

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT · TRAINING-IMPACT MEASUREMENT

Measuring what leadership training **actually changed.**

How a global IT services enterprise replaced gut-feel training evaluation with manager-validated, competency-level measurement across 106 leaders.

90° · SELF + MANAGER

6 COMPETENCIES

PRE / POST · MEDIAN

CLIENT

A global IT services & consulting enterprise

ANONYMIZED

106

LEADERS ASSESSED

57TRACKED THROUGH BOTH
READS**6**LEADERSHIP
COMPETENCIES**90°**SELF + MANAGER
RATINGS**+4.2**TOP MEDIAN GAIN
(PTS)





A big investment, judged by gut feel.

The enterprise had invested in a structured leadership development program for 106 of its mid-to-senior leaders. The investment was significant — but the way its impact was being judged was not.

Like most organizations, it had no objective way to know whether the training had actually changed how its leaders performed. Each available signal failed in a different way.

- 1 **Self-assessment alone inflates.** People rate themselves generously — especially after a development program they want to believe worked.
- 2 **Manager opinion alone is subjective.** It varies wildly from one reviewer to the next, with no common scale to anchor it.
- 3 **Satisfaction surveys measure the wrong thing.** They tell you whether people *enjoyed* the training — not whether they *grew*.

WHAT WAS AT STAKE FOR L&D

-  **Prove what was built**
No way to tell leadership which capabilities the program had genuinely strengthened — and which it hadn't.
-  **Justify the next cycle**
No defensible basis to justify — or sharpen — the next round of development investment.
-  **A common scale**
Ratings lived in different heads and formats — nothing let leaders and competencies be compared on the same terms.
-  **Before & after**
Without a captured baseline, any post-program read had nothing to be measured against.

THE BRIEF

Measurement they could defend.

The L&D team needed competency-level, before-and-after evidence — a read on training impact rigorous enough to stand behind in front of leadership, not a feeling that the program had gone well.

Three deliberate design choices.

PMaps deployed a structured leadership competency assessment across the full cohort, built so the result would be trustworthy by design — not by hope.



90° Measurement

CHOICE 01

Every leader was rated on the same competencies twice — by **themselves** and by their **manager**. Pairing self-perception against an independent observer removes self-presentation bias and surfaces the gap between how leaders see themselves and how they're experienced.



Defined Framework

CHOICE 02

Six enterprise-relevant competencies, each scored on a common **0–100 scale** — so every leader and every competency could be compared on the same terms.



Pre / Post Design, Median-Aggregated

CHOICE 03

A baseline was captured before training and re-measured afterward. Cohort scores were aggregated using **medians rather than averages**, so a handful of extreme scores couldn't distort the picture — giving leadership a stable, trustworthy read of where the group actually stood.

THE SIX-COMPETENCY FRAMEWORK

01

Problem Solving



02

Decision Making



03

Stakeholder Management



04

Business Storytelling



05

Business Acumen



06

Business Analytics



THE OUTPUT

An individual report for every leader — and one cohort view.

Each leader received strengths, development gaps, behavioral indicators, and pre-to-post movement. The L&D and HR leadership team received a group dashboard: a single, objective view of the entire cohort.

Real impact – and **honestly concentrated.**

A baseline was established across all 106 leaders; 57 completed the post-training re-assessment within the measurement window. Post-training, the cohort’s competency medians clustered tightly around **75 / 100** — a solid, consistent leadership bench.



THE HONEST FINDING

Not a vague "the training was a success," but competency-level evidence that the program's impact was real and *concentrated* — strong on stakeholder capability, limited elsewhere. For an L&D team, that distinction is the difference between repeating a program on faith and redesigning it on evidence.

From a feeling to a system.



Manager-validated evidence of impact

Satisfaction surveys and gut feel replaced with data leadership could stand behind.



Per-leader gap reports

A cohort-level program turned into 106 individual development conversations.



A defensible basis to redirect investment

Toward the five competencies the program didn't shift – and the leaders showing the most progress.



A repeatable measurement system

Re-runnable every development cycle to track movement over time.

WHY IT WORKED – THE PMAPS DIFFERENCE



90° design

Removes the self-presentation problem that makes single-source leadership data untrustworthy.



Median aggregation

Gives a robust cohort read that a few outliers can't distort.



Competency-level granularity

Tells you *what* changed, not just whether people were satisfied.



Individual + group reporting

Serves both the leader's development and the enterprise's talent strategy in one pass.

THE TAKEAWAY

For the first time, the enterprise could see exactly which leadership capabilities its investment moved – and which it didn't – *at the level of the individual leader.*

READY WHEN YOU ARE

Measure what your leadership investment **actually changes.**

Book a 30-minute walkthrough to see how PMaps measures leadership capability and development impact — at the level of the individual leader and the whole cohort.

[BOOK A DEMO →](#)[LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT](#)[!\[\]\(10f8862fc183b400327470ea85afe9ae_img.jpg\) ssawant@pmaps.in](mailto:ssawant@pmaps.in)[!\[\]\(e1d6102fe77919492c04879c8450f1f5_img.jpg\) assessment@pmaps.in](mailto:assessment@pmaps.in)[!\[\]\(73002692dd5e7a64e60946be3158e719_img.jpg\) +91 8591320212](tel:+918591320212)

106

LEADERS ASSESSED

90°

SELF + MANAGER

6

COMPETENCIES

+4.2

TOP MEDIAN GAIN