

FACILITATOR EVALUATION SUMMARY

Training: 5011-03-4001 (Basic ISO/IEC 17011 Course) **Facilitator(s):** Ned Gravel
Location: Arlington, Virginia **Date:** Dec. 12 & 13, 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?	1		1	6	18
Were they well defined?			3	9	14
Were they achieved?		1	3	11	10
Course Content:					
Was the material appropriate?			3	8	14
Complexity (1=too complex or too simple ← → Perfect=5)		2	7	6	10
Was the material clear to you?		1	1	13	11
Volume (1=too much or not enough ← → Perfect=5)	1	3	6	8	8
Did the handouts fit with this training - did they help?			4	10	12
Facilitator Methods:					
Did the facilitator allow sufficient discussion?			1	3	22
Did the facilitator encourage participation?				7	19
Did the facilitator help bring out new group ideas?		1	3	8	14
Did the facilitator help close out discussions?		2	3	8	13
Would you accept this facilitator again?			2	6	18
Catering and Facility:					
Was the seminar facility appropriate for the course?	2	3	6	6	8
Was the lunch and breaks service acceptable?	1	3	4	7	10

Participant's Comments	MOTIVA Response
This is not a big deal, but the tables could be larger, cramped for 3 people.	Agreed.
Wish it could have been closer to my work but this was OK, was able to get a van from our work at this time.	OK. Glad this worked out.
I was asked to remind you that you forgot to call me after I raised my hand.	Thank you.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hotel location was bad and hotel was poor. • Very inconvenient venue. Many more hotels available closer to Metro. 	Understood. Message passed to training specifier.
Some individuals were too knowledgeable for the training. Some discussions could have been tabled.	See next comments regarding opposite perception.

Participant's Comments	MOTIVA Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The facilitator moved slowly through the material which mainly involved reading the Standards. I would have liked to see more active facilitation encouraging quiet participants to speak up and to moderate the louder voices. • Need to stay more on schedule. • First day you should move faster through the questions and add more meat of what is in the Standard. It would be helpful to give examples based on other activities than labs. Much of the information was not related to what the audience does. Terms used made it difficult. Define them sooner. 	<p>Those folks with passion about the subject mater may monopolise the discussion at times. This is recognised, but the group dynamics allowed for a much stronger group to emerge at the end.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program needs to be more related to agriculture not labs. • We would appreciate scenarios involving agricultural related topics relating to product certification and inspection bodies. • More practical examples of 17011 applications outside of the laboratory industry would be helpful. • Questions and exercises somewhat vague on explanation of what is being expected. • Following what acronyms meant was at times difficult. Some of the examples were heavy on the lab side, but putting it in perspective of the NOP regulatory framework was done and helpful. • More focus on application of regulations – beyond the context of consideration for MRA status. Some questions on slides were ambiguous – not by design. • At times in beginning – acronyms a bit much! 	<p>Agreed – was not initially sure which parts of which programs would be useful to the participants. We tended to get away from solely lab examples during subsequent days.</p> <p>Interpretation exercises during the second course were devoid of reference to one specific paradigm and this was able to bring the discussion back to the more familiar ground of the participants.</p> <p>Acronyms were better understood by the participants by the beginning of the third day.</p>
<p>Course needs to be adjusted to appropriate audience, the acronyms and laboratory examples are not comprehensive for people who do not work with laboratories and are not familiar with this field. Explanation of how these work together would be appreciated. A variation of examples from different fields would also be helpful.</p>	<p>Interactivity and interoperability of relevant standards was scheduled and delivered on the 4th day scheduled for this series of courses – ISO/IEC Guide 65 and Interoperability of Standards.</p> <p>However, it might be useful to do this part of the four days at the beginning of day 1.</p>
<p>Doug was useful as an expert guest. However, it would have been more helpful to have someone from an inspection (quality) background.</p>	<p>Both facilitators have inspection body experience. This may not have been apparent during the discussion.</p>

Participant's Comments	MOTIVA Response
<p>Clause reviews needed title/partition discussions. Small tables for 3 people but manageable. To some the review questions for each “chapter” per clause were not used as an opportunity to read through the clause itself, rather just to find the answer. A different approach could help some people to utilize the time for clearer understanding of the different areas of 17011. Example: review the table of contents, point out the titles of the different clauses while reviewing the questions.</p>	<p>Room comment valid and addressed to coordinating agency.</p> <p>With regard to the approach, focussing on the search for specific material in a document is considered a quick method of familiarising trainees with its contents. In this case, the participants were sufficiently knowledgeable to undertake interpretation of the standard by the middle of the second day – based on this approach.</p>

Other comments:

- Great discussion. Very good presentation of information, fast moving, not boring, good examples, lively discussions. Very knowledgeable of this information-recommend for future training. Thank you.
- I appreciate the instructor making the training relatable and having a sense of humour and respect for class participants.
- Fantastic (need more time!). Great presentation and exercises.
- Mr. Gravel encouraged participation and discussion. Made sure our objectives were defined and met. The make up of the course facilitated becoming familiar with 17011 without making it forced, dry or miserable. I fully enjoyed and was benefitted by this training.
- I appreciate Ned’s passion for this subject and his ability to apply or infuse humour into a subject that can be quite dry.
- Overall, the course was excellent!! Ned is very good! Would recommend him !!
- Very informative class.
- Ned is an excellent facilitator – one of the best I’ve experienced.
- Good course. The breakout sections and scenarios helped identify and explain sections 17011 Standards better than going through actual Standard point by point.
- Entertaining, I learned a lot. Thank you !
- Excellent – thank you !
- Thank you for the extra ISO Standards.
- Excellent discussions, thank you.
- Thank you re: scheme ownership.