

# Unit Assessment Report - Four Column

## Guam Community College

### CE&WD Department

**Mission Statement:** The Office of Continuing Education provides opportunities for learning that enrich the lives of individuals and improve the quality of living in our community.

**Vision Statement:** We are the premiere institution in the region which provides educational and technological "cutting edge" approaches in support of a trained workforce.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
<p>CE&amp;WD Department - SSUO #1: FA2012-SP 2013 Certificate or Online Training/Testing - Upon successful completion of the health certificate workshop students will receive a health certificate.</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> 10/08/2012</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> 03/10/2014</p> <p><b>SLO Status:</b> Completed the Assessment Cycle</p> <p><b>Program SLO/AUO Plan reflects/incorporates:</b> Institutional Strategic Master Plan (ISMP)</p> <p><b>Historical Assessment Perspective:</b> ISMP - Based on the comp evaluation report recommended to assess non-credit courses is now being implemented.</p>	<p><b>Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool Description:</b> Health Certificate Test results will be used as the measuring tool to determine success rate of completion. The last week of March locally developed test results and a pie chart showing the successful passing rate of participants will be uploaded into TracDat.</p> <p><b>Type of Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool:</b> Locally Developed Tests</p> <p><b>Criterion ( Written in % ):</b> 70% of the students who participate in the Health Certificate class during the last week of March will pass the Health Certificate Test.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">HCW March 2012</a> <a href="#">Health Certificate Workshop Syllabus</a></p>	<p>02/13/2013 - The CE&amp;WD office supports the Tourism and Hospitality Department in conducting the Health Certificate Workshops for the Department of Public Health and Social Services (DPHSS) Health Certificate (HC) Program. The CE&amp;WD office is responsible for registering and admitting students into the HC workshop. The CE&amp;WD office prepares and submits the final HC Student Test Score Roster to DPHSS to grant the "permanent annual" health certificate to successful completer/test-takers.</p> <p>Overall analysis of the HC Student Test Score Roster shows that of the 203 students scheduled by DPHSS for the HC Workshop during the last week of March 26 - 29, 2012, a total of 103 students registered. This HC Workshop yielded an attendance rate of close to 51% (50.7%, n=103) thus revealing a gap of a Of the 51% (n=103) of students who attended and completed the HC Workshop and tested, the final HC Student Test Score Roster shows that 77% (76.69%, n=103) of test-takers successfully passed with a failure rate of slightly over 23% (23.3%, n=24) of the remaining test-takers. Based on these findings, CE&amp;WD will review the assessment results with the Department Chair of the Tourism and Hospitality Department to determine if the Health Certificate Workshop curriculum and test instrument(s) need to be updated or revised to address the pass/failure rate of test-takers. Other areas to be addressed are the gaps between the number of students scheduled by DPHSS versus the actual number of registrants for the HC workshop as well as the determination of barriers affecting the failure rates of the test-takers (i.e., language barriers, etc.).</p> <p><b>Summary of Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p><b>Data Collection Status/Summary of Result Status:</b> Open</p> <p><b>Growth Budget Implications/Effect:</b> Over \$5,000</p> <p><b>Growth Budget Justification:</b> Increase in fees associated with Health Certificate Workshop for subject matter expert</p>	<p>02/13/2013 - Based on these findings, CE&amp;WD will review the assessment results with the Department Chair of the Tourism and Hospitality Department to determine if the Health Certificate Workshop curriculum and test instrument(s) need to be updated or revised to address the pass/failure rate of test-takers. Other areas to be addressed are the gaps between the number of students scheduled by DPHSS versus the actual number of registrants for the HC workshop as well as the determination of barriers affecting the failure rates of the test-takers (i.e., language barriers, etc.).</p> <p><b>Implementation Status:</b> 02/13/2013 - The curriculum and test instruments will be updated and the effectiveness of such changes will be documented and included in the CE&amp;WD next assessment cycle.</p>

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		<p>(Adjunct Instructor) costs. Budget Related Performance Indicators: Additional services may be required as a result to address the failure rate of test takers (i.e., new curriculum materials, instructors, ESL language barriers, language translator(s), test development into different language(s), etc.).</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">HCW March 2012</a>  <a href="#">Health Certificate Workshop Syllabus</a></p>	
<p>CE&amp;WD Department - SSUO #2: FA2012-SP2013 Specialized Training Courses (Non-credit) or CEUs - Students will demonstrate a better understanding of the fundamentals and principles of the Guam government procurement.</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> 10/08/2012</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> 03/11/2013</p> <p><b>SLO Status:</b> Completed the Assessment Cycle</p> <p><b>Program SLO/AUO Plan reflects/incorporates:</b> Institutional Strategic Master Plan (ISMP)</p> <p><b>Historical Assessment Perspective:</b> Based on the accreditation evaluation report recommendation to assess non-credit courses.</p>	<p><b>Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool Description:</b> Procurement Training Survey will be used as the measuring tool for the criterion. The survey tool will be uploaded into TracDat.</p> <p><b>Type of Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool:</b> Student Satisfaction Survey</p> <p><b>Criterion ( Written in % ):</b> 70% of the Spring 2012 students of the Procurement Training will agree they gained a better understanding of the Guam government procurement.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">Procurement Training Syllabus</a>  <a href="#">Procurement Training Survey.</a></p>	<p>02/13/2013 - The CE&amp;WD office worked with subject matter experts in developing the C_BE101 Procurement Training course for CEUs offered in Spring 2012. The first class was launched in February, 2012 with a total of 20 students registered. Of the students registered, 90% (n=18) completed the course and received 1.8 CEUs.</p> <p>CE&amp;WD administered the Procurement Training Survey (PTS) to the class. Overall analysis of the Procurement Training Survey (PTS) showed the following results. Of the 18 student completers of the course, the PTS yielded a response rate of close to 89% (88%, n=16).</p> <p>The students were asked to respond to the eight (8) survey questions which resulted as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When asked to if sufficient time was made available to discuss items listed on the syllabus, close to 38% (37.5%, n=6) strongly agreed, 63% (62.5%, n=10) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree.</li> <li>2. When asked if the instructor(s) demonstrated a knowledgeable and clear understanding of the subject matter, 75% (n=12) responded they strongly agreed, 25% (n=4) responded they agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree.</li> <li>3. When asked did the training provide information you can use to develop your agency/company?s current process or program, responses showed almost 69% (68.8%, n=11) strongly agree, 25% (n=4) agree, over 6% (6.3%, n=1) somewhat agree, with no response to disagree or strongly disagree.</li> <li>4. When asked do you have a better understanding of the subject matter to augment, strengthen or support your process or program, close to 69% (68.8%, n=11) strongly agree and over 31% (31.3%, n=5) agree, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree.</li> <li>5. When asked if the resource handbook, CD, handouts, and presentations helped explain the subject matter, the</li> </ol>	<p>02/13/2013 - Based on these findings, CE&amp;WD will review the assessment results with the subject matter experts to develop additional procurement training courses to address Guam?s procurement law and processes. The local industry certification program will continue to evolve into what is envisioned as the Guam Procurement Institute.</p> <p><b>Implementation Status:</b> 02/13/2013 - The goal is to develop a Procurement Institute. The dialogue between the procurement trainers and GCC has been initiated and the details of the Procurement Institute are being developed, refined, and tied to the GCC mission. Further evidence will continue to be collected through the CE&amp;WD assessment process.</p>

