



## LabCAT Certification Program Critique Summary 2007

PROGRAM DATES INCLUDE – JANUARY 11, 2007 – December 20, 2007

1. The length of time for the classroom presentation was:

- |                |     |
|----------------|-----|
| a) Too long    | 1   |
| b) About right | 118 |
| c) Too short   | 15  |

Comments:

- May want to speak a bit slower.
- A bit more time could be spent on review.
- Maybe a little short
- Sometimes it felt short. If I had a question, I didn't get to ask it because we were already on the next slide.
- Only a little short, if you have not taken the training class before hand.
- Way too fast, not enough detail.
- Too fast.
- I love how fast the streamline goes.
- In most programs you don't even get a review beforehand. This was very helpful.
- Ran through the material very fast, hard to keep up.
- More time should be spent on some formulas and process procedures.
- I probably should have attended the training session.
- Instructor spoke too fast.
- Could stop every once and a while for questions.
- It was very rushed.
- The streamline re-certification speed was great.
- Did a great job.
- Was able to answer all questions asked.
- The classroom presentation was fine, but we waited too long for one of the students to show up. Class is supposed to start at 7:30 am. The last person didn't show up until after 8:00 am. *(Response from Program Manager, Tom Clayton: Registration check in is between 7:30 – 800 am. The session start time is 8:00 am)*
- **It was covered quickly but thoroughly.**

2. Please rate the classroom presentation material:

- |              |    |
|--------------|----|
| a) Excellent | 53 |
| b) Good      | 74 |
| c) Fair      | 5  |
| d) Poor      | 0  |

Comments:

- Good book, showing all of the slides, nice!
- Not enough time spent on materials.
- Streamline is nice and short.
- The workbooks reflected some changes that have been made!
- Some of the slides could use improvement. Include more material and key points tested on. Choose Fahrenheit or Celsius and stick with it.
- Hit all of the pertinent changes in the procedures.

3. The written exam was:

- |              |    |
|--------------|----|
| a) Very fair | 53 |
| b) Fair      | 79 |
| c) Unfair    | 2  |

Comments:

- Some question could be asked more clearly. More questions on the overall understanding of the procedure and less on somewhat “insignificant” details.
- Tricky.
- Some of the questions were hard to follow. It was not clear what was being asked.
- Some questions are vague and indirect.
- Questions took careful thought. Tests were not returned so missed questions could not be studied.
- Some questions were worded tricky.
- Too many trick questions. Questions could have multiple answers.
- Some questions were worded unusual. Could not understand what they are asking.
- The exam was fair, but it was a little too “tricky” on some multiple choices and on the T/F questions.
- Good detail.
- Some of the wording suggests things or situations which do not exist. Slightly unfair, example: specimen vs. sample.
- Some of the questions were worded in a manner that was difficult to interpret.
- Good questions, they really make you think.
- Exam was very fair, not too hard, yet not too easy.
- Not enough room to write down some procedures.
- Some questions were worded to where it was hard to know what information was needed.
- A few questions were written as to where it was hard to understand.
- If you have a working knowledge of this material it is not tricky.
- Tough and thorough, but fair.
- **Some tricky wording on a few questions.**

4. The laboratory proficiency orientation was:

- |                |     |
|----------------|-----|
| a) Too long    | 1   |
| b) About right | 113 |
| c) Too short   | 10  |

Comments:

- Maybe a little short.
- Not enough detail, should demonstrate each lab as required.
- Demonstrate all labs like you used to do 3 years ago.
- Too short, need more presentation time.
- Procedures were fair and educational.
- Lab orientation was just right, fast paced.
- A little short, but still something other programs don't do.
- Spend a little more time on operating machines.
- All of the important points were quizzed.
- Took too long to complete the proficiency.
- A learning experience.
- Excellent proctors.
- **Maybe run through procedures before having to test for them.**

5. Please rate the knowledge of the proctors conducting the proficiency exams:

- |              |    |
|--------------|----|
| a) Excellent | 94 |
| b) Good      | 38 |
| c) Fair      | 0  |
| d) Poor      | 0  |

Comments:

- Proctor Rod Von Bernuth, taught me some extra things about gyro that were not covered or used on the test.
- Good to excellent.
- Very easy to talk to.
- Very personable and knowledgeable.
- They all seemed to be experienced beyond their years.
- He was fair and answered a few questions as well.

