

FACILITATOR EVALUATION FORM

Understanding ISO/IEC 17025 and ISO/IEC

Training: Guide 34 **Facilitator(s):** Ned Gravel
Location: NRC, Ottawa - Hosted **Date:** July 6 to 8, 2009

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

Comments	Response
It was a little bit confusing going back and forth between Guide 34 and 17025.	Understood. NRC asked for a course on both together even though the relevant parts of Guide 34 are already part of 17025. Advised of this very consideration and it was decided to proceed.
There is a lot of "jargon" (technical terms) specific to test and measurement. Might need to spend some time on definitions. Define acronyms and their relationship	Will ask future participants of this "combined" course on their understanding of terms before proceeding.
Preferred more concentrated classroom style information transmission, less discussion style but in fact first question and answer regime. The course could be given efficiently in one day.	More people are comfortable with the "discussion" style than with the question and answer style. This requires the latter to demonstrate some patience while their peers catch up. Completion in one day is only possible if there is no discussion of the requirements.

Comments	Response
Course content too much volume. Needed more discussion/time	There are obviously differing views on volume and type of delivery. See comment above. CALA Training Service tries to reach the middle ground and will definitely try to not go too fast for anyone.
The introductory part of the course took very long time (half day) and was repetitive of what we saw later on (too detailed). Introduction was too detailed and was therefore repetitive of what we saw later in the course.	This course faced two different audiences at the same time with two different aims: one for Guide 34 and one for 17025. Establishment of common understanding at the beginning of the course was required. Leaving one group out was not considered an acceptable option.
Question 5.7 of the introductory PowerPoint quiz is wrong (should be True, not False).	Most persons in the group thought differently than this. Wording for question 5.7 was therefore modified to make it clearer.

Other Comments

- Instructor was great and clearly well informed.