

# FACILITATOR EVALUATION SUMMARY

**Training:** 4010-1302 Internal Auditor      **Facilitator(s):** Ned Gravel and Dawn Mettler  
**Location:** Columbus, OH      **Date:** June 24 & 25, 2013

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

Participant Feedback	MOTIVA Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was annoying flipping back &amp; forth in books, but nice to have information. Lunch was very quick.</li> <li>The course materials need to be better organized. At times the instructor had difficulty finding the right pages</li> <li>Better organization of materials &amp; page numbering.</li> <li>Materials would be easier to reference if they were numbered as a single document, rather than sections.</li> </ul>	<p>We messed up on the production of the binders for this course. We put the wrong set of "sample" documents in the separate binder. Should have this sorted out by the next course.</p> <p>Putting them all together in one document with numbered pages might be a good idea and it may be attempted to see how it goes. Note that the various parts of the participant binder are from different documents and a unified page numbering system would be difficult to implement and very difficult to follow.</p>

<b>Participant Feedback</b>	<b>MOTIVA Response</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two days doesn't seem long enough.</li> <li>Not enough time for thorough review of material.</li> </ul>	<p>Understood. More days mean more time for participants away from their work and more expense. If there is enough customer demand for a longer version of this course, it can certainly be delivered.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At times there were many tangents that confused more than helped. Too much time was devoted to exercises without enough description before – meaning how the activities worked was not explained as well as information/instruction for the class before the activity was held. Too much group discussion and not enough leader instruction.</li> <li>A few less discussions and tangents would be nice.</li> <li>I liked the least the comical nature of the discussions at some point.</li> </ul>	<p>While it is understood that there are some in the class environment that wish to simply “get to it,” there are others who need the time and peripheral discussion to collate their information and come to their own conclusions. See comment that precedes this one. Constructivism (the learning model used by MOTIVA) requires full discussion to ensue as part of learning.</p> <p>However, the point is a very valid one and MOTIVA will emphasise this aspect of learning so that those who may be ready to go before their peers understand the need to bring everyone along before we proceed to the next steps.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maybe a bit more presentation, I am a visual person.</li> <li>Spent too much time on exercises. Would prefer more lecture/scope material.</li> </ul>	<p>This is a skills demonstration course. Participants are required, to show they can plan, present, deliver, and close out an internal audit in order to obtain a certificate of successful completion. That is why there is more time spent on exercises than lecture. However, it is a good idea to emphasise this aspect of training early in the course – so that folks know why this it is structured this way.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I would like more auditing, less on root cause (needs to be de-emphasized for this course). Too much on <u>external</u> type audit requirements meetings, etc.</li> <li>Still seemed like it was treated like an external audit format, rather than an internal audit of your own labs.</li> <li>My organization doesn't fit the “normal” definition. There is no formal QM for our lab. The responsibilities just fall on me.</li> </ul>	<p>Root cause is now officially part of the processes within conformant quality systems for the close out of all types of applicable findings and although the skillset can be de-emphasised, its inclusion today is the result of comments from participants wishing more on the topic during previous sessions. Best practice in audits is that ALL types of audits (internal and external) follow the same processes.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not enough instruction prior to practical exercises.</li> <li>Liked least the clarity of the instructors directions vs what was being presented thru materials provided.</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed. Material is being revamped to focus the exercises on the new sample materials being prepared for the next revision of this course.</p>

<b>Participant Feedback</b>	<b>MOTIVA Response</b>
<p>Maybe include a section geared toward smaller labs and food micro.</p>	<p>This course can be easily focused towards these types of labs during delivery without changing any of the material. All that is needed is demand to hold such a course with sufficient number of participants from those labs.</p>

**Other comments:**

- Good job Ned!
- Excellent facilitators
- Excellent facilitator/instructor - superb subject matter expert.
- Participation and discussion were very encouraged in a fair, open and tolerant environment.
- Good class and instructor. Dawn did an excellent job.
- I liked the interactive aspects, and the “worst case scenarios” interviewing exercises.
- Good effective exercises.
- Very good instructors
- It was good to know that there are other QA people dealing with the same issues.
- I loved that Ned treated us as his customer who he wanted and needed to understand the material – sincerely concerned about educating us and we got answers to our questions.
- Liked most the exercises and interactiveness.
- I liked most the knowledge of the instructors (Ned and Dawn)
- The instructors knew the information well.
- Liked most the standard was provided and the example forms could be helpful.
- Very knowledgeable instructors
- Liked most the interaction of instructors with class
- Liked most the class participation
- Gave me more points to try when I do internal audits