

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
CE&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. Start Date: 10/08/2012 End Date: 03/10/2014 SLO Status: Completed the Assessment Cycle Program SLO/AUO Plan reflects/incorporates: Institutional Strategic Master Plan (ISMP) Historical Assessment Perspective: ISMP - Based on the comp evaluation report recommended to assess non-credit courses is now being implemented.	Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool Description: 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. Type of Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool: Locally Developed Tests Criterion (Written in %): 70% of the students who participate in the Health Certificate class during the last week of March will pass the Health Certificate Test. Related Documents: HCW March 2012 Health Certificate Workshop Syllabus	02/13/2013 - The CE&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&WD office is responsible for registering and admitting students into the HC workshop. The CE&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. 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&WD will review the assessment results with the Department Chair of the	02/13/2013 - Based on these findings, CE&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.). Implementation Status: 02/13/2013 - The curriculum and test instruments will be updated and the effectiveness of such changes will be

Tourism and Hospitality Department to determine if the documented and included in the

CE&WD next assessment cycle.

Health Certificate Workshop curriculum and test

the test-takers (i.e., language barriers, etc.).

Growth Budget Implications/Effect:

Growth Budget Justification: Increase in fees associated with Health

Summary of Result Type:

Criterion Met

Over \$5,000

Open

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

Data Collection Status/Summary of Result Status:

Certificate Workshop for subject matter expert

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria (Written in %) / Tasks	Data Conection Status/Summary of Results $(N - c)$	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		(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.).	
		Related Documents: HCW March 2012 Health Certificate Workshop Syllabus	
CE&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.	Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool Description: Procurement Training Survey will be used as the measuring tool for the criterion. The survey tool will be uploaded into TracDat. Type of	02/13/2013 - The CE&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	02/13/2013 - Based on these findings, CE&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
Start Date: 10/08/2012 End Date:	Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool: Student Satisfaction Survey Criterion (Written in %):	CEUs. CE&WD administered the Procurement Training Survey (PTS) to the class. Overall analysis of the	certification program will continue to evolve into what is envisioned as the Guam Procurement Institute.
03/11/2013	70% of the Spring 2012 students of the	Procurement Training Survey (PTS) showed the	Guain Procurement Institute.
SLO Status: Completed the Assessment Cycle	Procurement Training will agree they gained a better understanding of the Guam government	following results. Of the 18 student completers of the course, the PTS yielded a response rate of close to 89%	Implementation Status:
Program SLO/AUO Plan	procurement.	(88%, n=16).	02/13/2013 - The goal is to develop a
reflects/incorporates:	Related Documents:	The students were asked to respond to the eight (8)	Procurement Institute. The dialogue

survey questions which resulted as follows:

or strongly disagree.

disagree or strongly disagree.

1. When asked to if sufficient time was made available

agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree,

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.

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

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

5. When asked if the resource handbook, CD, handouts, and presentations helped explain the subject matter, the

to discuss items listed on the syllabus, close to 38%

(37.5%, n=6) strongly agreed, 63% (62.5%, n=10)

2. When asked if the instructor(s) demonstrated a

Institutional Strategic Master Plan (ISMP)

Historical Assessment Perspective:

Based on the accreditation evaluation report recommendation to assess non-credit courses.

Generated by TracDat a product of Nuventive.

disagree.

Procurement Training Syllabus

Procurement Training Survey.

between the procurement trainers and

GCC has been intiated and the details

being developed, refined, and tied to

will continue to be collected through

the GCC mission. Further evidence

the CE&WD assessment process.

of the Procurement Institute are

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria (Written in %) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		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.	. 1
		6. Students were asked if the guest speakers provided	ŗ
		useful information to increase their understanding or	ŗ
		awareness of the subject matter and almost 69%	ŗ
		(68.8%, n=11) responded they strongly agree, over 31%	ŗ
		(31.3%, n=5) agree, with no response to somewhat	ŗ
		agree, disagree, or strongly disagree.	ŗ
		7. In response to the question what subject or topic did	ŗ
		you find the most interesting or helpful, the students commented as follows:	ŗ
		? 1 ? I found the topic of proper documentation of a	l,
		purchase most helpful I also found having Mr. Brown +	l,
		Mrs. Brooks participate in class very helpful. Mr. Perez	
		is also a very knowledgeable man on procurement +	ŗ
		it's procedures.	ŗ
		? 1 - Both the AG and Appeals was very interesting to	l,
		hear.	ŗ
		? 1 - This is history of procurement.	l,
		? 1 - Procurement history.	l,
/		? 1 ? History of the Guam Procurement Law and to	l,
		know that a policy office exists and also the powers of	l,
/		the policy office.	ŗ
/		? 1 ? Procurement process ? Ethics and moral values.	ŗ
/		? 1 ? The protest process as presented by the Public	ŗ
1		Auditor.	ŗ
/		? 1 ? GAR & GCA topic.	ŗ
		? 2- All subject(s).	ŗ
/		? 1 ? All.	ŗ
/		? 4 ?None.	ŗ
/		8. In response to improvements for the next training	ŗ
/		module, the students commented as follows:	ŗ
/		? 1 ? Give more advance notice of class times.? 1 - Would like to hear & understand better the	ŗ
/		? I - Would like to hear & 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.	,
/		? 1 ? Continue to have procurement modules. Make it a	,
/		course for a whole semester or more.	,
/		? 1 ? Continue with the certificating of procurement	
/		officers.	
/		? 1 ? Get into the details of Bids, RFP?s, etc.	
/		? 1 ? More class discussions and real life situations be	
/		debated.	
/		? 1 ? Make it available venue at each Gov?t. Agency	
/		Facility.	
/		? 1 ? Need more time.	
/		? 1 ? Have more times.	
/		? 1 ? Break every 45 minutes.	
1		? 1 ? By limiting the class for 2 hours during the day.	
l <u> </u>			
02/27/2017 5:39 PM	Generated by TracDat a pr	roduct of Nuventive.	Page 3 of 21

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria (Written in %) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	<u>%</u>)/Tasks	 2 1 ? Better venue, sometimes to cold. ? 3 ? None. 2 Summary of Result Type: Criterion Met Data Collection Status/Summary of Result Status: Open Growth Budget Implications/Effect: Over \$5,000 Growth Budget Justification: 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. 	Status
		Related Documents: Procurement Training Survey. Procurement Training Syllabus	

CE&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.

