

FACILITATOR EVALUATION FORM

Training: Ashbrooke: Lead Auditor Course

Date: 19-23 November 2007

Facilitator(s): Ned Gravel

Location: Ottawa, ON

Item	Met Participant Needs?				
	1 No	2	3 OK	4	5 Yes
Course Objectives:	<i>√ as appropriate below</i>				
Were you given the opportunity to help define them?	0	0	0	0	10
Were they well defined?	0	0	0	2	8
Were they achieved?	0	0	0	3	7
Course Content:					
Was the material appropriate?	0	1	5	1	3
Complexity (1=too complex or too simple ← → Perfect=5)	0	3	3	2	2
Was the material clear to you?	0	4	2	2	2
Volume (1=too much or not enough ← → Perfect=5)	2	2	3	0	3
Did the handouts fit with this training - did they help?	0	1	2	2	5
Facilitator Methods:					
Did the facilitator allow sufficient discussion?	0	0	0	1	9
Did the facilitator encourage participation?	0	0	0	0	10
Did the facilitator help bring out new group ideas?	0	0	0	0	10
Did the facilitator help close out discussions?	0	0	0	0	10
Would you accept this facilitator again?	0	0	0	0	10
Catering and Facility:					
Was the seminar facility appropriate for the course?	0	0	0	3	7
Was the lunch and breaks service acceptable?	0	0	0	3	7

Comments	Response
If it is possible delivering training materials before the course or making it available online will be really helpful.	This is a skill-based course so it cannot be delivered online or via CD. Materials could be delivered via CD separately and the actual binder delivered at the beginning of the course. Experience shows that some binders go missing between delivery and course start.

Comments	Response
<p>First time with new low emphasis on theory lecturing and high emphasis on interactive workshops – very useful! However starting each day with a brief review of the days applicable theory (summary of papers in book) would be very beneficial as a launching pad for the workshops.</p>	<p>Good idea. Will try and work this into future editions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having to correlate 9001 with 17025 was quiet confusing at times. Assessments course for 17025 only would be ideal. • If all was on 17025 it would be better, somewhat confusing mixing 17025 and 9001. • Ned was an excellent facilitator however the course content needs some major revisions to address ISO 17025. There was too much confusion and ambiguity because the course content was too heavy on the ISO 9001 and not enough on the ISO 17025. • Provide more information about becoming a CAEAL assessor before jumping into the course, would be helpful. It looks like this course was designed more for an ISO 9000 auditor. Though more info about ISO 17025 was delivered through the course. It seems that it was always a step late. By the time we start to get back to the right track, the course is over. • Expected more focus on ISO/IEC 17025 and really wasn't expecting 9001 at all. This led to some additional confusion. • Needs to be an actual ISO 17025 Lead Assessor course. There was way too much information on ISO 9001. Perhaps it would also be a good idea to have some of the in-class materials (crosswords) already constructed so as not to have to do it during class. • Course would be better if standards not mixed, use 17025. 	<p>It is not currently possible to remove all reference to 9001 from this course as the course certification body, IRCA, does not provide recognition of a lead auditor / lead assessor course without reference to 9001. If this were possible, CAEAL would start using such a course yesterday.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Way too much volume for 4 days – at times overwhelming. • The manual should be re-written. Very hard to find things. Should be distributed ahead of time (electronically) for review. Too much to learn, NO SLEEP!! Not conducive to good learning. Crosswords/bingo not effective. Question: why would I recommend to anyone to take this course, so they can feel like an idiot and get no sleep for a week. Can't spell, can't write and can't think. Not ideal for learning. Please consider changing format and pre-requisites. 	<p>Understood. Comments from course alumni however, is that this is a benefit. Facing real auditing situations was easier because the course was harder (in this regard).</p>

Comments	Response
A weak group is a challenge for all within it to learn and achieve. It might be helpful to rotate group members between each case study to share the benefits of everyone's experience, enhancing the learning.	Normally try to leave groups stable, but will canvas participants in future to see if their arrangements are still suitable.

Other Comments

- A dynamic, compelling knowledgeable individual. Such a gem is perfect for a course like this!
- Ned knows his stuff and can get his points across.
- Thanks again Ned for providing your experience and excellent knowledge of the standard. You certainly provide all the info required. The course... well referred to as "the 5 days from ----" But I am still alive. Happy Flying!
- Excellent.
- Always enjoy Ned's presentations!
- Ned – Very enthusiastic, energetic and motivating personality.
- Thank you Michael and Ned excellent program, keep it up!