

# FACILITATOR EVALUATION SUMMARY

**Training:** 4021-1301 Understanding ISO/IEC 17065      **Facilitator(s):** Ned Gravel  
**Location:** A2LA Frederick, MD      **Date:** January 23-25, 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?				6	23
Were they well defined?			2	12	15
Were they achieved?			4	16	9
<b>Course Content:</b>					
Was the material appropriate?		1	7	10	10
Complexity (1=too complex or too simple ← → Perfect=5)	1	2	8	12	6
Was the material clear to you?	1	2	5	15	6
Volume (1=too much or not enough ← → Perfect=5)		2	4	16	7
Did the handouts fit with this training - did they help?			4	9	15
<b>Facilitator Methods:</b>					
Did the facilitator allow sufficient discussion?			1	3	25
Did the facilitator encourage participation?				2	27
Did the facilitator help bring out new group ideas?			1	7	21
Did the facilitator help close out discussions?			3	8	18
Would you accept this facilitator again?	1		1	11	16
<b>Catering and Facility:</b>					
Was the seminar facility appropriate for the course?		1	6	12	10
Was the lunch and breaks service acceptable?		1	1	14	13

Participant Feedback	MOTIVA Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Temperature control in room fluctuated too much. Hotel freezing cold.</li> <li>Food was just OK</li> </ul>	<p>We tried to modify these for the second day, but the door with the air leak is also a fire escape. May not be able to use this hotel again.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A little too technical. I don't have knowledge of other ISO standards, so many items were over my head.</li> <li>Initial day discussions were too complex. Too many unexplained acronyms.</li> </ul>	<p>Good comment. We will now specify that some understanding of conformity assessment is a pre-requisite for this course.</p>
<p>Perhaps a more detailed clause by clause review of 17065. Would have preferred the course to follow the order of the Standard. Too much bounding around. Hard to follow. Maybe too much emphasis on nuances.</p>	<p>This comment was given by a majority of the participants. The course will be modified to provide those participants with the comfort that they have seen it all.</p>

<b>Participant Feedback</b>	<b>MOTIVA Response</b>
Based on the description of the course, I assumed there would be a heavier focus on the changes between Guide 65 and 17065, but instead this has been an in depth look at 17065 in general.	This is the second most common comment with regard to course flow. For some it, was not enough. For others it was too much. Perhaps the best way to resolve this is to be more specific in advertising the course.
Not enough attention was paid to giving a big picture framework of the standard to put the fine points in perspective.	This is true. See the comments above regarding the opposite desire to spend more time on the individual clauses.
Poor pedagogical technique. Focus on possible points of debate proved confusing.	Points of debate were more than possible and when they occurred, it was important to not invalidate them. To do otherwise adversely affects learning.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Try to cut out sidebar conversations (at tables).</li> <li>• Class size of 30 is too large for this session and resulted in bias toward TCBs and assessors (who didn't pay for the course)</li> <li>• Too many conversations that were only applicable for specific people.</li> </ul>	Actual root cause of this problem is stated in the second statement. With 20 or less, there is much less tendency for this type of thing to occur and this dissatisfaction would not exist. Future courses will not exceed 20.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sometimes too much discussion occurred on irrelevant topics like measurement uncertainty.</li> <li>• Maybe too much discussion.</li> </ul>	<p>Not all would agree that uncertainty of measurement is an irrelevant topic when it comes to product safety certification.</p> <p>As for general discussion, it is needed for people to understand the complexities associated with product certification. There are no easy, cookie-cutter approaches.</p>
Handouts and other materials were not well vetted and contained too many errors. Fix orientation of 99 page checklist. Modify comparison document layout	Very true. Even though this was a first-time delivery we should have spent more time doing QA on the materials. The double sided output had some pages upside down. This has been corrected.
I believe "organisation" has been misspelled throughout the presentation and handouts – organization.	Disagree. The spelling used is correct, in accordance with the Oxford English spelling although it is not the same as the Webster version of the word.
Modify answer on Chapter 2 slide 6 should be false	Good catch. This has been corrected.
Chapter 3, slide 13 and page 22 need updating to false.	Agreed. Answer has been changed.
Chapter 4, slide 5 revise answer to false	Agreed. Answer has been changed
Combination of Assessors and CB confuses the process as each is approaching the subject from distinctly different agendas.	Agreed. This approach will not be repeated. Both sets of audiences will be trained separately, even if the materials are the same.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course appears biased to assessors and focused on the assessors processes.</li> <li>• Separate training for CBs and Assessors</li> <li>• TCB centric attendee must use filters to pick up TCB issues and set aside other not related to FCC/TCB-IC/CB.</li> </ul>	Agreed. See above