Start Date: 10/08/2012

End Date: 03/10/2014 SLO Status: Completed the Assessment Cycle

Program SLO/AUO Plan

reflects/incorporates:

Institutional Strategic Master Plan (ISMP) Historical Assessment Perspective:

ISMP - Based on the comp evaluation report recommended to assess non-credit courses is

now being implemented.

Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool Description:

The Work Readiness Training (WRT) survey will be used as the measuring tool for the criterion. The survey will be uploaded into TracDat.

Type of

Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool: Student Satisfaction Survey Criterion (Written in %):

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 workplacement.

Related Documents:

Workforce Readiness Training forSEOP Syllabus2012 SEOP Employer Survey.pdf

02/13/2013 - The CE&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&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: 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.

2. When asked to rate if the trainer was knowledgeable, well-prepared and communicated well, the students responded as follows:

? 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.

? 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.

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.

Implementation Status:

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&WD assessment process will include the results of the work to formalize the SEOP and all its components.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria (Written in %) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		 ? 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. ? 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. ? 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. 	
		 When asked to rate their satisfaction with the following workshops, the students responded as follows: Customer Service Workshop: 92% (n=23) agree with 8% (n=2) responding they did not attend, with no response to neutral or disagree. 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. Team Building Workshop: 100% (n=25) agree with no response to neutral, disagree, or did not attend. Social Media in the Workplace: 100% (n=25) agree with no response to neutral, disagree, or did not attend. Success Habits/Work Ethics: 100% (n=25) agree with no response to neutral, disagree, or did not attend. Success Habits/Work Ethics: 100% (n=25) agree with no response to neutral, disagree, or did not attend. Success Habits/Work Ethics: 100% (n=25) agree with no response to neutral, disagree, or did not attend. Success Habits/Work Ethics: 100% (n=25) agree with no response to neutral, disagree, or did not attend. In response to the open Comment section, 68% (n=17) responded: Just by attending the workshop, I have learned so much about the work place. 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. This was a good workshop, I learned a lot of new things that I can use in the workforce. I am ready to work! But I need more knowledge on money. This will help many students in the future. I had a great and fun experience in today?s training. I did expect to learn this much so I want to thank you all. This training was very enjoyable. I had so much fun bein	
		out with the job dilemma.	

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria (Written in %) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		 ? 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 & 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 & coordinators were very friendly and AWESOME Summary of Result Type: Criterion Met Data Collection Status/Summary of Result Status: Open Growth Budget Implications/Effect: Over \$5,000 Growth Budget Justification: 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. Related Documents: Workforce Readiness Training for SEOP Syllabus 2012 SEOP Employer Survey.pdf 	
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. Outcome Type: SLO Start Date: 03/10/2014 End Date: 10/12/2015 SLO Status: Completed the Assessment Cycle Program SLO/AUO Plan reflects/incorporates: Use and Implementation of Results from the previous cycle Historical Assessment Perspective:	Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool Description: 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. Type of Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool: Locally Developed Tests Criterion (Written in %): 70% of the students who participate in the Health Certificate class during the last week of March will pass the Health Certificate Test. Related Documents: Health Certificate Workshop Syllabus		
The assessment of the Health Certificate Workshop began in Spring 2013 and further assessment of the same workshop will provide		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
further data to support the updated Health Certificate Workshop curriculum and test instruments launched in FA2013. Budget Goals: Over \$5,000		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. Summary of Result Type: Criterion Met Data Collection Status/Summary of Result Status: Open Growth Budget Implications/Effect: Over \$5,000 Growth Budget Justification: Growth Budget Justification: 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. Budget Related Proposed Outcomes: 1. New Test Instrument 2. New Test Instrument in different languages	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.
		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	
<u>1</u> 02/27/2017 5:39 PM	Generated by TracDat a pro	oduct of Nuventive.	Page 7 of 21

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria (Written in %) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		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.	
		Summary of Result Type: Criterion Met Data Collection Status/Summary of Result Status: Open Growth Budget Implications/Effect: Over \$5,000 Growth Budget Justification: 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. Budget Related Proposed Outcomes: 1. New test instrument 2. New test instrument in different languages	
		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. Summary of Result Type: Criterion Met Data Collection Status/Summary of Result Status:	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.
		Open Growth Budget Implications/Effect: Over \$5,000 Growth Budget Justification: Growth Budget Justification: Increase in budget	Implementation Status: 10/09/2015 - Criterion met. However, for FA15-SP17 Cycle, CEWD will discontinue assessing the
02/27/2017 5:39 PM	Generated by TracDat a pro	oduct of Nuventive.	Page 8 of 21

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria (Written in %) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		 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. Budget Related Proposed Outcomes: New test instrument to yield an increase in the success rate of test-takers. New test instrument translated into different language specific to the ethnic group representation of test-takers to address language barriers that may exist. 	Implementation Status: 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 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.
CE&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. Outcome Type: SLO	Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool Description: Procurement Training Survey will be used as the measuring tool for the criterion. The survey tool will be uploaded into TracDat. Type of Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool: Student Satisfaction Survey Criterion (Written in %): 70% of the Spring 2014 students of the		

Start Date:

03/10/2014

End Date:

10/12/2015

SLO Status:

Completed the Assessment Cycle

Program SLO/AUO Plan reflects/incorporates:

Use and Implementation of Results from the

previous cycle

Historical Assessment Perspective: 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.

Budget Goals:

Over \$5,000 will be used to support CEWD operations in administering WorkKeys.

Procurement Training will agree they gained a better understanding of the Guam government procurement.

Related Documents: CEWD Course Survey

Template_January_2014.docx

10/01/2014 - In February, 2012 the first course, C_BE101 Procurement Basic Training (PBT): Fundamentals & 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 & 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.

