

FACILITATOR EVALUATION SUMMARY

Training: Root Cause Analysis **Facilitator(s):** Ned Gravel
Location: Portland, OR **Date:** 17 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	1	2	13
Were they well defined?	0	0	3	3	10
Were they achieved?	0	0	5	6	5
Course Content:					
Was the material appropriate?	0	0	1	7	8
Complexity (1=too complex or too simple ← → Perfect=5)	0	1	2	10	3
Was the material clear to you?	0	2	1	7	6
Volume (1=too much or not enough ← → Perfect=5)	0	1	4	8	3
Did the handouts fit with this training - did they help?	0	0	3	10	3
Facilitator Methods:					
Did the facilitator allow sufficient discussion?	0	0	0	5	11
Did the facilitator encourage participation?	0	0	0	4	12
Did the facilitator help bring out new group ideas?	0	0	2	3	11
Did the facilitator help close out discussions?	0	0	2	5	9
Would you accept this facilitator again?	0	0	1	2	13
Catering and Facility:					
Was the seminar facility appropriate for the course?	0	0	2	6	8
Was the lunch and breaks service acceptable?	0	0	4	10	2

<u>COMMENTS</u>	<u>REPSONSE</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Root Cause worksheet was missing. • "What is a Root Cause" slide not in handout. 	These comments are about the new inclusion of the Exova Deviation and Incident Report format being included in the reference material and the definition of a root cause not included in the printouts of the slides provided to participants. Both have now been corrected.
Started late.	True. In future we will poll participants to obtain consensus on whether or not to start without any missing colleagues.
Facility was fine – but substandard for the quality expected of Exova.	Agreed, (and appreciate the comment about the "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.

<u>COMMENTS</u>	<u>REPSONSE</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The material was great but I think we should have had more complex scenarios to work on root cause – perhaps from some “real-life” scenarios determined by each table. I think it would be good for us to come prepared with some examples from the lab with regard to difficult RCA’s. 	<p>This is a good suggestion. It is weighed against a set of generic scenarios that allow participants to practice basic approaches. Often, when the basic scenarios have been done, specific local lab examples are then discussed. This did happen during this session, but not to the satisfaction of everyone involved. It is something we try to achieve because it brings the skilset home to everyone involved in the example being discussed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not all slides matched the presentation (i.e. Initial actions at Accident slide has 7, presentation only showed 5). Legislation slide different from printout “legislation” slide. 	<p>Very true. Slides were modified without changing the handouts. This will be corrected.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Really fast! Course content - too simple Course content - not enough in terms of volume. I think we could have spent a little more time on the slides. 	<p>Differences in perception here are noted and we will ask for future participants to state, during the training, if the material is too fast, too slow, too little or too much so that accommodation can be made that also facilitates overall group progress.</p>
<p>Didn’t go over ISO/IEC standard.</p>	<p>True. The standard is silent on how to do this – only that it needs to be done.</p>
<p>Did not wrap up with discussion about meeting our goals.</p>	<p>Facilitator error. He thought he had. In future, participants will be asked to warn the facilitator if the session is about to end without this being done.</p>

Other Comments

This training clarified some of the uncertainties I had with RCA, especially; when is it appropriate or necessary to conduct the process?