FIELD NOTE 02

From Training Completion to Readiness Evidence

Why activity measures are useful but insufficient - and what organisations should observe when they want to know whether people are actually ready.

PUBLICATION	Field Note 02 · August 2026

Completion tells us that an intervention happened. Readiness evidence tells us whether people and systems can now act differently.

The measurement problem

Learning teams have become good at measuring participation: attendance, completion, assessment scores and satisfaction. Those measures matter because they show reach and immediate learning response. But they do not establish whether capability survives the transition from learning environment to real work.

In the AI era, this distinction becomes more important. Work, tools and role expectations are changing quickly; organisations need evidence that learning can be translated into judgement, workflow behaviour and sustained performance.

FOUR LEVELS OF READINESS EVIDENCE

Move from activity to observable movement

Evidence layer	What it tells us	Typical signals
Activity	Did people participate?	Attendance, completion, access, time spent.
Learning	Did knowledge or skill improve?	Assessment, practice, scenario performance, confidence.
Application	Is capability being used in work?	Behaviour, workflow use, quality of judgement, manager observation.
System movement	Is the environment reinforcing the new capability?	Leadership signals, process change, tool access, standards, accountability.

The practical shift

- Define the future behaviour before selecting the intervention.
- Specify what should become observable after the intervention.
- Capture evidence in the work environment, not only inside the learning platform.
- Ask whether leaders, tools, processes and standards support the new behaviour.
- Separate short-term confidence from durable readiness.

A READINESS EVIDENCE CANVAS

Five questions before you measure

Question	Why it matters
What future must people be ready for?	Measurement should start from the required future behaviour, not from the course.
What must they be able to do?	Turns broad capability statements into observable performance.
What might prevent application?	Surfaces friction in culture, technology, workflow or leadership.
What evidence would demonstrate movement?	Creates a defensible measure before activity begins.
How will we test durability?	Distinguishes temporary performance from sustained readiness.

The most useful evaluation question may be: What is now more possible, more consistent or more observable than before?

Research context

Current workforce research reinforces the need to go beyond one-off training. The World Economic Forum estimates that nearly six in ten workers will need training by 2030, while McKinsey argues that AI-era learning needs to become continuous and embedded in everyday work. BCG similarly connects AI impact with workflow redesign, leadership support and sufficient training rather than tool deployment alone.

EVIDENCE BASE

References & source discipline

External sources inform the problem landscape. They are not presented as validation of Translate IDEAS™ proprietary frameworks.

1. World Economic Forum (2025). Future of Jobs Report 2025.
2. McKinsey & Company (2026). Reimagine learning and development for the AI age.
3. McKinsey & Company (2026). The AI upskilling challenge.
4. Boston Consulting Group (2025). AI at Work: Momentum Builds, but Gaps Remain.

Readiness evidence does not replace learning metrics. It completes the picture by asking whether capability is becoming usable, supported and durable.