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

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

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria (Written in %)/Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		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	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.
		somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 2, when asked did instructor(s) demonstrate a knowledgeable and clear understanding of the subject matter cleas to 75% (n=0) strongly agreed 25% (n=2)	10/01/2014 - described in detail what you found
		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	Implementation Status: 10/01/2014 - With the implementation with the CPF, the instructors will be aware of the requirement TALK ABOUT IT ON HOW TO IMPROVE.
		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 classmatesdiscuss issues and come	
02/27/2017 5:39 PM	Generated by TracDat a pro	oduct of Nuventive.	Page 10 of 21

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria (Written in %) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)		Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?) 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. 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 dii 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 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 disag	Status
		another student found the protests and its process,	

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria (Written in %) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
1		remedies when there's a protest as an interesting topic,	,
		while 83% (83.33%, n=10) did not respond to the	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1		question. For question 8, when asked how we could	ŗ
		improve the next training module, 25% (n=3), one	ľ
1		student recommended to have more	r
1		discussion/scenarios regarding construction, another	ŗ
1		student recommended more class interactions, group	,
1		projects, while another student recommended short	,
1		quizzes during the course of the training so we are	ŗ
1		better prepared for the final and 75% (n=9) did not	ŗ
1		respond.	,
1		C_BE104 PBT: Management & Administration of	ŗ
1		Procurement – Of the 13 students registered, close to $1000((n-12))$ completed the course and received 1.8	ŗ
1		100% (n=13) completed the course and received 1.8	,
1		CEUs. Overall analysis showed of the 13 student	ŗ
1		completers, the survey yielded a response rate of close to 0.2% (02.21%, n=12). For question 1, when excladif	
1		to 92% (92.31%, n=12). For question 1, when asked if	
1		sufficient time was made available to discuss the items listed on the syllabus, close to 67% (66.67%, $p=8$)	,
1		listed on the syllabus, close to 67% (66.67% , n=8) strongly agreed 33% (33.33% , n=4) agreed with no	ŗ
1		strongly agreed, 33% (33.33%, n=4) agreed, with no	ŗ
1		response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 2, when asked did instructor(s)	ŗ
1		disagree. For question 2, when asked did instructor(s) demonstrate a knowledgeable and clear understanding	,
1		of the subject matter, close to 67% (66.67% , $n=8$)	,
.1		strongly agreed, 33% (33.33% , $n=4$) agreed, with no	,
.1		response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly	ŗ
.1		disagree. For question 3, when asked did this training	,
.1		meet the Student Learning Outcomes for you to be able	ا
.1		to know how to plan a procurement solicitation, from	,
.1		inception of a notion of need to preparation of	,
.1		specifications, know how to create an audit trail of	,
.1		documentation and price and cost data to attain an	,
.1		accountability outcome, know how to transition from	
.1		contract solicitation to opening the contract and	,
.1		administering it during the course of performance, to	
.1		enforcement of performance obligations and final close-	
.1		out of the contract, 83% (83.33%, n=10) agreed, 8%	
.1		(8.33%, n=1) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=1) somewhat	
.1		agreed, with no response for disagree or strongly	
.1		disagree. For question 4, when asked do you have a	
.1		better understanding of the subject matter to augment,	
.1		strengthen, or support your professional skills, close to	
.1		42% (41.67%, n=5) strongly agreed, 58% (58.33%,	
.1		n=7) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree,	
.1		disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 5, when	
.1		asked did the resource handbook, CD, handouts, and/or	
.1		presentations help explain the subject matter, close to	
.1		75% (n=9) strongly agreed, 25% (n=3) agreed, with no	
.1		response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly	
.1		disagree. For question 6, when asked did the guest	
.1		speakers/lecturers provide useful information to	
.1		increase your understanding or awareness of the subject	í
1 02/27/2017 5:39 PM			
	Concrated by TracDat a pr	reduct of Numerative	$\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{a}\mathbf{c}\mathbf{c}\mathbf{c}} = 12 \mathbf{c}\mathbf{f} 21$

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria (Written in %) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		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 short quizzes during the course of the training so we are better prepared for the final and 75% (n=9) did not respond.	
		 Summary of Result Type: Criterion Met Data Collection Status/Summary of Result Status: Open Growth Budget Implications/Effect: Over \$5,000 Growth Budget Justification: 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. Budget Related Proposed Outcomes: 1. Local Industry Certificate in Procurement 2. National Certification in Procurement 3. Certificate Program in Procurement 4. Associates of Science in Procurement 5. Curriculum development of Procurement Courses Related Documents: 	
		Related Documents: Health Certificate Workshop Syllabus	
CE&WD Department - SSUO #3: SP2014- FA2015 Curriculum and Assessment - Upon successful completion of a CEWD course, over	Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool Description: An analysis of Coures/Event permission Forms		

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

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.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria (Written in %) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
adjunct for cycle FA2015-SP2017.	Type of		
Outcome Type:	Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool:		
SLO	Needs Assessment Review/Plan		
Start Date:	Criterion (Written in %):		
03/10/2014	1) At least 25% of the CPFs/EPFs submitted		
End Date:	through CEWD shall have the summary of		
10/12/2015	assessment instrument attached; with 50% of		
SLO Status:	trainees/students indicate they are able to apply		
Completed the Assessment Cycle	the knowledge learned from course/training		
Program SLO/AUO Plan	SLOs.		
reflects/incorporates:	Budget Related Performance Indicators:		
Use and Implementation of Results from the	Over \$5,000 will be used to support CEWD's		
previous cycle	operations in relation to course curriculum/assessment.		
Historical Assessment Perspective:			
In support of the Institutional Assessment	Related Documents:		
Initiative, CEWD incorporated the requirements	CEWD Memo on Assessment		
of including assessment instruments with Course			
Permission Forms (CPF). CEWD will continue	CE CPF EPF Form 2012		
to improve the collection of course evaluation	DEPARTMENT 10222013.doc		
analysis prior to paying adjunct for cycle			

FA2015-SP2017. Budget Goals:

Over \$5,000 will be used to support CEWD operations in relation to curriculum and operations assessment to make improvements or changes where needed.

10/21/2014 - In February, 2012 the first course, C_BE101 Procurement Basic Training (PBT): Fundamentals & 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 & 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.

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,

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.

