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Overview

The content for Release 4 was presented and assessed in two iterations: Release 4A and Release 4B. Participants were asked to complete both a Pre- and Post-Assessment for Release 4A, and a Pre-Assessment for 4B in addition to completing the course content. Twenty-three of the 26 participants (88%) currently enrolled in the program completed both the 4A Pre- and Post-Assessments; 21 of the current program participants (81%) completed the Release 4B Pre-Assessment. The overall average score on the knowledge assessment questions for the 4A Post-Assessment was 87%.

## Release 4 Knowledge Assessment

This section presents the knowledge assessment results related to information presented in Release 4. These results are divided into two iterations; the material presented in Release 4A and the material presented in Release 4B.

Release 4A Knowledge Post-Assessment Results

* **Release 4A Post-Assessment average score, score distribution**
  + For the participants who completed the 4A Post-Assessment (77%), the average total score was 10.40 out of 12 or 87% correct.
  + The lowest score was 8 (67%) and the highest score was 12 (100%).
* **Highest and lowest scoring performance objective(s)**
  + The following performance objectives were included in this release:

| Objective | Objective Description |
| --- | --- |
| 4.1 | Assess the readiness of the technical evaluation team. |
| 4.2 | Implement evaluation methods and criteria to evaluate vendor maturity and ability to deliver a product that solves a given need. |
| 4.3 | Describe how to run an effective evaluation to get the best solution. |
| 4.4 | Determine the next steps that follow contract award. (Kickoff, Ramp-up, Baselining) |

* + Participants performed **best** on Performance Objective 4.2 – **Implement evaluation methods and criteria to evaluate vendor maturity and ability to deliver a product that solves a given need.**
  + Participants performed **poorest** on Performance Objective 4.3 – **Describe how to run an effective evaluation to get the best solution.**
  + Mean percentage scores for each of the Release 4A performance objectives are provided in the following chart:

Release 4B Knowledge Pre-Assessment Results

* **Release 4B Pre-Assessment average score, score distribution**
  + For the participants who completed the 4B Pre-Assessment, the average total score was 5.14 out of 9 or 57% correct.
  + The lowest score was 2 (22%), the highest score was 8 (89%).
* **Highest and lowest scoring performance objective(s)**
  + The following performance objectives were included in this release:

| Objective | Objective Description |
| --- | --- |
| 4.7 | Identify software engineering practices for high-quality digital services like version control, continuous integration, and continuous delivery. |
| 4.8 | Identify metrics creation and utilization to help identify when failure actually occurs. |
| 4.9 | Determine how to execute an exit strategy and course correct. |

* + Participants performed **best** on Performance Objective 4.9 **– Determine how to execute an exit strategy and course correct.**
  + Participants performed **poorest** on Performance Objective 4.7 **– Identify software engineering practices for high-quality digital services like version control, continuous integration, and continuous delivery.**
  + Mean percentage scores for each of the Release 4B performance objectives are provided in the following chart:

## Release 4A Performance Comparisons

For each of the performance objectives included in Release 4A, participants were asked to complete both a Pre- and Post-Assessment of their knowledge related to the performance objectives. The Pre-Assessment was completed before the classroom instruction and/or activities, while the Post-Assessment was completed after all other activities. The table below displays the comparison between scores on the Release 4A Pre-Assessment and the Post-Assessment. A few of the program participants did not complete both the Pre- and Post-Assessment. As such, performance comparisons cannot be made for those individuals.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Comparison of Cohort 4A Pre- and Post-Assessment Scores** | | | |
| **Performance Objective** | **Score Increase** | **Equal Score** | **Score Decrease** |
| **4.1** | 19% | 38% | 19% |
| **4.2** | 42% | 31% | 4% |
| **4.3** | 42% | 31% | 4% |
| **4.4** | 38% | 31% | 8% |

Over 40 percent of participants saw an increase in their score for Objectives 4.2 and 4.3. The objective for which the most participants saw a decrease in their score from pre- to post-assessment was Objective 4.1.