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		<p>responses included 75% (n=12) strongly agree, close to 19% (n=3) agree, over 6% (6.3%, n=1) somewhat agree, with no response to disagree or strongly disagree.</p> <p>6. Students were asked if the guest speakers provided useful information to increase their understanding or awareness of the subject matter and almost 69% (68.8%, n=11) responded they strongly agree, over 31% (31.3%, n=5) agree, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree.</p> <p>7. In response to the question what subject or topic did you find the most interesting or helpful, the students commented as follows:</p> <p>? 1 ? I found the topic of proper documentation of a purchase most helpful I also found having Mr. Brown + Mrs. Brooks participate in class very helpful. Mr. Perez is also a very knowledgeable man on procurement + it?s procedures.</p> <p>? 1 - Both the AG and Appeals was very interesting to hear.</p> <p>? 1 - This is history of procurement.</p> <p>? 1 - Procurement history.</p> <p>? 1 ? History of the Guam Procurement Law and to know that a policy office exists and also the powers of the policy office.</p> <p>? 1 ? Procurement process ? Ethics and moral values.</p> <p>? 1 ? The protest process as presented by the Public Auditor.</p> <p>? 1 ? GAR &amp; GCA topic.</p> <p>? 2- All subject(s).</p> <p>? 1 ? All.</p> <p>? 4 ?None.</p> <p>8. In response to improvements for the next training module, the students commented as follows:</p> <p>? 1 ? Give more advance notice of class times.</p> <p>? 1 - Would like to hear &amp; understand better the relationship between the agencies and CPO/DPW Dir. Find an agency who does thing ?right? or has a good system to present their system/process. Might be good at RFP or IFB, and another on contact management. Also produce contact mgmt as a topic.</p> <p>? 1 ? Continue to have procurement modules. Make it a course for a whole semester or more.</p> <p>? 1 ? Continue with the certificating of procurement officers.</p> <p>? 1 ? Get into the details of Bids, RFP?s, etc.</p> <p>? 1 ? More class discussions and real life situations be debated.</p> <p>? 1 ? Make it available venue at each Gov?t. Agency Facility.</p> <p>? 1 ? Need more time.</p> <p>? 1 ? Have more times.</p> <p>? 1 ? Break every 45 minutes.</p> <p>? 1 ? By limiting the class for 2 hours during the day.</p>	

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		<p>? 1 ? Better venue, sometimes to cold. ? 3 ? None.</p> <p><b>Summary of Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p><b>Data Collection Status/Summary of Result Status:</b> Open</p> <p><b>Growth Budget Implications/Effect:</b> Over \$5,000</p> <p><b>Growth Budget Justification:</b> Increase in budget costs will be required to hire additional subject matter experts and administrative assistance will be required for the development and growth operations for the procurement training program.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">Procurement Training Survey.</a> <a href="#">Procurement Training Syllabus</a></p>	
<p>CE&amp;WD Department - SSUO #3: FA2012-SP2013 Special Event: Work Readiness Training for Summer Employment Opportunity Program (SEOP) - Participants will report satisfaction with the knowledge learned on work readiness for immediate application for gainful employment or for continued high school education after the SEOP.</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> 10/08/2012</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> 03/10/2014</p> <p><b>SLO Status:</b> Completed the Assessment Cycle</p> <p><b>Program SLO/AUO Plan reflects/incorporates:</b> Institutional Strategic Master Plan (ISMP)</p> <p><b>Historical Assessment Perspective:</b> ISMP - Based on the comp evaluation report recommended to assess non-credit courses is now being implemented.</p>	<p><b>Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool Description:</b> The Work Readiness Training (WRT) survey will be used as the measuring tool for the criterion. The survey will be uploaded into TracDat.</p> <p><b>Type of Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool:</b> Student Satisfaction Survey</p> <p><b>Criterion ( Written in % ):</b> 70% of the participants of the Summer Employment Opportunity Program (SEOP) will be satisfied with the work readiness knowledge learned to apply at their SEOP Employer work-placement.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">Workforce Readiness Training for SEOP Syllabus</a> <a href="#">2012 SEOP Employer Survey.pdf</a></p>	<p>02/13/2013 - The CE&amp;WD office worked with subject matter experts to provide WRT for the participants of the Summer Employment Opportunity Program for high school students achieving academic excellence. The training was provided in Summer 2012 with a total of forty-four (44) students scheduled to attend. CE&amp;WD administered the Work Readiness Training (WRT) Survey to the participants. Overall analysis of the WRT Survey showed the following results. Of the 44, over 61% (61.4%, n= 27) students registered and completed the WRT. Of the 27 completers, close to 93% (92.59%, n=25) responded to the WRT Survey. The students were asked to respond to the four (4) survey questions which resulted as follows:</p> <p>1. When asked to rate their overall satisfaction with the training, the participants response rate shows 96% (n=24)very satisfied, 4% (n=1)somewhat satisfied, with no response to neutral, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied.</p> <p>2. When asked to rate if the trainer was knowledgeable, well-prepared and communicated well, the students responded as follows:</p> <p>? Customer Service Workshop: 92% (n=23) very satisfied with 8% (n=2) responding they did not attend, with no response to somewhat satisfied, neutral, or somewhat dissatisfied.</p> <p>? Dollars and Cents Workshop: 76% (n=19) very satisfied, 12% (n=3) somewhat satisfied, 8% (n=2) neutral, 4% (n=1) somewhat dissatisfied, with no response to very dissatisfied or did not attend.</p>	<p>02/13/2013 - Based on these findings, the SEOP will be a formalized program with the Work Readiness Training as a permanent component. Additionally, a Memorandum of Agreement will be generated between GCC and each Employer Group interested in providing summer employment job experience for the SEOP student trainee.</p> <p><b>Implementation Status:</b> 02/13/2013 - Subject matter experts will develop the training components, network to develop Employer Group participation, summer employment job placement and continued assessment of the SEOP to evolve into the leading mentorship-workforce development program for high school students who achieve academic excellence. The CE&amp;WD assessment process will include the results of the work to formalize the SEOP and all its components.</p>