<b>Participant Feedback</b>	<b>MOTIVA Response</b>
Some more clarification on the actual CHANGES a CB must implement would be good when CBs are present for the class.	Agreed. This approach will be used when this course is delivered to CBs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Table arrangements were too small for the big binders used during the class.</li> <li>The table sizes were difficult if laptops used.</li> </ul>	Agreed. Will add more tables and make groups of four or less.
Handouts should be one sided only, two sided is too hard to manipulate.	Hard to do. Binder is already too thick.
The presented questions were often not precisely formulated which causes confusion and wasted time for later clarification.	That is the aim of their formulation. There are no pat answers and discussion is required in order to come to consensus.
Facilitator started half hour early on first day which threw off flow for me. It took a full day to think like the facilitator. Flow was not clear. Purpose of ISO 17065 quiz true false was not clear.	Not certain how to address this one. 17065 discussion quiz was to force participants to get into the words of the standard to support their answers and to create discussion leading to resolution.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Course was made more difficult than it had to be.</li> <li>Material presentation is jumping all over the place.</li> </ul>	This comment appears to be aimed at changing the course to a clause-by-clause walk through and to amend the need to develop consensus in resolution of issues. The first part is agreed and this will be done for the next version of this course. Resolution by consensus will remain, however.
Work exercises were not helpful. If my group did not do it I did not really learn from it.	This is a helpful comment. It may be that all groups should conduct all exercises with only one selected group presenting for each one.
Seemed to be a bit too much discussion on schemes and not enough on some of the more detailed questionable clauses.	Understanding of schemes is fundamental to the management of certification programs and their accreditation.
Day 2 seemed rushed	It was. The exam at the end of the day loomed large and we needed to provide people with sufficient opportunity to complete it.
<b>Comments provided by hosting organisation</b>	
Based on the feedback, and the lingering sidebar conversations I heard over the final two days, I would recommend that A2LA separate outside parties and assessors in future classes.	Good idea.
Cannot exceed class size, period.	From comments and experience, 20 is the maximum class size for this type of course. While the idea of having more seemed like a good one at the time (for cost and other considerations) it just does not work. Future classes will be limited to 20.

<b>Participant Feedback</b>	<b>MOTIVA Response</b>
Although the material eventually covered the entire standard, there were too many comments on flow and too many wanted a clause-by-clause review. I tend to agree with this and would prefer a clause-by-clause review, followed by the discussion questions. If some of the sidebar conversations were limited, I believe that this could have easily been achieved in a three day course.	Agreed. Course will be re-structured away from the processes involved in certification to a clause-by-clause examination.
Too much focus on specific schemes.	Mostly agree. If scheme discussions take away from concentrating on the standard. If the scheme discussions are part of the considerations, then they need to take place. No certification takes place without a scheme, however defined.
Although I understand the rationale for using internationally accepted English (i.e. organisation) this caused at least 4 comments, so I recommend just changing it to the native spelling.	Will change if for deliveries of the course into venues making use of the Webster version of the spelling.
Remove all acronyms!	Good idea. It will take some work, but if the folks do not know what the term means, it interferes with attainment of the training objectives.
Overall the hotel wasn't a great venue, and every assessor rented a car. Next time we should choose a hotel next to an airport to lower this expense.	Good idea. Hoster's choice.

**Other comments:**

- Excellent materials.
- Ned was great!
- Good job!
- Very informative! Especially interesting were viewpoints of assessors that show some contention or polarisation on issues.
- I did like having A2LA staff there who were also knowledgeable in the class, this only reinforces the material and the instructor