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		or strongly disagree. For question 3, when asked did	ľ
		this training meet the Student Learning Outcomes for	,
1		you to be able to legally acquire goods, services and	,
		construction under Guam law, embrace the importance	,
1		of writing legal specifications that stand up to scrutiny,	ŗ
1		and identify a contract form and clauses best suited to	ľ
1		meet performance requirements, 75% (n=9) strongly	,
1		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	ŗ
1		have a better understanding of the subject matter to	ľ
1		augment, strengthen, or support your professional r_{1}	
1		skills, close to 67% (66.67%, n=8), 33% (33.33%, n=4)	ŗ
1		agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree,	ŗ
1		or strongly disagree. For question 5, when asked did the	
1		resource handbook, CD, handouts, and/or presentations	ŗ
1		help explain the subject matter, close to 75% (75%, $n=9$) strongly agreed 25% (25%, $n=3$) agreed with no	ŗ
1		n=9) strongly agreed, 25% (25%, n=3) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly	ŗ
1		disagree. For question 6, when asked did the guest	ŗ
1		speakers/lecturers provide useful information to	ŗ
1		increase your understanding or awareness of the subject	۲ ۲
1		matter, close to 67% (66.67% , $n=4$) strongly agreed,	ŗ
.1		33% (33.33%, n=4) agreed, with no response to	ŗ
.1		somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For	ŗ
.1		question 7, when asked what topic did you find the	ŗ
.1		most interesting or helpful, of the 18% , (18.18%, n=2)	,
.1		who provided a response, 1 student found the small	,
.1		purchases/blanket purchase agreements topic interesting	<u>z</u>
.1		and another student found the real cases of protests and	
.1		issues with other government of Guam agencies as an	,
.1		interesting topic, while 91% (90.90%, n=10) did not	,
.1		respond to the question. For question 8, when asked	,
.1		how we could improve the next training module, 25%	,
.1		(n=3), one student recommended additional group	
.1		discussions on situations were the law or regulation	
.1		applies, another student recommended more	
.1		interactions with classmatesdiscuss issues and come	
.1		up with solutions as a group and more speakers, while	
.1		another student recommended short quizzes during the	
.1		course of the training so we are better prepared for the final and 75% (n=0) did not reasoned	
.1		final and 75% (n=9) did not respond.	
.1		C_BE103 PBT: Procurement Review Process – Of the students registered close to 58% (57.89% p=15)	
.1		students registered, close to 58% (57.89%, n=15)	
.1		completed the course and received 1.8 CEUs. Overall analysis showed of the 19 student registered, the survey	-
.1		yielded a response rate of close to 63% (63.16% , $n=12$).	
.1		For question 1, when asked if sufficient time was made	
.1		available to discuss the items listed on the syllabus,	
.1		close to 67% (66.67%, n=8) strongly agreed, 33%	
.1		(33.33%, n=4) agreed, with no response to somewhat	
.1		agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 2,	
,1		agree, usugree, or strongly usugree. For question =,	
02/27/2017 5:39 PM		roduct of Nuventive	Page 15 of 21