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		<p>? Team Building Workshop: 88% (n=22) very satisfied, 16% (n=4) somewhat satisfied, 4% (n=1) neutral, with no response to somewhat dissatisfied, very dissatisfied or did not attend.</p> <p>? Social Media in the Workplace: 80% (n=20) very satisfied, 16% (n=4) somewhat satisfied, 4% (n=1) neutral, with no response to somewhat dissatisfied, very dissatisfied or did not attend.</p> <p>? Success Habits/Work Ethics: 84% (n=21) very satisfied, 16% (n=4) somewhat satisfied, with no response to neutral, somewhat dissatisfied, very dissatisfied or did not attend.</p> <p>3. When asked to rate their satisfaction with the following workshops, the students responded as follows:</p> <p>? Customer Service Workshop: 92% (n=23) agree with 8% (n=2) responding they did not attend, with no response to neutral or disagree.</p> <p>? Dollars and Cents Workshop: close to 96% (95.8%, n=23) agree with over 4% (4.2%, n=1) disagree, with no response to neutral or did not attend.</p> <p>? Team Building Workshop: 100% (n=25) agree with no response to neutral, disagree, or did not attend.</p> <p>? Social Media in the Workplace: 100% (n=25) agree with no response to neutral, disagree, or did not attend.</p> <p>? Success Habits/Work Ethics: 100% (n=25) agree with no response to neutral, disagree, or did not attend.</p> <p>4. In response to the open Comment section, 68% (n=17) responded:</p> <p>? Just by attending the workshop, I have learned so much about the work place.</p> <p>? In my honest opinion I believe that the training today was a success. I enjoyed the people, food, and the activities that were given. I learned new things that I have never knew (known) until now. I am glad that I was chosen to participate in the knowledgeable, fun and prosperous Workforce Development Training.</p> <p>? This was a good workshop, I learned a lot of new things that I can use in the workforce.</p> <p>? Thank you for this it really helped for the work force.</p> <p>? I am ready to work! But I need more knowledge on money.</p> <p>? This will help many students in the future.</p> <p>? I had a great and fun experience in today?s training.</p> <p>? I did expect to learn this much so I want to thank you all.</p> <p>? This training was very enjoyable. I had so much fun being here. I am grateful (grateful) that I was one of the chosen ones to be here.</p> <p>? The food was great! The program is really helping me out with the job dilemma.</p>	

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		<p>? Thank you (for) Changing my life.  ? It was very interesting and taught me a lot. It?s the only training class I took all summer that didn?t put me to sleep! Thank you!  ? Good Job!!!  ? I really learned a lot from this &amp; I enjoyed coming to this workshop.  ? I really enjoyed this program!!  ? Overall it good!  ? The Dollars and Cents speaker spoke a little too fast. Maybe you can try sense? The other speakers &amp; coordinators were very friendly and AWESOME</p> <p><b>Summary of Result Type:</b>  Criterion Met  <b>Data Collection Status/Summary of Result Status:</b>  Open  <b>Growth Budget Implications/Effect:</b>  Over \$5,000  <b>Growth Budget Justification:</b>  Budget costs will be required to formalize the SEOP, pay for trainers or Adjunct Instructors associated with the components of the SEOP, and administrative assistance needed to support the development and operations of the program.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">Workforce Readiness Training for SEOP Syllabus</a>  <a href="#">2012 SEOP Employer Survey.pdf</a></p>	
CE&WD Department - SSUO #1: SP2014-FA 2015 Certificate or Online Training/Testing_1 - Upon successful completion of the health certificate workshop students will be able to receive a health certificate. <b>Outcome Type:</b> SLO <b>Start Date:</b> 03/10/2014 <b>End Date:</b> 10/12/2015 <b>SLO Status:</b> Completed the Assessment Cycle <b>Program SLO/AUO Plan reflects/incorporates:</b> Use and Implementation of Results from the previous cycle <b>Historical Assessment Perspective:</b> The assessment of the Health Certificate Workshop began in Spring 2013 and further assessment of the same workshop will provide	<b>Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool Description:</b> Health Certificate Test Results will be used as the measuring tool to determine the success rate of completion. The last week of March test results and a pie chart showing the successful passing rate of participants will be uploaded into TracDat. <b>Type of Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool:</b> Locally Developed Tests <b>Criterion ( Written in % ):</b> 70% of the students who participate in the Health Certificate class during the last week of March will pass the Health Certificate Test. <b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">Health Certificate Workshop Syllabus</a>	10/21/2014 - The CEWD office supports the Tourism and Hospitality Department in conducting the Health	

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
<p>further data to support the updated Health Certificate Workshop curriculum and test instruments launched in FA2013.</p> <p><b>Budget Goals:</b> Over \$5,000</p>		<p>Certificate Workshops for the Department of Public Health and Social Services (DPHSS) Health Certificate (HC) Program. The CEWD office is responsible for registering and admitting students into the HC workshop. The CEWD office prepares and submits the final HC Student Test Score Roster to DPHSS to grant the permanent annual health certificate to successful completers/test-takers. Overall analysis of the HC Student Test Score Roster/Results for the workshop/test period of March 24 – March 31, 2014 utilizing the new test instrument introduced August 2013 shows that of the 313 students scheduled by DPHSS for the HC Workshop a total of 141 students registered. Of the 141 students registered, the HC Student Test Score Roster/Results show that close to 77% (76.60%, n=108) of the test-takers successfully passed the test with a failure rate of 23% (23.40%, n=33) of the remaining test-takers.</p> <p><b>Summary of Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p><b>Data Collection Status/Summary of Result Status:</b> Open</p> <p><b>Growth Budget Implications/Effect:</b> Over \$5,000</p> <p><b>Growth Budget Justification:</b> Growth Budget Justification: Increase in budget costs will be required to address the need for subject matter experts to provide written language translation services to develop the new test instrument specific to the ethnic groups represented in the unsuccessful test-taker population.</p> <p><b>Budget Related Proposed Outcomes:</b> 1. New Test Instrument 2. New Test Instrument in different languages</p>	<p>10/21/2014 - Based on these findings CEWD will review the assessment results with the Department Chair of the Tourism and Hospitality Department to determine what the barriers may be associated with the failure rate of 23% of the new test instrument. Test results of the same period in March 2013 showed the same failure rate of the unsuccessful test-takers utilizing the archived test instrument. Upon this determination (test questions, language barrier, etc.), the DC of Tourism and Hospitality and DPHSS would consider the development of a revised test instrument, the possibility of translating the test instruments into different languages relative to the ethnicity of the test-taker population experiencing language barriers in order to increase the success rate of test-takers in the HC workshops moving forward.</p>
		<p>10/21/2014 - The CEWD office supports the Tourism and Hospitality Department in conducting the Health Certificate Workshops for the Department of Public Health and Social Services (DPHSS) Health Certificate (HC) Program. The CEWD office is responsible for registering and admitting students into the HC workshop. The CEWD office prepares and submits the final HC Student Test Score Roster to DPHSS to grant the permanent annual health certificate to successful completers/test-takers. Overall analysis of the HC Student Test Score Roster/Results for the workshop/test period of March 24 – March 31, 2014 utilizing the new test instrument introduced August 2013 shows that of the 313 students scheduled by DPHSS for the HC Workshop a total of 141 students registered. Of the 141</p>	



Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		<p>students registered, the HC Student Test Score Roster/Results show that close to 77% (76.60%, n=108) of the test-takers successfully passed the test with a failure rate of 23% (23.40%, n=33) of the remaining test-takers.</p> <p><b>Summary of Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p><b>Data Collection Status/Summary of Result Status:</b> Open</p> <p><b>Growth Budget Implications/Effect:</b> Over \$5,000</p> <p><b>Growth Budget Justification:</b> Growth Budget Justification: Increase in budget costs will be required to address the need for subject matter experts to provide written language translation services to develop the new test instrument specific to the ethnic groups represented in the unsuccessful test-taker population.</p> <p><b>Budget Related Proposed Outcomes:</b> 1. New test instrument 2. New test instrument in different languages</p>	
		<p>10/21/2014 - The CEWD office supports the Tourism and Hospitality Department in conducting the Health Certificate Workshops for the Department of Public Health and Social Services (DPHSS) Health Certificate (HC) Program. The CEWD office is responsible for registering and admitting students into the HC workshop. The CEWD office prepares and submits the final HC Student Test Score Roster to DPHSS to grant the permanent annual health certificate to successful completers/test-takers. Overall analysis of the HC Student Test Score Roster/Results for the workshop/test period of March 24 – March 31, 2014 utilizing the new test instrument introduced August 2013 shows that of the 313 students scheduled by DPHSS for the HC Workshop a total of 141 students registered. Of the 141 students registered, the HC Student Test Score Roster/Results show that close to 77% (76.60%, n=108) of the test-takers successfully passed the test with a failure rate of 23% (23.40%, n=33) of the remaining test-takers.</p> <p><b>Summary of Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p><b>Data Collection Status/Summary of Result Status:</b> Open</p> <p><b>Growth Budget Implications/Effect:</b> Over \$5,000</p> <p><b>Growth Budget Justification:</b> Growth Budget Justification: Increase in budget</p>	<p>10/21/2014 - Based on these findings CEWD will review the assessment results with the Department Chair of the Tourism and Hospitality Department to determine what the barriers may be associated with the failure rate of 23% of the new test instrument. Test results of the same period in March 2013 showed the same failure rate of the unsuccessful test-takers utilizing the archived test instrument. Upon this determination (test questions, language barrier, etc.), the DC of Tourism and Hospitality and DPHSS would consider the development of a revised test instrument, the possibility of translating the test instruments into different languages relative to the ethnicity of the test-taker population experiencing language barriers in order to increase the success rate of test-takers in the HC workshops moving forward.</p> <p><b>Implementation Status:</b> 10/09/2015 - Criterion met. However, for FA15-SP17 Cycle, CEWD will discontinue assessing the</p>



Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		<p>costs will be required to address the need for subject matter experts to provide written language translation services to develop the new test instrument specific to the ethnic groups represented in the unsuccessful test-taker population.</p> <p><b>Budget Related Proposed Outcomes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New test instrument to yield an increase in the success rate of test-takers.</li> <li>2. New test instrument translated into different languages specific to the ethnic group representation of test-takers to address language barriers that may exist.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Implementation Status:</b></p> <p>Health Certificate Workshops (HCW). Department of Public Health and Social Services (DPHSS) will be administering and coordinating the HCW in the near future. Refer to related document form DPHSS Director.cbs</p> <p>10/21/2014 - The curriculum and test instruments will be updated and the effectiveness of such changes to curriculum content and test items will be documented and included in the CEWD next assessment cycle.</p>
<p>CE&amp;WD Department - SSUO #2: SP2014-FA2015 Specialized Training Courses (Non-credit) or CEUs_1 - Upon successful completion of the specialized training, more than 50% of students will be at able to demonstrate a better understanding of the fundamentals and principles of the Guam government procurement.</p> <p><b>Outcome Type:</b> SLO</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> 03/10/2014</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> 10/12/2015</p> <p><b>SLO Status:</b> Completed the Assessment Cycle</p>	<p><b>Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool Description:</b> Procurement Training Survey will be used as the measuring tool for the criterion. The survey tool will be uploaded into TracDat.</p> <p><b>Type of Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool:</b> Student Satisfaction Survey</p> <p><b>Criterion ( Written in % ):</b> 70% of the Spring 2014 students of the Procurement Training will agree they gained a better understanding of the Guam government procurement.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">CEWD Course Survey Template_January_2014.docx</a></p>		
<p><b>Program SLO/AUO Plan reflects/incorporates:</b> Use and Implementation of Results from the previous cycle</p> <p><b>Historical Assessment Perspective:</b> The assessment of the procurement specialized training began in Spring 2013 and further assessment of the same specialized training will provide further data to support the eventual development of the procurement certificate program.</p> <p><b>Budget Goals:</b> Over \$5,000 will be used to support CEWD operations in administering WorkKeys.</p>		<p>10/01/2014 - In February, 2012 the first course, C_BE101 Procurement Basic Training (PBT): Fundamentals &amp; Principles was developed and launched. The positive response rate received from the participants from both the public and private industry with regard to the student learning outcomes for this course provided the impetus to address the development of additional procurement training modules. A total of 3 additional procurement training modules were developed namely: C_BE102 PBT: Methods of Source Selection, C_BE103 PBT: Procurement Review Process, and C_BE104 PBT: Management &amp; Administration of Procurement. The courses were offered during the Spring 2014 and Summer 2014 semesters. An Evaluation Survey consisting of eight (8) questions was administered at the end of each course offering to the participants and the following are survey results per course.</p>	<p>10/09/2015 - CEWD sees the demand for training in Procurement Modules 1 through 4. Therefore, CEWD plans to further research and develop a curriculum for the Learning Outcomes Committee to review, with the goal of developing a local and nationally recognized certification and/or a degree program to meet Guam's industry needs. cbs</p> <hr/> <p>10/21/2014 - Based on these findings, the overall analysis of the 3 additional procurement CEU courses supports the procurement industry's demand and need for procurement training to raise</p>