6. Please rate the knowledge and professionalism of the instructor:

- |              |    |
|--------------|----|
| a) Excellent | 98 |
| b) Good      | 32 |
| c) Fair      | 1  |
| d) Poor      | 0  |

Comments:

- Proctor Ken Meyer, from CDOT was quite good. Everyone was great.
- Nick is an excellent instructor, very knowledgeable and easy to learn from.
- He's all about asphalt.
- Go Nick!
- Very professional and still made everyone feel comfortable and at ease.
- Very experienced and very helpful.
- Very friendly and helpful.
- I think Tom Clayton is way better than Nick was.
- Great delivery of materials.

7. Was the equipment operating properly:

- a) Yes 117
- b) No 1

Comments:

- The Rice vacuum was not pulling 28 mm accuracy.
- Nick was very approachable.
- The equipment was operating properly, but was a little different of a setup for the Rice.

8. Were the most current test procedures used during the classroom presentation:

- a) Yes 120
- b) No 0

Comment:s:

- As far as I know. I would not be the one to ask this. I am trying to pass the cert.

9. **If this is your first LabCAT certification**, in your opinion, will the certification program benefit you in performing your job:

- a) Excellent benefit 46
- b) Good benefit 40
- c) Fair benefit 3
- d) No benefit 0

Comments:

- Directly and indirectly.
- LabCAT needs to scale sections down to what techs are actually doing. The extra knowledge is great.
- A lot of requirements and procedures were brought to light for me.
- **This was excellent even though I don't do testing.**

10. **If you have been previously LabCAT certified**, please rate the value of the certification program:

- a) Excellent 31
- b) Good 25
- c) Fair 1
- d) Poor 0

Comments:

- The certs will benefit a lot.
- Spend more time on classroom and labs.
- This is a good refresher to keep you current and on your toes.
- This is my 3<sup>rd</sup> re-cert, the program is excellent.

11. **If you have been previously LabCAT certified**, which certification method did you choose to recertify:

- a) Standard 34
- b) Streamline 17
- c) Slip Stream 0  
(proctor recertification method)

Comments:

- I did the standard method just in case I have developed some bad habits, and also to see any changes in specifications.
- I took recertified so that I could have a refresher of the material.
- I re-certified standard, but didn't realize they just had a streamline session.

12. Please rate the overall quality of the certification program:

- |              |    |
|--------------|----|
| a) Excellent | 64 |
| b) Good      | 49 |
| c) Fair      | 2  |
| d) Poor      | 0  |

Comments:

- Good to excellent.
- Not enough time spent on labs and classroom material.

13. General Comments:

Comments:

- There needs to be a "Grandfather" type program.
- Streamline certification is definitely for the experienced technician.
- Proctor for Hveem was somewhat rude and arrogant.
- The lunches spoiled us. Thanks for everything.
- I am glad we went over so much info once and twice. I am also glad that we could always ask any questions we needed to without hesitation.
- I am not a general. Thanks
- I enjoyed taking this class.
- It seemed like the standard program was more of a streamline program. There are some tests that we don't run that often and could use a more detailed demonstration.
- Standard seems like streamline from 3 years ago.
- Good experience.
- Good instructor and good proctors.
- The streamline version is a good way for experienced testers to get re-certified. Very efficient.
- Instructor and proctors were excellent and knowledgeable. Thanks guys!
- Very good instructor and very nice lab work stations.
- A good experience which made me want to proctor.
- I would like to see certification every 5 years, instead of three.
- The only suggestion I would have is to maybe go through some scenarios and problems that may occur. Maybe go through some of the calculations.
- Good program.
- Overall good experience. Very knowledgeable and great group of guys.
- CAPA does a great job representing the contractors and the asphalt industry. Does a good job preparing the techs for CDOT projects, affordably. Nick does a good job.
- Nick was a pleasure to learn from.
- People are nice and easy to work with.
- Thanks, great course/certification.
- You need to know what you're doing prior to the certification, this isn't a training class.
- The instructor and proctor were helpful with some questions about CDOT procedures as I am with a start-up company in this field.
- All and all, very good.
- Good food.
- Well trained teachers.
- Good classes, great instructors. Had a good time.
- Positive atmosphere in classroom and in the proficiency labs. Very knowledgeable staff. Certification helps gain confidence and knowledge to take back to my company.
- Happy to have Tom Clayton teaching the class! The proctors were very good! Always such a pleasure to see Diane!
- Thanks for the help and understanding of CDOT procedures.
- I wish the lab proficiency was open book, due to the fact that some of us don't run those tests everyday and it's difficult to cram all the information needed in one-two days.
- Very good certification program.
- Keep up the good work.
- Overall good.