



LabCAT Certification - Levels A, B, C and E Program Critique Summary 2009

PROGRAM DATES INCLUDE – January 7, 2009 – November 5, 2009

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

- | | |
|----------------|-----|
| a) Too long | 1 |
| b) About right | 107 |
| c) Too short | 0 |

Comments:

- Just right.
- Presentation was fine. Participation from class in between power point pictures would be a good addition.
- Very good.
- Some of the level E photos were a bit dark.
- I really enjoyed the instructors experience and insights.
- I like being open for discussion.
- Presentation might be more detailed.
- Good, especially with the instructor, Cindy.
- Perfect.
- Gave the right info and allowed time for questions.
- With all the required prerequisites applicants should be able to move through certification process quicker.

2. Please rate the classroom presentation material:

- | | |
|--------------|----|
| a) Excellent | 59 |
| b) Good | 44 |
| c) Fair | 5 |
| d) Poor | 0 |

Comments:

- A few slides are difficult to read due to color combinations, a couple of typos...otherwise the presentation materials are excellent and handy, great reference material.
- Sometimes a little fast.
- The newer slides are very good; they cover the subjects from end to end.
- A few slides are difficult to read due to colors. A couple of slides are difficult to understand due to either content or order of slides.
- Excellent knowledge of material.
- Cut out stuff not needed and showed info we did need.
- Good material, but was out of order, book did not match slides.

3. The written exam was:

- | | |
|--------------|----|
| a) Very fair | 48 |
| b) Fair | 61 |
| c) Unfair | 0 |

Comments:

- Very good, learn a lot.
- Wording of a couple of questions seemed to be misleading, level E.
- Just a suggestion, on the key put what page and what section in the FMM or the CPL the answer is.

- A few ambiguous questions involving volumetrics.
- The written exam was very fair, no more tricky questions.
- Poor wording on some questions.
- Not an accurate measure of the knowledge obtained. Less “trick” type questions are needed.
- Need to have more straight forward questions instead of the trick ones.
- Scale leveling clarification.
- Open book helped a lot.
- Somewhat confusing.
- There are a few unclear questions.
- A few confusing questions that were worded oddly.
- Some of the wording could be made more clear.

4. The laboratory proficiency orientation was:

- | | |
|----------------|-----|
| a) Too long | 0 |
| b) About right | 101 |
| c) Too short | 4 |

Comments:

- I appreciated the training and education attitude Cindy provides. She is very helpful to provide additional lab time if requested, to review the steps of a test.
- I like it because the only thing being done is getting people familiar with the lab equipment.
- Not all the Hveem calibration procedures are noted on the slide presentation.
Comment from Instructor, Cindy Rutkoski: This point has been discussed with the tech committee and changes are in progress for the July 2009 manual updates.
- Very knowledgeable proctors.
- More time was taken if needed.
- The nuclear gauge presentation was a little confusing on what we needed to demonstrate.

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

- | | |
|--------------|----|
| a) Excellent | 80 |
| b) Good | 27 |
| c) Fair | 0 |
| d) Poor | 0 |

Comments:

- Cindy is extremely knowledgeable and brings real-world experience to CAPA.
- Very informative and helpful.
- Very knowledgeable!
- Proctor, Darcie Lopez, rocks!
- The proctor was very knowledgeable.
- Kept the class interesting.
- They kept to the exam forms.

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

- | | |
|--------------|----|
| a) Excellent | 97 |
| b) Good | 12 |
| c) Fair | 0 |
| d) Poor | 0 |

Comments:

- Two thumbs way, way up.
- Cindy made the class great, while plowing through the material.
- Very professional, Cindy's CDOT experience showed well!
- Very helpful.
- Cindy always does a good job.
- Very informative and patient.
- Cindy is extremely patient and fair. Thank you.
- Cindy is excellent, raise needed!

- The teacher was well spoken.
- Her professionalism was excellent.
- Cindy did a great job with us “oldies”.
- Open to any questions and had great answers.
- The instructor was very knowledgeable.
- Cindy was very knowledgeable and professional in presenting the criteria for Levels A and B. Presentation was very good.
- Cindy is great!
- Everything was done nicely.

7. Was the equipment operating properly:

- | | |
|--------|----|
| a) Yes | 92 |
| b) No | 2 |

Comments:

- Too many hands working on delicate equipment, still good though.
- Mico-deval not working. *Comment from Instructor, Cindy Rutkoski –The equipment works, but does not have full weight of charges available.*
- Initially we had problems with the Hveem machine. *Comment from Instructor, Cindy Rutkoski Proctor was not familiar with how to use the program. Corrections made and all was well.*
- Equipment was working, but the pan was very dirty.

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

- | | |
|--------|----|
| a) Yes | 99 |
| b) No | 1 |

Comments:

- I was not aware that mechanical shaker for sand equivalent testing was required.
- I think so.

