

FACILITATOR EVALUATION FORM

Training: Accreditation Seminar

Facilitator(s): Ned Gravel

Location: AECL, Chalk River

Date: September 30, 2008

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	1	2	8	8
Were they well defined?	0	2	3	8	6
Were they achieved?	0	1	8	10	0
Course Content:					
Was the material appropriate?	0	1	5	9	4
Complexity (1=too complex or too simple ← → Perfect=5)	0	1	11	4	3
Was the material clear to you?	0	3	11	4	1
Volume (1=too much or not enough ← → Perfect=5)	1	6	5	5	2
Did the handouts fit with this training - did they help?	2	3	7	6	1
Facilitator Methods:					
Did the facilitator allow sufficient discussion?	0	0	1	6	12
Did the facilitator encourage participation?	0	0	0	6	13
Did the facilitator help bring out new group ideas?	0	0	2	8	9
Did the facilitator help close out discussions?	0	2	2	9	6
Would you accept this facilitator again?	0	0	3	6	10
Catering and Facility:					
Was the seminar facility appropriate for the course?	1	1	1	9	7
Was the lunch and breaks service acceptable?	0	0	0	13	6

Comments	Response
There were no copies of the slides presented in the manual given with the course.	Good idea. Will include the slides in the written materials.
Modify slide 6 on lesson 3 (to reflect chart in binder) Change the slide about the "Source of Assessors" according to the one in the binder	Done.
The Foster room does not seem like a professional setting for a seminar: holes in drywall, cloth covering up vents, bad chairs, outdated.	Room was selected by the hosting agency and it met all CALA requirements for space and lighting. Future courses may better meet participant needs in a local hotel – although the selection of such venues is limited.
Seminar was more of a "how do I do my job" discussion. Didn't learn much about ISO 17025.	Very true. That is the focus of the accreditation seminar. There is a separate focus on ISO/IEC 17025 in a course established for that purpose.
Tab 8 – Sample appendices do not include a calibration example.	Will include a calibration appendix in Tab 8.
Too much to review (the binder) in one day. But well explained and summarized well enough that it will be easy to review on my own	Understood.

Comments	Response
Improve manual with a Table of Contents; and subsections separated by tabs rather than colored sheets.	Will use more visible colours for separations and include small post-it notes for annotation of these separators.
Content was not presented in a clear organized manner	Not certain where the difficulty lies with this comment.
Ned, please send the "Measurement Guide" (we have the Lab Assessment Guide) in the binder	Done.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much discussion not related to topic • Instructor rushed to stay on time 	Very true. Most participants face an imposed requirement for accreditation with trepidation and concern. This course is designed to address those very issues. The topic is primarily about facing the trepidations and concerns, and not all participants agree.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Binder notes hard to follow with course • Manual was confusing (numbering system) instructor jumped around too much. 	Participants set the objectives and required deviation from course structure. Will warn future participants of this phenomenon in the future. Participant objectives always govern.

- Good job, thank you!!