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria (Written in %)/Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)		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. C_BE104 PBT: Management & 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 completes, the survey yieledia a require rate of close to 92% (0.23)%, n=12). For question 1, when asked it asilicitent time was made available totknows. Its items listed in the xyliana, close to 17% (66/07%, n=3) errorspores to somewhat agree, disagree, or storughy disagree. For question 2, when asked did instructor(s) demonstrates a loss/skipsalite and the xyliana (2.6) (66/07%, n=3) astrongly agreed, 33% (13.33%, n=1, n=3) astrongly	Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria (Written in %) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
completes, the survey studied arophone real of close to 95% (92.31%), en (2). For question 1, when asked if sufficient time was made available to discuss the items linet on the system, 17% (93.35%, ref.) and strongly agreed, 37% (93.35%, ref.) and the subject of the subject discuss the items that the demossrate a knowledgeader and clear understanding. Of the subject and clear understanding of the subject and clear understanding of the subject and clear understanding. Of the subject masket discuss that arow the subject discuss that are expense to somewhat agree, discusse, ref. subject and the straining met the Subdeck Learning Outcomes for you to be able as the subject of the subject of the subject discusses that are subject to the subject of the subject discusses that are accountability unaccines, know how to create an and subt trail of the decounter subject of the subject discussion from cuerinat solicitation to expense that agree, disagree, the accountability unaccines, know how to create an advect that the sub- dimension of the subject discussion from cuerinat solicitation to expense and the subject discussion from cuerinat solicitation to expense and the subject masket and administering a parent shaped. See, (53.3%, ref.) somewhat agreed, with an response for disgators and final does a strengthen, ref. Single AS (63.3%, ref.) somewhat agreed, with an response for disgators and final does administering append. See, (53.3%, ref.) somewhat agreed, (41.6%, ref.) strengthen agreed, see, (63.3%, ref.) somewhat agreed, (41.6%, ref.) strengthen agreed, see, (63.3%, ref.) somewhat agreed, (41.6%, ref.) strengthen agreed, see, (63.3%, ref.) and (41.6%, ref.) strengthen agreed, see, (63.3%, ref.) speed, see, (63.3%, ref.) speed, see, (63.3%, ref.) speed, see, (63.3%, ref.) speed, ref. (63.3%, ref.) agreed, see, (63.3%, ref.) speed, see, (6			CEUs. Overall analysis showed of the 13 student	
 to 95% (92.31%, -rel 3), For 95% (96.67%, n.=3) sufficient time was made available to does not 67% (96.67%, n.=3) strongly agend, 33%, 33.33%, n=4) agend, with no response to somewhat agers, of 7% (96.67%, n.=3) strongly agend, 33%, 33.33%, n=4) agend, with no response to somewhat agers, or strongly diagend, and the strongly agend, and the strong strong agend, and the strong strong agend, and the strong strong				
sufficient time, was made available to discuss the items listed on the syllabus, close to 67% (66.7%, n=8) strongly agreed, 33% (63.35%, n=4) agreed, with no response to sourcesha agree, discusser, or strongly diagnees. For question 2, Warner Adata and Edit and and stranding of the subject nutrier, close are strongly of the subject nutrier, close are strongly discusser. For question 2, Warner Adata and Stranding of the subject nutrier, close are strongly discusser. For question 3, Warner Adata and Stranding of the subject nutrier, close are strongly discusser. For question 3, Warner Adata and the stranding of the subject nutrier, close are strongly discusser. For question 3, Warner Adata and the stranding meet the Student Learning Outcourse for you to be able to know how to plan a processer and stration of specifications, know how to crastism and it rail of documentation and price and cost data to statia an accountability outcome, know how to reatest and administring if during the correct of performance, to ac- counter solicitation to pering the cortact and administring if during the correct of performance, to ac- counter solicitation to appening the cortact and administring if during the correct of strongly disagree. For question 4, Mark 53(35%, n=1) somewhat agreed, with the subject nutries and string and advin strongly disagreed. Strongly agreed, Strongly disagreed. For question 4, Mark 53(35%, n=1) somewhat agreed, with the response for disagree or strongly disagreed. For question 4, Warner Stranding of the subject nutries, randor advin the subject nutries and of the subject nutries and able of the subject nutries and advin the subject nutries. The adving adving the subject of the subject nutries, randor asked did the resource handback, rCh, handback, did by greed. Now asked did the resource handback, rCh, handback, randor asked did the resource handback, rule handback and by adving response to somewhat agree, distance, not strongly distance. For question 4, Warn adving adving the for mattic resource handba				
strongly agreed. 33% (33.3%, m-1) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disreger, or strongly disagree. For question 2, when asked did instructor(s) disorder and antwork(q) and an addie and understanding of the subject matter, close to 5% (66.6%, n-8) strongly agreed. 3% (33.3%, m-1) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly most the Studient Learning Outcomes for you to be able to know how to plan a programmation of need to perform a need to studient Learning Outcomes of the able to know how to plan a programmation of specifications, know how to reate an audit total of a constraint of a need to or studient of the outperformance of the constraint of the outperformance obligation. From a constraint of performance obligation for a constraint of performance obligation for a constraint of performance obligation for a constraint of performance obligation and fraid close- out of the vontant. Sfr. 80(3.3%, m-1) agreed, 8% to the vontant of performance obligation for a greed, with no response for usinger we strongly disagree. For question 4, when aked do yon have a better understanding of the subject matter to agreent, strengthen, or simply agreed. Sing (4.33%, m-1) agreed, 8% to all the resource handbook. (20) handoons, and fraid close- ton of the vontant. Sfr. (8.33%, m-1) agreed, with no saked did the resource handbook. (20) handoons, and a sing strengthen, or simply agreed. (20) handoons, and a sing strengthen, or simply agreed. (20) handoons, and a sing strengthen, or simply agreed, (20) handoons, and a sing strengthen, and strengthen, and strengthen, and a sing strengthen, and strengthen, and strengthen, and a sing strengthen, when aked did the resource handbook. (20) handoons, and a sing strengthen, when aked did the resource handbook. (20) handoons, and a sing strengthen, when aked did the resource handbook did by greed a sing strengthen, when aked what togic did the resource handbook. (20) handbook strengthen a sing strengthen, is strengthen, and the sing strengthen strengthen and				
response to somewhat arge, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 2, when asked did instructor(s) demonstrate a knowledgeth and clear understanding of the shiple transtre, clears to 7% (66.67%, n=4) strongly agreed, 33%, 123%, n=1) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 7, when asked did this training most the Shankon Learning Outcomes for you to be able to somewhat agree, disagree, and the able to somewhat agree, disagree and the able contract solicitation to transition from contract solicitation to transition from contract solicitation to transition from contract solicitation to partornauce, to enforcement of performance, to enforcement of performance, no enforcement of performance, no enforcement of performance, and and the able to the transfer agreed. with in o transfer for diagree or strongly disagree. For question A, when asked do you have a better understanding of the shiple transfer to agreed, still, close to 44% (41.6%, still, store) and stored. Still, close to the strongly agreed, 25% (close), and/or presentions help explained. Store, close to response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree, or strongly disagree, for question A, when asked the store to BSW, (Store, n=2) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree, for question A, when asked di the guest speakers/lettures provide, strong disagree, for question A, when asked di the performance to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question A, when asked di the performance to somewhat agree, dis			listed on the syllabus, close to 67% (66.67%, n=8)	
disignes. For question 2, when asked did inversion(s) demonstrate a knowledgebb and clear understanding of the subject matter, lose to 67%, (66.5%, (78%) strongly gareed, 33% (63.3%), (7.5%), (7.5%), (7.5%) disignes, 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 transition from contrast solicitation, from accountability outcome, know how to transition from contrast solicitation of need to preparation of specifications, know how to transition from contrast solicitation of need to preparation of accountability outcome, know how to transition from contrast solicitation of population from contrast solicitation of population and final close- out of the contrast, solicitation of pageod, 8% (8.33%), en-1) gareed, 8% (83.33%), en-1) gareed, 8% (8.33%), en-1) gareed, 8% (83.33%), en-1) gareed, 8% (8.33%), en-1) gareed, 8% (83.33%), en-1 somewhat agreed, with no response for disagree or strongly disagree, For question 4, when a sole do you have a better understanding of the subject matter to augment, strengthen, or support your projections ad kills, Close to 42% (41.67%), en-2) gareed, 5% (83.3%), en-3) gareed, 8% (83.3%), en-10 gareed, 8% (83.3%), en-3) gareed, 8% (83.3%), en-3) gareed, with no response to somewhat garee, disagree, or strongly gareed, 5% (0.5%), and all disagree, or strongly gareed, 5% (0.5%), and all disagreed, regression for disagree, or strongly disagree, or strongly gareed, 5% (0.5%), and all disagreed, regression for disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree, or strongly gareed, 5% (0.5%), and all disagreed, regression for disagree, for disagree, for disagree, for disagreed, regression for disagree, for disagree, for disagreed,			strongly agreed, 33% (33.33%, n=4) agreed, with no	
demönstrate a knowledgelbe and clear understanding of the subject matter, close to 67% 66.67%, n=W) strongly agred, 33% (6.67%, n=W) disagree. Ter question 3, when asked id this training met the Student Learning Ottomes for you to be able to know how to plan a procurement solicitation, from inception of a notion of a notion of acid to preparation of epecifications, know to transition from inception of a notion of acid to preparation of epecifications, know to transition from control a notion of acid to preparation of epecifications, know to transition from control acid to preparation of epecifications, know to transition from control acid to preparation of epecifications, know to transition from control to prepare the contract, and the acid transition of acid to preparation of epecifications (know to transition from control to preparation of acid to preparation of enforcement to performance, to enforcement to performance biligations and final close- out of the contract, 43% (63.33%, n=10) agreed. %% (63.3%, n=1) agreed, %% (13.3%, n=10) agreed. %% (63.3%, n=1) agreed, %% (13.3%, n=10) agreed. %% (53.3%, n=1) agreed, %% (13.4%), (n=3.3%), agreed, 5% (53.5%), agreed abetic understanding of the subject matter to angreent, strongthen, or support your professional kglitt, close to 4.3% (1.6%), n=5.3 strongly agreed, 5% (53.5%), (n=3.3%), agreed, with no response to surrewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question (C.D), handbutt, andfor presentations help capital he subject matter to agreed, with no response to surrewhat agreed, with no response to source handbow (C.D), handbutt, andfor presentations help capital he subject matter, close to 17% (16.6%), n=3.2 agreed, with no response to source handbow (C.D), handbutt, andfor presentations help capital he subject matter, close to source handbow (C.D), handbutt, andfor presentations help capital here and keil di due guest speakers/lectures provide useful information to increase your understanding or atter, close to source hand agreed, subject matter, clos				