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		<p>C_BE102 PBT: Methods of Source Selection – Of the students registered, 88% (88.25%, n=15) completed the course and received 1.8 CEUs. Overall analysis showed of the 17 students registered, the survey yielded a response rate of close to 71% (70.59%, n=12). For question 1, when asked if sufficient time was made available to discuss the items listed on the syllabus, close to 58% (58.33%, n=7) strongly agreed, close to 42% (41.67%, n=5) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 2, when asked did instructor(s) demonstrate a knowledgeable and clear understanding of the subject matter, close to 75% (n=9) strongly agreed, 25% (n=3) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 3, when asked did this training meet the Student Learning Outcomes for you to be able to legally acquire goods, services and construction under Guam law, embrace the importance of writing legal specifications that stand up to scrutiny, and identify a contract form and clauses best suited to meet performance requirements, 75% (n=9) strongly agreed, 17% (16.67%, n=2) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=1) somewhat agreed, with no response for disagree or strongly disagree. For question 4, when asked do you have a better understanding of the subject matter to augment, strengthen, or support your professional skills, close to 67% (66.67%, n=8), 33% (33.33%, n=4) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 5, when asked did the resource handbook, CD, handouts, and/or presentations help explain the subject matter, close to 75% (75%, n=9) strongly agreed, 25% (25%, n=3) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 6, when asked did the guest speakers/lecturers provide useful information to increase your understanding or awareness of the subject matter, close to 67% (66.67%, n=4) strongly agreed, 33% (33.33%, n=4) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 7, when asked what topic did you find the most interesting or helpful, of the 18%, (18.18%, n=2) who provided a response, 1 student found the small purchases/blanket purchase agreements topic interesting and another student found the real cases of protests and issues with other government of Guam agencies as an interesting topic, while 91% (90.90%, n=10) did not respond to the question. For question 8, when asked how we could improve the next training module, 25% (n=3), one student recommended additional group discussions on situations where the law or regulation applies, another student recommended more interactions with classmates...discuss issues and come</p>	<p>the professional standards in the field. The results support the development of the local industry certificate, the national industry certificate, the Certificate Program, and the Associate of Science degree for Procurement in compliance with Public Law 32-131.</p> <hr/> <p>10/01/2014 - described in detail what you found</p> <p><b>Implementation Status:</b></p> <p>10/01/2014 - With the implementation with the CPF, the instructors will be aware of the requirement .... TALK ABOUT IT ON HOW TO IMPROVE.</p> <hr/>

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		<p>up with solutions as a group and more speakers, while another student recommended short quizzes during the course of the training so we are better prepared for the final and 75% (n=9) did not respond.</p> <p>C_BE103 PBT: Procurement Review Process – Of the students registered, close to 58% (57.89%, n=15) completed the course and received 1.8 CEUs. Overall analysis showed of the 19 student registered, the survey yielded a response rate of close to 63% (63.16%, n=12). For question 1, when asked if sufficient time was made available to discuss the items listed on the syllabus, close to 67% (66.67%, n=8) strongly agreed, 33% (33.33%, n=4) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 2, when asked did instructor(s) demonstrate a knowledgeable and clear understanding of the subject matter, close to 67% (66.67%, n=8) strongly agreed, 33% (33.33%, n=4) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 3, when asked did this training meet the Student Learning Outcomes for you to be able to understand what to do, and when to do it, on receiving a protest of an IFB or RFP as a government employee or submitting a protest as a potential contractor, know how to timely prepare and conduct oneself if an appeal is taken of a protest decision to the Public Auditor, apply a remedy to a wrong created during the procurement process, and the process required for that, 50% (n=6) strongly agreed, close to 42% (41.67%, n=5) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=1) somewhat agreed, with no response for disagree or strongly disagree. For question 4, when asked do you have a better understanding of the subject matter to augment, strengthen, or support your professional skills, close to 75% (75%, n=9), 25% (n=3) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 5, when asked did the resource handbook, CD, handouts, and/or presentations help explain the subject matter, close to 67% (66.67% %, n=8) strongly agreed, 33% (33.33%, n=4) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 6, when asked did the guest speakers/lecturers provide useful information to increase your understanding or awareness of the subject matter, 75% (75%, n=9) strongly agreed, 25% (25%, n=3) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 7, when asked what topic did you find the most interesting or helpful, 17%, (16.67%, n=2) who provided a response, 1 student responded contract laws/regulations/procedures pertaining to construction (Bid bonds, etc.) an interesting topic while another student found the protests and its process,</p>	

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		<p>remedies when there's a protest as an interesting topic, while 83% (83.33%, n=10) did not respond to the question. For question 8, when asked how we could improve the next training module, 25% (n=3), one student recommended to have more discussion/scenarios regarding construction, another student recommended more class interactions, group projects, while another student recommended short quizzes during the course of the training so we are better prepared for the final and 75% (n=9) did not respond.</p> <p>C_BE104 PBT: Management &amp; Administration of Procurement – Of the 13 students registered, close to 100% (n=13) completed the course and received 1.8 CEUs. Overall analysis showed of the 13 student completers, the survey yielded a response rate of close to 92% (92.31%, n=12). For question 1, when asked if sufficient time was made available to discuss the items listed on the syllabus, close to 67% (66.67%, n=8) strongly agreed, 33% (33.33%, n=4) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 2, when asked did instructor(s) demonstrate a knowledgeable and clear understanding of the subject matter, close to 67% (66.67%, n=8) strongly agreed, 33% (33.33%, n=4) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 3, when asked did this training meet the Student Learning Outcomes for you to be able to know how to plan a procurement solicitation, from inception of a notion of need to preparation of specifications, know how to create an audit trail of documentation and price and cost data to attain an accountability outcome, know how to transition from contract solicitation to opening the contract and administering it during the course of performance, to enforcement of performance obligations and final close-out of the contract, 83% (83.33%, n=10) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=1) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=1) somewhat agreed, with no response for disagree or strongly disagree. For question 4, when asked do you have a better understanding of the subject matter to augment, strengthen, or support your professional skills, close to 42% (41.67%, n=5) strongly agreed, 58% (58.33%, n=7) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 5, when asked did the resource handbook, CD, handouts, and/or presentations help explain the subject matter, close to 75% (n=9) strongly agreed, 25% (n=3) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 6, when asked did the guest speakers/lecturers provide useful information to increase your understanding or awareness of the subject</p>	

