

FACILITATOR EVALUATION FORM

Training: Internal Auditor **Facilitator(s):** Ned Gravel
Location: Radisson hotel, Calgary **Date:** February 10 to 12, 2010

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

<u>COMMENTS</u>	<u>RESPONSE</u>
There was too much food provided which presumably led to waste	Agreed. Spoke to hotel, but they were obviously trying to do extra for us. We thanked them for their diligence.
Lots of info addressed – Need to have time now to review after course	Agreed.
My objectives were to simplify our procedures, but as a result of the course we seem to have a lot more work than we currently do for IA's.	That is not necessarily a bad outcome. Congratulations on being able to see your own system in a more knowledgeable light.

<u>COMMENTS</u>	<u>REPSONSE</u>
To review A02 for Quality Manual and Procedure in time frame too extensive – should not have 3 plus hours homework.	As this is a skills demonstration course and as A02 is the easiest tool a laboratory can use for quick and dirty approaches to auditing, the alternatives would have taken much more time. An important auditing skilset is time management and the homework allocation provides candidates with real life experience during the course. Will warn future participants of this aspect of the course.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality Manual and Procedures in better condition (mostly meets requirements with few errors) would be better/easier to audit than policy that has almost nothing. • Grammar in Quality Manual and Procedures so difficult to understand in some cases, I couldn't tell if it meets requirements – ex. Handwritten changes in page 3 in procedures 3. 	The samples provided are written to make it easier for participants to find difficulties and create observations leading to audit findings.
Some variation in provided lunches might be nice.	Agreed. Will ask this hotel to provide more variety if we have the opportunity to use them in the future.
Edit ICAR form – Proposed corrective/preventive action – remove proposed and suggested action – change “suggested” to “implemented.”	Good idea. Have already done this with the original forms, but had not translated this idea to all of our training materials. Thank you.
Previous notification of take-home work would be nice, perhaps on registration confirmation	Good idea. CALA has three courses which require evening review. We can put that information in the course descriptions.
Still confused verification of calibration?	This topic is not normally part of this course. The course which deals with understanding 17025 would be more appropriate before taking this auditor course. See http://www.caeal.ca/t_caeal_training_flow.jpg
Course needs a 17025 interpretation component	Already contained in the included document called P07 – CALA Application of requirements for ISO/IEC 17025. Alternatively, the course which deals with understanding 17025 would be more appropriate before taking this course. See http://www.caeal.ca/t_caeal_training_flow.jpg
Course too short	Industry standard for this course is two days. The CALA version is three days. Not certain if members would agree to the extra cost of a four-day course. Will include this suggestion in the 2011 Member Training Needs Survey.

<u>COMMENTS</u>	<u>REPSONSE</u>
Audit Report Summary “Conclusions and follow up actions” is this necessary?	This portion of the process audit report is a statement of the requirement to undertake actions from the findings in the report. It could be stated somewhere else, but it is needed.
Quizzes – wording often ambiguous leading to several possible answer – wants less ambiguity.	Questionnaires are primarily for discussion – not for providing participants with the “right” answer. They do succeed in generating discussion.
As reading of the ABC Quality Manual and Procedures Manual and associated exercises required much homework, I would have liked to receive the 2 manuals (in an e-mail?) so that I could have read up on the manuals prior to the actual exercise in class.	This idea is currently being examine for implementation across the whole of the CALA Training Program.

Additional Comments

- Food and breaks provided were excellent
- The practical component was very worthwhile and helped put the concepts together.
- Ned was an enthusiastic presenter that kept the course moving at a good pace-fun.
- Very informative and interactive class
- Dry material injected with life and enthusiasm.
- Very entertaining which helps to break ice, kept all awake and participating.
- Ned went to great levels to ensure that all questions were answered to completion. Great!
- Ned is a passionate speaker, excellent facilitator, very knowledgeable authority on the subject of internal auditing.
- I enjoyed doing the exercises as the reinforced the concepts. This is a valuable tool/resource for anyone who is assigned the task of internal auditing. I wish I had done so earlier!