of the subject matter, i-06 set of 3% (66 3%, n=4) strongly agreed, 3% (63 3%, n=-1) agreed, with no response to somewhat gree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 3, when saded did this training meet the Student Learning Outcomes for you to be able to know how how to plan a procurement solicitation. From inception of a notion fored to preparation of specifications, know how to transition from contract solicitation of periodic and and thrail of documentation and protein and notice that and the station contract solicitation of periodic and solitation from contract solicitation of periodic and periodic and the solitation administry it during the contract and administry of thraing the contract and administry of thraing the contract and administry of thraing the contract and periodic and the contract solicitation of periodic and periodic and the solitation of the solitation of periodic and periodic and the solitation of earlier of periodic and periodic and periodic and the solitation administry of the solitation of the solitation of the solitation of earlier of periodic and periodic and periodic and the solitation of earlier of periodic and periodic an				
strongly 'agreed, Six' (33.33%, i-14) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, Gisagree, or strongly disagree. For question 3, when asked thil this training meet the Student Learning (Duttomes for you to be able to know how to preparation of appecifications, know how to retate an audit trail of documentation and price and cost duat to attain an accountability outcome, know how to transition from contract solicitation to genering the contract and administering it during the course of performance, to enforcement of performance obligations and final close- out of the counter, 45% (83.33%, n=1) agreed, 5% (8.33%, n=1) agreed, 5% (8.33%, n=1) somewhat agreed, with no response to strongly disagreed, with no response for disagreed or strongly disagreed, with no response to somewhat agreed, 42% (41.67%, n=3) strongly agreed, 5% (63.33%, n=7) agreed, with no response to more strongly disagreed, with no response to more strongly disagreed to response to more strongly agreed, strongly disagreed, with no response to more strongly agreed, when asked disagreed astrongly agreed, disagree, of strongly disagreed to response to more strongly agreed, the response of the strongly agreed, disagreed astrongly agreed, strongly disagreed to response to more strongly agreed, disagreed disagreed to response to more strongly agreed, disagreed disagreed to response to more strongly agreed, disagreed disagreed, field the response to more strongly disagreed. T75% (n=0) dits not response to more strongly disa			• •	
response to somewhat agrees, disagree, or strongly disagrees. 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 rock to preparation of specifications, know how to reate an audit trail of documentation and price and cost data to attain an accountant solicitation to preving the contrast and administering it during the course of performance, to enforcement of performance obligations and final close- out of the contract, 38%, 163,38%, n=10 Jagreed, 38% (8,33%, n=1) agreed, 38%, 633%, n=10 Jagreed, 58% (8,33%, n=1) agreed, 58%, 633%, n=10 Jagreed, 58% (5,33%, n=7) agreed, 38%, 633%, n=10 Jagreed, 58% (5,33%, n=7) agreed, 58%, 633%, n=10 Jagreed, 58% (1,67%, n=9) strongly agreed, 25% (n=3) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, For question 5, when asked did the guest asked did the response to log disagree. For question 5, when asked did the response to somewhat agree, disagree. For question 5, when asked did the guest predextentions help explain the subject matter to agreed, 58% (1,67%, n=9) strongly gareed, 25% (n=3) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 7, when asked did the guest predextention for the assocreases of the subject matter, close to 83% (633, n=10) strongly gareed, 25% (n=9) did not response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 7, when asked what topic did you find the moto increase your underly did support, 17% (1,66%, n=3), nestudent responded to first start ot with a well theogenot of the 25%, (n=3) who provided a response to the subject matter is on the somewhat agree, disagree, for strongly did a			•	
disagree. Tor 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 increption of a notion of need to preparation of specifications, how how to to cract an audit trail of documentation and price and cost data to statia an accountability outcome, know how to trainstion from contrast solicitation to pening the contract and administering if udring the course of performance, to enforcement of performance, to specifications, 83% (83.3%, n=10) agreed, 8% (8.3.3%, n=1) agreed, 8% (8.3.3%, n=1) agreed, 8% (8.3.3%, n=10) agreed, 1% how asked do you have a better understanding of the subject matter to agment, strengthen, or support your professional skills, close to 4.2% (41.6%) nongly agreed, 5% (8.3.3%, n=10) agreed, with no response to Somewhat agree, disagree, for question 5, when asked did the resource handbook, CD, handbook, and or presentations 1% how agreed, 9% than of the subject matter, close to 7.3% (16.6%) storagly agreed, 8% (n=0) storage species, 1% than of the resource handbook, CD, handbook, and or presentations 1% and agreed, 9% than of the subject matter, close to 1.2% (16.6%), n=0, agreed, 9% than of the subject matter, close to 1.2% (16.6%), n=0, agreed, 9% than of the subject matter, close to 1.3% (n=0) storage species, 1% than of the subject matter, close to 1.3% (n=0) storage species, 1% than of the most interesting or helphic, 17% (16.6%), n=0, agreed, 1% than of the most interesting or helphic, 1% and 1% agreed, 1% than of the most interesting or helphic, 1% advect the most interesting or helphic, 1% advect the subject interesting or helphic, 1% a				
meei the Studen Learning Outcomes for you to be able to know how to plan a proterment solicitation, from inception of a notion of need to preparation of specifications, know how to create an auxili trail of documentation and price and cost data to attain an accountability outcome, know how to trainstion from contract solicitation to opening the course of performance, to enforcement of performance obligations and final close- out of the contract, 83%, n=1) somewhat agreed, 8% (8,33%, n=1) somewhat agreed, 9% (8,13%, n=1) somewhat agreed, 9% (8,13%, n=1) somewhat agreed, 9% (8,13%, n=1) somewhat agreed, 9% (8,13%, n=1) somewhat agreed, 9% (1,10%, n=5) strongly agreed, 5% (8,53.3%, n=7) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 5, when asked did the result ensure handbook, CD, handouts, and/or presentations help explare, disagree, or strongly disagreed, 5% (n=3) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree, for question 5, when asked did the guest speakervlectures, provide and areagree, disagree, or strongly disagreed, 17% (16.07%, n=4) strongly agreed, 25% (n=3) strongly agreed, 5% (n=3) distance and nucleation and nucleation and nucleation agreed, nucleation and nucleation and nucleation agreed, nucleation and agreed, agreed, or strongly disagreed, 17% (16.07%, n=4) strongly agreed, 5% (n=3) distance areagreed, agreed, or strongly disagreed, 17% (16.07%, n=4) strongly agreed, 5% (n=3) distance areaging agreed, 5% (n=3) distance areaging agreed, agreed, or strongly disagreed, 17% (16.07%, n=3) distance areagin a dist				
to know how to plan a procurement solicitation, from incerption 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 accountatify outcome, know how to transition from contrast solicitation to opening the countrast and administering if during the course of performance, to enforcement of performance obligations and final close- out of the contrast, 83% (83.33%, n=1) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=1) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=1) openeed, 8% (9.33%, n=1) agreed, 9% (9.33%, n=1) openeed, 9% (9.33%, n=1) agreed, 9% (9.33%, n=1) openeed, 9% (9.33%, n=1) agreed, 9% (9.33%, n=1) openeed, 9% (9.33%, n=7) agreed, 9% (9.33%, n=1) agreed, 9% (9.33%, n=7) agreed, 9% (9.33%, n=1) agreed, 9% (9.33%, n=7) agreed, 9% (9.33%, n=1) agreed, 9% (9.33%, n=2) agreed, 9% (9.33%, n=1) agreed, 9% (9.33%, n=2) agreed, 9% (9.33%, n=1) agreed, 17% (16.63%, n=2) agreed, 17% (16.63%, n=1) adree tsubart found how to previde adree tares				
incertion of need to preparation of speechections. Know how to create an audit trail of documentation and price and cost data to attain an accountability outcome, know how to transition from centrat solutiation to opening the contract and administering it during the course of performance. To centration 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=10) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=1) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=10) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=1) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=10) agreed, 8% (n o 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% (41.07%, n=5) strongly agreed, 58% (83.33%, n= -7) agreed, with no response to strongly disagree. For question 5 kills, close to 42% (41.07%, n=5) strongly agreed, 58% (63.33%, n= -7) agreed, with no response to strongly disagree. For question 5, when asked did the resource nearboak, IC, Duadouts, and/or presentations help explain the subject matter, close to 75% (n=5) strongly agreed, 5% (n=3) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 6, when asket did the guest specakers/lecturers provide useful information to increase your understanding or avareness 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 asket did the guest specakers/lecturers provide useful information to increase your understanding or avareness of the subject matter, close to 83% (83.33%, n=10) strongly agreed, 17% (16.67%, n=2) along that the provide to the most interesting or halpfal, of the 25%, (n=5) when another student really exponded to first start out with a well though to or plan, another student from how to prepare bids and RFP an interesting topic, while another student really encyded the group rojexes, 75% (n=5) did ho				