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		<p>matter, close to 83% (83.33%, n=10) strongly agreed, 17% (16.67%, n=2) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 7, when asked what topic did you find the most interesting or helpful, of the 25%, (n=3) who provided a response, 1 student responded to first start out with a well thought out plan, another student found how to prepare bids and RFP an interesting topic, while another student really enjoyed the group projects, 75% (n=9) did not respond to the question. For question 8, when asked how we could improve the next training module, 25% (n=3), one student recommended take a little more time discussing scenarios to relate it to the material provided, another student recommended more guest speakers, while another student recommended short quizzes during the course of the training so we are better prepared for the final and 75% (n=9) did not respond.</p> <p><b>Summary of Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p><b>Data Collection Status/Summary of Result Status:</b> Open</p> <p><b>Growth Budget Implications/Effect:</b> Over \$5,000</p> <p><b>Growth Budget Justification:</b> Growth Budget Justification: Increase in budget costs will be required to address the need for additional subject matter experts to provide adjunct instructional services. Additional administrative staff assistance will be needed to implement the continued development and growth operations for the procurement training program as required by Public Law 32-131.</p> <p><b>Budget Related Proposed Outcomes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Local Industry Certificate in Procurement</li> <li>2. National Certification in Procurement</li> <li>3. Certificate Program in Procurement</li> <li>4. Associates of Science in Procurement</li> <li>5. Curriculum development of Procurement Courses</li> </ol> <p><b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">Health Certificate Workshop Syllabus</a></p>	
CE&WD Department - SSUO #3: SP2014-FA2015 Curriculum and Assessment - Upon successful completion of a CEWD course, over 50% of trainees/students will indicate they are able to apply the knowledge learned. The SLOs will be identified on course evaluations and agendas. CEWD will continue to improve the collection of course evaluations prior to paying	<p><b>Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool Description:</b></p> <p>An analysis of Coures/Event permission Forms (C/EPFs) and a review of assessment instruments and assessment plans attached will determine compliance with the new course offering requirement.</p>		

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
<p>adjunct for cycle FA2015-SP2017.</p> <p><b>Outcome Type:</b> SLO</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> 03/10/2014</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> 10/12/2015</p> <p><b>SLO Status:</b> Completed the Assessment Cycle</p> <p><b>Program SLO/AUO Plan reflects/incorporates:</b> Use and Implementation of Results from the previous cycle</p> <p><b>Historical Assessment Perspective:</b> In support of the Institutional Assessment Initiative, CEWD incorporated the requirements of including assessment instruments with Course Permission Forms (CPF). CEWD will continue to improve the collection of course evaluation analysis prior to paying adjunct for cycle FA2015-SP2017.</p> <p><b>Budget Goals:</b> Over \$5,000 will be used to support CEWD operations in relation to curriculum and operations assessment to make improvements or changes where needed.</p>	<p><b>Type of Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool:</b> Needs Assessment Review/Plan</p> <p><b>Criterion ( Written in % ):</b> 1) At least 25% of the CPFs/EPFs submitted through CEWD shall have the summary of assessment instrument attached; with 50% of trainees/students indicate they are able to apply the knowledge learned from course/training SLOs.</p> <p><b>Budget Related Performance Indicators:</b> Over \$5,000 will be used to support CEWD's operations in relation to course curriculum/assessment.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">CEWD Memo on Assessment Reporting_Final (2).pdf</a>  <a href="#">CE CPF EPF Form 2012</a>  <a href="#">DEPARTMENT 10222013.doc</a> </p>	<p>10/21/2014 - In February, 2012 the first course, C_BE101 Procurement Basic Training (PBT): Fundamentals &amp; Principles was developed and launched. The positive response rate received from the participants from both the public and private industry with regard to the student learning outcomes for this course provided the impetus to address the development of additional procurement training modules. A total of 3 additional procurement training modules were developed namely: C_BE102 PBT: Methods of Source Selection, C_BE103 PBT: Procurement Review Process, and C_BE104 PBT: Management &amp; Administration of Procurement. The courses were offered during the Spring 2014 and Summer 2014 semesters. An Evaluation Survey consisting of eight (8) questions was administered at the end of each course offering to the participants and the following are survey results per course.</p> <p>C_BE102 PBT: Methods of Source Selection – Of the students registered, 88% (88.25%, n=15) completed the course and received 1.8 CEUs. Overall analysis showed of the 17 students registered, the survey yielded a response rate of close to 71% (70.59%, n=12). For question 1, when asked if sufficient time was made available to discuss the items listed on the syllabus, close to 58% (58.33%, n=7) strongly agreed, close to 42% (41.67%, n=5) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 2, when asked did instructor(s) demonstrate a knowledgeable and clear understanding of the subject matter, close to 75% (n=9) strongly agreed, 25% (n=3) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree,</p>	<p>10/21/2014 - Based on these findings, the overall analysis of the 3 additional procurement CEU courses supports the procurement industry's demand and need for procurement training to raise the professional standards in the field. The results support the development of the local industry certificate, the national industry certificate, the Certificate Program, and the Associate of Science degree for Procurement in compliance with Public Law 32-131.</p>

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		<p>or strongly disagree. For question 3, when asked did this training meet the Student Learning Outcomes for you to be able to legally acquire goods, services and construction under Guam law, embrace the importance of writing legal specifications that stand up to scrutiny, and identify a contract form and clauses best suited to meet performance requirements, 75% (n=9) strongly agreed, 17% (16.67%, n=2) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=1) somewhat agreed, with no response for disagree or strongly disagree. For question 4, when asked do you have a better understanding of the subject matter to augment, strengthen, or support your professional skills, close to 67% (66.67%, n=8), 33% (33.33%, n=4) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 5, when asked did the resource handbook, CD, handouts, and/or presentations help explain the subject matter, close to 75% (75%, n=9) strongly agreed, 25% (25%, n=3) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 6, when asked did the guest speakers/lecturers provide useful information to increase your understanding or awareness of the subject matter, close to 67% (66.67%, n=4) strongly agreed, 33% (33.33%, n=4) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 7, when asked what topic did you find the most interesting or helpful, of the 18%, (18.18%, n=2) who provided a response, 1 student found the small purchases/blanket purchase agreements topic interesting and another student found the real cases of protests and issues with other government of Guam agencies as an interesting topic, while 91% (90.90%, n=10) did not respond to the question. For question 8, when asked how we could improve the next training module, 25% (n=3), one student recommended additional group discussions on situations were the law or regulation applies, another student recommended more interactions with classmates...discuss issues and come up with solutions as a group and more speakers, while another student recommended short quizzes during the course of the training so we are better prepared for the final and 75% (n=9) did not respond.</p> <p>C_BE103 PBT: Procurement Review Process – Of the students registered, close to 58% (57.89%, n=15) completed the course and received 1.8 CEUs. Overall analysis showed of the 19 student registered, the survey yielded a response rate of close to 63% (63.16%, n=12). For question 1, when asked if sufficient time was made available to discuss the items listed on the syllabus, close to 67% (66.67%, n=8) strongly agreed, 33% (33.33%, n=4) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 2,</p>	



Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		<p>when asked did instructor(s) demonstrate a knowledgeable and clear understanding of the subject matter, close to 67% (66.67%, n=8) strongly agreed, 33% (33.33%, n=4) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 3, when asked did this training meet the Student Learning Outcomes for you to be able to understand what to do, and when to do it, on receiving a protest of an IFB or RFP as a government employee or submitting a protest as a potential contractor, know how to timely prepare and conduct oneself if an appeal is taken of a protest decision to the Public Auditor, apply a remedy to a wrong created during the procurement process, and the process required for that, 50% (n=6) strongly agreed, close to 42% (41.67%, n=5) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=1) somewhat agreed, with no response for disagree or strongly disagree. For question 4, when asked do you have a better understanding of the subject matter to augment, strengthen, or support your professional skills, close to 75% (75%, n=9), 25% (n=3) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 5, when asked did the resource handbook, CD, handouts, and/or presentations help explain the subject matter, close to 67% (66.67% %, n=8) strongly agreed, 33% (33.33%, n=4) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 6, when asked did the guest speakers/lecturers provide useful information to increase your understanding or awareness of the subject matter, 75% (75%, n=9) strongly agreed, 25% (25%, n=3) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 7, when asked what topic did you find the most interesting or helpful, 17%, (16.67%, n=2) who provided a response, 1 student responded contract laws/regulations/procedures pertaining to construction (Bid bonds, etc.) an interesting topic while another student found the protests and its process, remedies when there's a protest as an interesting topic, while 83% (83.33%, n=10) did not respond to the question. For question 8, when asked how we could improve the next training module, 25% (n=3), one student recommended to have more discussion/scenarios regarding construction, another student recommended more class interactions, group projects, while another student recommended short quizzes during the course of the training so we are better prepared for the final and 75% (n=9) did not respond.</p> <p>C_BE104 PBT: Management &amp; Administration of Procurement – Of the 13 students registered, close to 100% (n=13) completed the course and received 1.8</p>	

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		<p>CEUs. Overall analysis showed of the 13 student completers, the survey yielded a response rate of close to 92% (92.31%, n=12). For question 1, when asked if sufficient time was made available to discuss the items listed on the syllabus, close to 67% (66.67%, n=8) strongly agreed, 33% (33.33%, n=4) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 2, when asked did instructor(s) demonstrate a knowledgeable and clear understanding of the subject matter, close to 67% (66.67%, n=8) strongly agreed, 33% (33.33%, n=4) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 3, when asked did this training meet the Student Learning Outcomes for you to be able to know how to plan a procurement solicitation, from inception of a notion of need to preparation of specifications, know how to create an audit trail of documentation and price and cost data to attain an accountability outcome, know how to transition from contract solicitation to opening the contract and administering it during the course of performance, to enforcement of performance obligations and final close-out of the contract, 83% (83.33%, n=10) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=1) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=1) somewhat agreed, with no response for disagree or strongly disagree. For question 4, when asked do you have a better understanding of the subject matter to augment, strengthen, or support your professional skills, close to 42% (41.67%, n=5) strongly agreed, 58% (58.33%, n=7) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 5, when asked did the resource handbook, CD, handouts, and/or presentations help explain the subject matter, close to 75% (n=9) strongly agreed, 25% (n=3) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 6, when asked did the guest speakers/lecturers provide useful information to increase your understanding or awareness of the subject matter, close to 83% (83.33%, n=10) strongly agreed, 17% (16.67%, n=2) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 7, when asked what topic did you find the most interesting or helpful, of the 25%, (n=3) who provided a response, 1 student responded to first start out with a well thought out plan, another student found how to prepare bids and RFP an interesting topic, while another student really enjoyed the group projects, 75% (n=9) did not respond to the question. For question 8, when asked how we could improve the next training module, 25% (n=3), one student recommended take a little more time discussing scenarios to relate it to the material provided, another student recommended more</p>	

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		<p>guest speakers, while another student recommended short quizzes during the course of the training so we are better prepared for the final and 75% (n=9) did not respond.</p> <p><b>Summary of Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p><b>Data Collection Status/Summary of Result Status:</b> Open</p> <p><b>Growth Budget Implications/Effect:</b> Over \$5,000</p> <p><b>Growth Budget Justification:</b> Growth Budget Justification: Increase in budget costs will be required to address the need for additional subject matter experts to provide adjunct instructional services. Additional administrative staff assistance will be needed to implement the continued development and growth operations for the procurement training program as required by Public Law 32-131.</p> <p><b>Budget Related Proposed Outcomes:</b> 1. Local Industry Certification in Procurement 2. National Industry Certification in Procurement 3. Associates of Science Degree in Procurement 4. Curriculum development of Procurement courses</p>	
		<p>10/21/2014 - A memorandum was disseminated from CEWD via the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Dean of TSS and the Dean of TPS informing all the Departments of the roll out of the evaluation process for CEU or noncredit courses, workshops, and training sessions for content effectiveness. This effort is in response to the ACCJC Evaluation Team recommendation 11.A.2 to develop a systematic evaluation process for CEU or noncredit courses offered through CEWD.</p> <p>The evaluation process as mentioned was scheduled to commence Spring 2014. Overall analysis of the results shows that a total of 35 CEU courses and a total of 65 noncredit courses, workshops, testing, or training sessions were offered through CEWD from January 1, 2014 – September 30, 2014. This is a combined total of 100 CEU and noncredit courses offered with a 27% (n=27) compliance rate of the assessment instrument (CEWD Evaluation Form) attached to the Course Permission or Event Permission forms.</p> <p><b>Summary of Result Type:</b> Criterion Met</p> <p><b>Data Collection Status/Summary of Result Status:</b></p>	<p>10/21/2014 - Based on these findings, CEWD will continue to cross-verify the inclusion of the CEWD Evaluation Form in the Course Permission or Event Permission Form packets submitted for signature approval. The continued goal is to realize at least a 25% increase in the compliance rate of curriculum and assessment requirements of the departments to align with the ACCJC recommendation 11.2.A to incorporate the CEWD process of systematically evaluating for CEU or noncredit courses, workshops, and training sessions for content effectiveness.</p> <p><b>Implementation Status:</b> 10/21/2014 - CEWD will continue to track the compliance rate of the inclusion of the CEWD Evaluation Form in the Course Permission or Event Permission Form packets submitted for approval. The</p>

