

# FACILITATOR EVALUATION FORM

**Training:** ISO/IEC Guide 65 for Assessors      **Facilitator(s):** Ned Gravel  
**Location:** Columbia, MD (A2LA Conclave)      **Date:** 22 March 2012

Item	Met Participant Needs?				
	1 No	2	3 OK	4	5 Yes
<b>Course Objectives:</b>	<i>√ as appropriate below</i>				
Were you given the opportunity to help define them?				1	4
Were they well defined?				1	4
Were they achieved?			1		4
<b>Course Content:</b>					
Was the material appropriate?				1	4
Complexity (1=too complex or too simple ← → Perfect=5)			2	3	
Was the material clear to you?				2	3
Volume (1=too much or not enough ← → Perfect=5)		3	2		
Did the handouts fit with this training - did they help?					
<b>Facilitator Methods:</b>					
Did the facilitator allow sufficient discussion?				1	4
Did the facilitator encourage participation?				1	4
Did the facilitator help bring out new group ideas?				1	4
Did the facilitator help close out discussions?				1	4
Would you accept this facilitator again?				1	4
<b>Catering and Facility:</b>					
Was the seminar facility appropriate for the course?				1	4
Was the lunch and breaks service acceptable?			3	2	

Participant's Comments	MOTIVA Response
I believe it would have been beneficial to introduce a product (computer, marker or whatever) at the beginning of class and reference this throughout, as we progressed through the certification process. I believe that this would have assisted in grasping the basic understanding of product certification.	This is a good idea. The aim of this session was to teach people about the processes involved in certification and how the standard applies to certification bodies.
The class was far too short and would have been better served to run at least 1.5 days.	Agreed. We tried to put too much into one day. Not all participants came with the same level of knowledge and it was always going to take time to train this standard to those not familiar with it.
I would have also preferred to add some assessment scenarios, but again time was limited and a good amount of material was covered in 9 hours.	This is a good idea, but it would require a whole other training day, much like a lead assessor course, to discuss and work through some examples.

<b>Participant's Comments</b>	<b>MOTIVA Response</b>
The Discussion Questions were often ambiguous and led groups down the wrong path.	Both of these comments are valid, but not everyone was at the same level of understanding of either product certification or Guide 65 at the beginning of the day. That is one of the reasons this course was created and delivered.
Just a thought about possibly going through the Guide itself rather than through the chapters as laid out in the course handbook. Then skip those sessions that everyone knows about such as internal audit, management review, etc. Follow through the Guide so that the attendee becomes familiar with it and IAF GD 5. Skipping around the issues became confusing. While the facilitator was good, I just feel it could have been done differently to learn the Guide and GD5	As for the issue of questions and a sense of "right" versus "wrong" answers, it is important to understand that there is no "wrong" path of ideas. Going down the "wrong" path is a valuable learning tool for those not familiar with the standard. The actual discussion was important and the conclusions people reached in the end were all appropriate and suitable for assessors conducting assessments for ISO/IEC Guide 65.
I expected much more information about proper application of requirements and A2LA expectations to be able to conduct a proper assessment. This was not the aim of training at all.	This is true, and it should have been made clearer to all that this course was not about the application of ISO/IEC Guide 65 for assessors. It was for assessors to come to common understanding of the processes of certification and the standard that is used for the accreditation of those processes. Actual accreditation requirements would require a separate course offered by A2LA accreditation staff.
Facilities were tight.	Comment has been passed to the organising group. A bit larger room should be used for 20 participants.

**Other comments:**

- Overall excellent presentation skills by the trainer who possessed the ability to connect with the participants and deliver an overall solid class.
- Good facilitator overall.