specifications, know how to create an addit trail of documentation and price and cost data to attain an accountation show how to transition from contrast solicitation to opening the contrast and administering it during the course of performance, to enforcement of performance obligations and final close- out of the contrast. 83% (83.33%, n=10) agreed, 8% (83.33%, n=1) agreed, 1% asagree. For guestion 4, when takked do you have a better understanding of the subject matter to augment, strengthen, or support your professional skills, close to 4.2% (14.75%, n=5) strongly agreed, 8% (83.33%, n=7) agreed, with no response to somewhat tagree, disagree, or strongly diagree. For question 3, when asked did the resource handbook, CD, handtouts, and/or presentations help explain the subject matter, close to 73% (n=2) 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/lectures provide useful information to uncease. For question 6, when asked did the guest speakers/lectures provide useful information to somewhat agree. (disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 6, when asked did the guest speakers/lectures provide useful information to uncease. For question 7, when asked did the guest speakers/lectures provide useful information to somewhat agree. (disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 7, when asked did the guest speakers/lectures provide useful information to somewhat agree. (disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 7, when asked did a trappone to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 7, when asked with a response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. (n=5) did to respond to the question. For question 7, when asked MPP an interesting topic, while another student really end yead the quote me exit training module. 25% (n=3), one situlent recommended take				
documentation and price and cost data to attain an accountability outbork transition from contract solicitation to opening the contract and administering it driving the course of performance, to enforcement of performance obligations and final close- out of the contract. SNN (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 4.2% (41.67%, n=5) strongly agreed. 5% (86.33%, n=7) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 5, when asked di the resource handbook. (20), handouts, and/or presentiations help explain the subject matter, close to 75% (n=9) strongly agreed. 2% (10), handouts, and/or presentiations help explain the subject matter, close to 75% (n=9) strongly agreed. 2% (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 matter, close to 83% (83.33%, n=10) strongly agreed. 17% (16.67%, n=2) agreed, with no strongly disagree. For question 7, when asked what topic did you find the most interesting or helpful, or the 25%, (n=3) who provided a response, 1 student responde to forst start out with a well hought out plan, another student found how to prepare bids and RFP an interesting topic, Ntile another student really encipyed the next raining module. 25% (n=3), one student recommended take a little more time discussing scenamics to relate to to the				
accountact solicitation to opening the courts and administering it during the courts 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) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=1) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=1) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=1) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=10) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=5) strongly agreed, 5% (8.33%, n=10) area, 1% (14.07%, n=5) strongly agreed, 5% (8.33%, n=10) area, 1% (14.07%, n=5) strongly agreed, 5% (n=3) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, di di dre resource handbook, CD, handouts, and/or presentituins help explain the swliget matter, close to 75% (n=9) strongly agreed, 25% (n=3) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 5, when asked did the guest speakers/lecturers provide useful information to increase your understanding or awarences 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 did the responde to first star out with a well thought out plan, another student found how to prepare bids and REP an interesting topic, while another student really enjoyed he group projects, 75% (n=5) (did not responde to the start out with a well thought out plan, another student found how to prepare bids and REP an interesting topic, while another student really enjoyed the group projects, 75% (n=5) (did not respond to the question for question 8, when asked how we could improve the next training module, 25% (n=3), on student recommended take a little more time discussing secantions to relate it to the				
contract solicitation to opening the contract and administering if during the course of performance. to enforcement of performance obligations and final close- out of the contract, 83% (83.33%, n=1) somewhat agreed, 3% (83.33%, n=1) agreed, 8% (83.33%, n=1) agreed, 8% (83.33%, n=1) agreed, 8% (83.33%, n=1) agreed, 8% (83.33%, 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, 5% (58.33%, n=7-7) 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% (1-9) strongly agreed, 25% (n=3) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, did the guest speakers/lectures providu eucli information to increase your understanding or awareness of the subject matter, close to 85% (83.35%, 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 did the guest of somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 7, when asked with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 7, when asked with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 7, when asked with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 7, when asked did the guest of 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=5) did not respond to the question 8, when asked how we could improve the next training module, 25% (n=3), one student recomined take a little more time discussing securitor training to the discussing securitor training to discussion for store to the substant recomine to ta ker discussion for sch				
enforcement of performance obligations and final close- out of the contract, 53% (83,33%, n=1) agreed, 8% (83,33%, n=1) agreed, 8% (83,33%, 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=2) strongly agreed, 58% (58,33%, n= 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, 32%, (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 75% (n=9) strongly agreed, 33%, n=10) strongly agreed, speakers/lectures provide useful information to increase your understanding or awareness of the subject matter, close to 35% (33,35%, 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 preare bids and RFP an interesting topic, while another student responded to first start out with a well thought out plan, another student found how to provided a RFP an interesting topic, while another student responded to first start out with a well thought out plan, another student found how to 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 discussions relate it to the				
out of the contract, 83% (83.33%, n=10) agreed, 8% (8.33%, n=1) 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, or strongly disagree, or strongly disagree, or strongly strongly agreed, 53% (s3.33%, n=10) strongl				
 (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. 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, 25% (n=3) agreed, 17% (16.67%, n=2) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, 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 responde to first start out with a well thought out plan, another student found how to prepare bids and RFP an interesting or helpful, while another student really enjoyed the group pricets, 75% (n=3) did not response to the awaked how we could improve the next training module, 25% (n=3) who provided a response, 1 student responde to first start out with a well thought out plan, another student found how to prepare bids and RFP an interesting or helpful, while another student really enjoyed the group pricets, 75% (n=3) did not responde to the quest student really enjoyed the group pricets, 75% 				
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, $58%$ ($83.33%$, 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% ($n=3$) agreed, $25%$ ($n=3$) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 5, 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 5, 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 intresting 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 RPF an interesting topic, while another student really enjoyed the group projects, 75% ($n=9$) did not respond to the question. For question For ques				
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 wareness 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 responde 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 tening module, 25% (n=3) was the student to not be				
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, 27 (15%, n=2) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, for question 7, when asked what topic did you find the most interesting or helpful, of the 25%, (n=3) agreed, 17% (16.67%, n=2) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, 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 plane, 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				
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 responde 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 respond to 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				
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 somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagreed, 17% (16.67%, n=2) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagreed, 17% (16.67%, n=2) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. 0 ymmetry 0 ymmetry <th></th> <th></th> <td></td> <td></td>				
n=7) agreed, with no response to somewhat agree,disagree, or strongly disagree. For question 5, whenasked did the resource handbook, CD, handouts, and/orpresentations help explain the subject matter, close to75% (n=9) strongly agreed, 25% (n=3) agreed, with noresponse to somewhat agree, disagree, or stronglydisagree. For question 6, when asked did the guestspeakers/lecturers provide useful information toincrease your understanding or awareness of the subjectmatter, close to 83% (83.33%, n=10) strongly agreed,17% (16.67%, n=2) agreed, with no response tosomewhat agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. Forquestion 7, when asked what topic did you find themost interesting or helpful, of the 25%, (n=3) whoprovided a response, I student responded to first startout with a well thought out plan, another student foundhow to prepare bids and RFP an interesting topic, whileanother 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 trainingmodule, 25% (n=3), one student recommende take alittle more time discussing scenarios to relate it to the				
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 treeommended take a little more time discussing scenarios to relate it to the				
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				
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 8, when asked how we could improve the next training module, 25% (n=3), one student reat it to the				
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			presentations help explain the subject matter, close to	
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				
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			response to somewhat agree, disagree, or strongly	
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				
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 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				
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				
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				
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				
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				
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				
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				
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				
(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			how to prepare bids and RFP an interesting topic, while	
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				
module, 25% (n=3), one student recommended take a little more time discussing scenarios to relate it to the				
little more time discussing scenarios to relate it to the				
material provided, another student recommended more				
			material provided, another student recommended more	