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		<p>Open</p> <p><b>Growth Budget Implications/Effect:</b> Over \$5,000</p> <p><b>Growth Budget Justification:</b> The CEWD's efforts increase to incorporate a systematic process to assess CEU courses or noncredit activity, the data collected as a result of the evaluations of CEWD activity will provide the evidence to grow the department's services to the community by providing training to staff for continued professional development in the research and assessment field to support institutional efforts towards accreditation of the department programs (IACET), continued Banner training, building an adjunct pool specific to CEWD course offerings, potential utilization of software specific to continuing education and workforce development activity, and automation efforts for registration of courses offered through CEWD along with Banner System training.</p> <p><b>Budget Related Proposed Outcomes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. IACET accreditation achieved.</li> <li>2. CEWD Adjunct Pool established.</li> <li>3. Software specific to continuing education and workforce development activity.</li> <li>4. Computer system upgrades.</li> <li>5. Automation of registration for CEWD courses through Banner.</li> <li>6. Banner System Training</li> </ol>	<p><b>Implementation Status:</b> continued goal is to realize at least a 25% compliance rate increase. This continual cross-verification of CPF/EPF packets will establish a routine of efficiency in CEWD processes.</p> <hr/>
<p>CE&amp;WD Department - SSUO#1: FA2015-SP2017 Certificate or Online Training/Testing - Upon successful marketing, registering and coordinating with constituents/community partners (PAN, PEARSON, etc.) OR CEWD, there will be a 10% increase of students for testing/training to enhance individual's training/employment skills.</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> 10/14/2015</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> 03/13/2017</p> <p><b>SLO Status:</b> Currently being assessed</p> <p><b>Program SLO/AUO Plan reflects/incorporates:</b> Other</p> <p><b>Historical Assessment Perspective:</b> *</p>	<p><b>Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool Description:</b> Testing Schedule Statistics/Student Satisfaction Survey</p> <p><b>Type of Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool:</b> Lab/Skills Test</p> <p><b>Criterion ( Written in % ):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) There will be an increase of 10% of students for testing training from FY 2015.</li> <li>2) 70% of participants/partners will indicate they were satisfied with the customer service, including accessibility of scheduling test to enhance/improve their employment skills.</li> </ol> <p><b>Budget Related Performance Indicators:</b> Over \$5,000 for equipment and administrative fees relative to the on-line testing/training.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b></p>		

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
<p><b>Budget Goals:</b> Over \$5,000 expand testing availability to constituents.</p>	<p><a href="#">CEWD-Test Center Survey Template.pdf</a></p> <p><b>Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool</b> <b>Description:</b> Student log sheets</p> <p><b>Criterion ( Written in % ):</b> 1) There will be an increase of 10% of students for testing/training from FY15 2) 70% of participants/trainees will indicate they are satisfied with the customer services provided to enhance their employment skills</p> <p><b>Budget Related Performance Indicators:</b> Over \$5,000 will be spent to support CEWD operations for testing/training.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">15-16 CEWD_Testing Center Statistics.pdf</a></p>		
<p>CE&amp;WD Department - SSUO #2: FA2015-SP2017- Specialized Training Courses (Non-Credit OR CEUs) - Upon successful completion of the specialized training, students will indicate training increased their knowledge of the fundamentals and principles of the government procurement practices.</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> 10/14/2015</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> 03/13/2017</p> <p><b>SLO Status:</b> Currently being assessed</p> <p><b>Program SLO/AUO Plan reflects/incorporates:</b> Other</p> <p><b>Historical Assessment Perspective:</b> Based on the large demand for procurement training, CEWD plans in researching and developing a curriculum for the four procurement training modules to be reviewed by the Learning Outcomes Committee (LOC). CEWD's goal is to develop a curriculum where individuals can attain a local, national and international certificate/credit to meet the needs of the industry.</p> <p><b>Budget Goals:</b> Over \$5,000.</p>	<p><b>Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool</b> <b>Description:</b> Student/Trainee satisfaction survey will identify 1) how satisfied the students were with the procurement module training(s); 2) Will agree the training increased students/trainees knowledge of content area.</p> <p><b>Type of</b> <b>Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool:</b> Student Satisfaction Survey</p> <p><b>Criterion ( Written in % ):</b> 1) More than 50% of student/trainee will indicate they were satisfied overall with the training.</p> <p>2) More than 50% of students/trainees will indicate they agree training increased their knowledge in the content area.</p> <p><b>Budget Related Performance Indicators:</b> Budget allocation for books, administrative/supplies and instructor will support procurement training.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b> <a href="#">CEWD 15-16_C_BE101 Procurement Survey.pdf</a> <a href="#">CEWD 15-16_C_BE102 Procurement Survey.pdf</a> <a href="#">CEWD 15-16_C_BE103 Procurement Survey.pdf</a> <a href="#">CEWD 15-16_C_BE104 Procurement Survey.pdf</a></p>		

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria ( Written in % ) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
<p>CE&amp;WD Department - SSUO #3: Curriculum and Assessment - Upon successful completion of CEWD courses, at least 50% of trainees/students will indicate they are able to apply the knowledge learned from course(s). The SLOs will be identified on course evaluations and agendas. CEWD will continue to improve the collection of CEWD course eval analysis prior to paying out adjunct for current cycle.</p> <p><b>Start Date:</b> 10/14/2015</p> <p><b>End Date:</b> 03/13/2017</p> <p><b>SLO Status:</b> Currently being assessed</p> <p><b>Program SLO/AUO Plan reflects/incorporates:</b> Other</p> <p><b>Historical Assessment Perspective:</b> Over \$5,000 will be used to support CEWD operations and to continuously improve and assess CEWD's curriculum.</p> <p><b>Budget Goals:</b> 1. Grow budget to support operations (full/part-time faculty &amp; staff 2. Software necessary for training/testing 3. Training</p>	<p><b>Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool Description:</b> Analysis of Course/Event permission forms (CPF/EPF) and a review of assessment instruments/assessment plans will determine compliance with course offering requirements.</p> <p><b>Type of Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool:</b> Needs Assessment Review/Plan</p> <p><b>Criterion ( Written in % ):</b> At least 25% of CPFs/EPFs submitted through CEWD shall have the assessment analysis attached, with at least 50% of trainees/students indicating they are able to apply the knowledge learned from course/training SLOs.</p> <p><b>Budget Related Performance Indicators:</b> Over \$5,000 will be used to support CEWD operations and to continuously improve and assess CEWD's curriculum.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">CEWD CPF.EPF Department Form.docx</a>  <a href="#">CEWD NC-CEU Sample Student Survey.pdf</a> </p>		