an increased demand for training driven by new cool daylighting standards for state-owned buildings. Preparations include a train the trainer program that will pair Wisconsin daylighting designers with instructional designers. This effort will add more Wisconsin-based case studies to the training and profile local experts of learning activities. We have also begun "Lunch and Learn" programs, adapted from a model commonly used in AIA Continuing Education programs. The Collaborative has developed 90 minute programs to present over lunch at A/E firms to help junior designers up the learning curve.

Evaluation activities are ongoing – both on-site training evaluations and overall program evaluations. Student evaluations from over 10 training courses report consistently high evaluation grades – an average of A- benchmarked against ECW overall averages of B+

⁴ The American Institute of Architects (AIA) requires 18 hours of continuing education per year for all of its members; one hour of instruction is equivalent to one AIA Learning Unit (LU). AIA then coordinates with all states requiring mandatory continuing education for architectural licensure to insure that the states accept the AIA LU's. Thus, providing AIA LU's assists architects in maintaining their license to practice in many states.

(ECW, 1999-2001). Follow-up interviews with some training participants indicated that architects adapted well to envelope-related aspects of cool daylighting design (shading, glazing, etc.) However, some were reluctant to downsize mechanicals as instructed in the training, thereby bypassing some of the energy savings of the design approach (ECW, 2001). The Collaborative responded by adding an engineer to the training faculty and offering discounts if architects attended training with their mechanical engineer. The following table summarizes the five keys to success and how they apply to the Daylighting Collaborative.

Table 3. Daylighting Collaborative Education & Training Keys

Education & Training Key	Program Elements
1. Design for behavior change, not information transfer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Training designed around case studies ▪ Participants required to perform design calculations in class ▪ Participants eligible for design assistance after training
2. Balance content experts with education experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Instructional designers worked with technical experts to develop curriculum ▪ Train the trainer classes focus on both technical experience and teaching ability
3. Integrate training into market transformation appropriately	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Training is designed for various levels – awareness building, introduction to skills, and advanced training ▪ Marketing feeds training; training feeds project identification and design assistance
4. Provide value to participants by treating them as customers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participants receive AIA LU's ▪ Increasing emphasis on Wisconsin-based case studies as projects are implemented locally
5. Evaluate appropriately	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Both on-site and long-term follow-up evaluations are used ▪ Post-training evaluations evaluate the application of both envelope and mechanical design techniques to measure impact on energy savings ▪ Evaluation results feed future program design

Summary & Next Steps

Program evaluation continues to affirm the importance that training plays in a market transformation program. In all sectors, evaluation data demonstrates that training designed around behavioral outcomes that incorporates learning activities leads to verifiable energy savings by training participants. Training is most effective when integrated with other program activities to create a push-pull effect on market actors.

ECW continues to explore ways to increase the direct value that education and training add to market transformation programs. In March of 2002, we introduced a “Technical Trainer’s Toolbox” program that teaches instructional design skills to technical experts that train exclusively on energy-efficiency topics. The first program not only yielded high evaluation marks from participants, but also an improvement of the evaluation marks of

participants in their own training programs. Next steps for the following program year include further development of the Technical Trainer's Toolbox program, including possibly a listserv to share successful techniques and meetings of instructors in their appropriate sectors; a more intensive integration of overall on-site evaluation conclusions and recommendations into both the organization's strategic and business plan as well as our work on Wisconsin's public benefits programs; and a plan to make more education and training programs self-funding as part of the transformation of specific markets.

References

- Boulder Center for Accelerative Learning. 1995. *Accelerative Learning* training handouts. Bloom, Benjamin, ed., 1956. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.
- Anderson, Lorin W., and David R. Krathwohl, eds., 2001. *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing*. New York: Longman.
- Energy Center of Wisconsin, 2000. *FY99 Evaluation Summary for Lifelong Learning Group*. Madison, WI: Energy Center of Wisconsin.
- Energy Center of Wisconsin, 2001. *FY00 Evaluation Summary for Lifelong Learning Group*. Madison, WI: Energy Center of Wisconsin.
- Energy Center of Wisconsin, 2002. *FY01 Evaluation Summary for Lifelong Learning Group*. Madison, WI: Energy Center of Wisconsin.
- Energy Center of Wisconsin, 1999. *Evaluation summary of Compressed Air Challenge workshops*. Madison, WI: Energy Center of Wisconsin.
- Putnam, Cynthia, Jane S. Peters, and Alan Mulak, 2000. *Building Operator Certification: A Market Transformation Venture Becomes Self-Supporting*. In Proceedings of the ACEEE 2000 Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings 6.327-334. Washington, D.C. American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy.
- Energy Center of Wisconsin, 1997. *Profiting from Energy Efficiency Evaluation*. Madison, WI: Energy Center of Wisconsin.
- Meunier, Mary G, Edward M. Carroll, Joseph P. Nagan, 2000. *Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes Program: Providing Building Trades with Solutions to Cold Climate Building Problems and Recognition for High Performance Homes*. In Proceedings of the ACEEE 2000 Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings 2.187-200. Washington, D.C. American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy.
- PA Consulting, 2001. *Focus on Energy II Pilot Study. Wisconsin ENERGY STAR[®] Homes Program: Third Interim Evaluation Report*. Madison, WI: State of Wisconsin Department of Administration Division of Energy.

Energy Center of Wisconsin, 2001. *Interim Daylighting Evaluation*. Madison, WI: Energy Center of Wisconsin.

Energy Center of Wisconsin, 1997, *Daylighting in Wisconsin, A Program Study*. Madison, WI: Energy Center of Wisconsin.

Energy Center of Wisconsin, 1999. *Evaluation summary of Daylighting and Energy Efficiency workshop*. Madison, WI: Energy Center of Wisconsin.

PA Consulting, 2001. *Focus on Energy II Pilot Study. Interim Evaluation of Demand Side Applications of Renewable Energy*. Madison, WI: State of Wisconsin Department of Administration Division of Energy.

