

FACILITATOR EVALUATION SUMMARY

Training: Internal Auditor **Facilitator(s):** Ned Gravel
Location: Portland, OR **Date:** 16 March 2011

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

<u>COMMENTS</u>	<u>REPSONSE</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better instructions for binding materials. • Need instructions for how to assemble the course materials. • Printing/Organization instructions for training material should be provided. • It would be groovy if all of the docs for this training would be in order and bound in some manner. 	<p>This was our first attempt at "participant assembly" of course materials. Instructions will be provided for future deliveries of this course.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume of material a bit much for most audiences. Too many reference materials to fish through. • Too many handouts. 	<p>Understood. In future, the references materials, while not necessarily lighter, will only be used for the exercises and participants will be advised to focus on the course notes.</p>

<u>COMMENTS</u>	<u>REPSONSE</u>
Facility was ok, but could have been better for Exova.	Agreed, (and appreciate the comment about an “Exova Standard”) but at half the price of the next closest facility (in terms of price). In future, we will try and have local staff conduct reconnaissance of facilities being considered.
Recommend that participants review materials prior to training.	Agreed. This was the decision of the onsite contact. In future, we will advise onsite contacts to print and deliver materials to participants well before the training.
Could probably use a few more breaks.	True. This can be a demanding course. In future, will advise participants to let the facilitator know when they want a break. Facilitators are good that way and will wish to meet participant needs.
Bad parking at venue.	Not certain what “bad” means here. Willing to discuss at the behest of the person making the comment.
Have students bring their own SOP’s for examples.	Very good idea. Will ask participants to select and send copies of sample SOPs to the facilitator so that the exercises can include them.
It would be groovy if all of the docs for this training would be in order and bound in some manner.	Difficulties in order of documents is understood and being addressed separately. All materials for this course were bound by the participant laboratories. Will suggest to lab contacts Course documents are bound to be easily dissembled and reference materials are Cerlox bound.

Other Comments

Slides were perfect! Ned did great with delivery & keeping everyone engaged.