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria (Written in %) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		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.	
		Summary of Result Type: Criterion Met Data Collection Status/Summary of Result Status: Open Growth Budget Implications/Effect: Over \$5,000 Growth Budget Justification: 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. Budget Related Proposed Outcomes: 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 10/21/2014 - A memorandum was disseminated from 	10/21/2014 Pased on these findings
		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. 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%	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.
		 (n=27) compliance rate of the assessment instrument (CEWD Evaluation Form) attached to the Course Permission or Event Permission forms. Summary of Result Type: Criterion Met Data Collection Status/Summary of Result Status: 	Implementation Status: 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

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria (Written in %) / Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
		OpenGrowth Budget Implications/Effect: Over \$5,000Growth Budget Justification: The CEWD's efforts increase to incorporate a systematic process to assess CEU courses or 	Implementation Status: 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.
CE&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. Start Date: 10/14/2015 End Date: 03/13/2017 SLO Status: Currently being assessed Program SLO/AUO Plan reflects/incorporates: Other Historical Assessment Perspective: *	Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/ToolDescription:Testing Schedule Statistics/Student SatisfactionSurveyType ofArtifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool:Lab/Skills TestCriterion (Written in %):1) There will be an increase of 10% of students for testing training from FY 2015.2) 70% of participants/partners will indicate they were satisfied with the customer service, including accessibility of scheduling test to enhance/improve their employment skills.Budget Related Performance Indicators: Over \$5,000 for equipment and administrative fees relative to the on-line testing/training.Related Documents:		

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

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)	Means of Assessment & Criteria (Written in %)/Tasks	Data Collection Status/Summary of Results (N=?)	Use of Summary Result & Implementation Status
CE&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. Start Date: 10/14/2015 End Date: 03/13/2017 SLO Status: Currently being assessed Program SLO/AUO Plan reflects/incorporates: Other Historical Assessment Perspective: Over \$5,000 will be used to support CEWD operations and to continuously improve and assess CEWD's curriculum. Budget Goals: 1. Grow budget to support operations (full/part- time faculty & staff	Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool Description: Analysis of Course/Event permission forms (CPF/EPF) and a review of assessment instruments/assessment plans will determine compliance with course offering requirements. Type of Artifact/Instrument/Rubric/Method/Tool: Needs Assessment Review/Plan Criterion (Written in %): 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. Budget Related Performance Indicators: Over \$5,000 will be used to support CEWD operations and to continuously improve and assess CEWD's curriculum. Related Documents: CEWD CPF.EPF Department Form.docx CEWD NC-CEU Sample Student Survey.pdf		
1. Software necessary for training/testing3. Training			