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

- | | |
|----------------------|----|
| a) Excellent benefit | 25 |
| b) Good benefit | 14 |
| c) Fair benefit | 3 |
| d) No benefit | 2 |

Comments:

- This is my recertification. The program is excellent.
- Most definitely necessary and helpful in making me study and understand information necessary to perform my job with adequacy, consistency and competency.
- We were expecting Marshall testing procedures for airport work. *Comment from Instructor, Cindy Rutkoski: The tech or the company should have found out what the LabCAT certification covered before registering.*
- The class gave me a better understanding of the different methods.
- The program only has a “fair benefit”, because the manuals are almost always available. If the tech doesn’t know how to perform the task he/she can look it up. *Comment from Instructor, Cindy Rutkoski: Looking up the procedure does not take the place of the certification program. We have no assurance that the tech will look anything up.*

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

- | | |
|--------------|----|
| a) Excellent | 47 |
| b) Good | 17 |
| c) Fair | 1 |
| d) Poor | 0 |

Comments:

- It has gotten better over the years.
- Not my first, but it gave me ideas on how to improve our lab.
- Better than before, it’s more to the point and less mess.

- Even though I have been previously certified, it was still a benefit to me.
- It is sweet and to the point. You should know what your doing before you come get certified.

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

- | | |
|----------------|----|
| a) Standard | 43 |
| b) Streamline | 16 |
| c) Slip Stream | 1 |
- (Proctor recertification method)

Comments:

- I like following Cindy with the book to assure everything is correct and find things that maybe wrong with our own procedure.
- This is not my first certification with LabCAT, but the review and new information is really helpful.
- Even though this was not my first time being certified, I haven't been testing HMA over the last 2 years, (soils), so I thought I could benefit from some classroom time.

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

- | | |
|--------------|----|
| a) Excellent | 73 |
| b) Good | 27 |
| c) Fair | 1 |
| d) Poor | 0 |

Comments:

- Wonderful job!

13. General Comments:

Comments:

- Great instructor/instruction and good proctors. Thank you CAPA.
- I like the pictures.
- Very well presented!
- I have been certified several times over the years. I like the taking the standard session. There would be a lot of people upset if this class goes away. There are many positive aspects of the standard session. Also, just a suggestion, why don't you do away with the presentation book handed out at class and just require everyone to bring a CPL manual. That would cut costs down. Everyone can get the CPL manual off the internet for free.
- Proctors and Instructor did a really good job. My first time here, so it is going to help me out a lot. To keep getting re-certified every 3 years, I think is unnecessary, unless there are major changes in the testing process.
- The written exam was a bit more tricky and harder than previous re-certifications but information was valuable and will be used in the lab and field on a daily basis.
- The certification program is the right opportunity to review and learn the specs.
- A timely review is always good.
- I appreciate that CAPA offers these programs for the sake of the industry and to improve the quality of the individual worker. Cindy is an awesome instructor and cares about helping people understand the information and the importance of the information.
- Make the presentation book available prior to the session. *Comment from Instructor, Cindy Rutkoski Program manuals are available on the CAPA web site for review. Students should be studying their CP manuals as well.*
- Thank you for the great experience.
- This was my 3rd time, had a great time and learned a lot. Thanks.
- It is a good easy way to certify technicians.
- Written exam, very short. Lab procedures – good.
- Direction of Nuclear gauge when testing asphalt should be along the long axis of the gauge parallel to the direction of the paver. I've found that some people do not know this, it should be added. *Comment from Instructor, Cindy Rutkoski I agree, it should be stated in the material presentation.*

- I always have a great time. Thanks!
- Tom, Diane and Cindy – Thank you for all your patience with me. I really appreciate it.
- Cindy was great.
- As usual, top of the line.
- I am proud to have been a part of this historic all female certification class.
- This is my first certification at CAPA since Cindy Rutkoski has been the instructor. She did a wonderful job! I took so much away from her classroom instruction.
- I learned a lot at this certification and the instructor was awesome.
- The instructor and proctors were excellent.
- Thank you very much.
- Lack of proctors made 2nd day of (13) longer than it needed to be. *Comment from Instructor, Cindy Rutkoski: Arrangement for proctors were made for each station, however due to “last minute difficulties” on the proctor’s job, the proctor had to cancel on the morning of his volunteer day. Attempts were made for last minute replacements. At that point, testing technicians need to patient.*
- Very enjoyable and professional.
- All the proctors were very nice and well prepared on their stations.
- Cindy is very knowledgeable in the field and an excellent instructor.
- Change “tester” in the literature to “technician”. *Comment from Instructor, Cindy Rutkoski: I agree. Changes will be made.*
- Thank you all at the RMAEC!
- Cindy is very good answering questions and leading discussion.
- Good repetition and emphasis on points.
- **Best certification I’ve had here.**
- **CAPA E is excellent.**