

# FACILITATOR EVALUATION SUMMARY

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

Participant Feedback	MOTIVA Response
Course information should be in three-ring binder	The logistics for this course were arranged by the hosting organization. This comment has been passed to them.
Not everyone had familiarity with ISO/IEC Guide 65, so learning the differences between Guide 64 and ISO/IEC 17065 was not as effective for them.	Good point. This would normally be discussed during the introduction to the course and that is why folks normally indicate their responsibilities within the organization. We missed that one or two were not involved at all in actual certification work.
Slide 14 of Chapter 5 should be modified to specify that only applicable requirements must be met.	Very true. Good catch. This slide has now been changed.
My learning style did not match that provided by the facilitator. I prefer more lecture presentation instead of discussion.	Understood. Normally, the opposite is the problem, when folks want more discussion and less formal presentation. It is perhaps a good idea to confirm the facilitator's methods at the beginning of training so that those affected can make their wishes known.

<b>Participant Feedback</b>	<b>MOTIVA Response</b>
Be careful with acronyms.	Understood. Bad habit that needs to be overcome.
The slide on outputs from management review should cite 8.5.3 of the standard and not 8.5.2	Good catch. That slide has now been changed.
One of the binders was missing some of the Tab 4 pages.	The logistics for this course were arranged by the hosting organization. This comment has been passed to them.
It would be helpful to be advised to review the course booklet before training. The entire package was a bit overwhelming. I found the quiz form difficult because I was unfamiliar with the material.	Understood. It is valid that some participants desire the opportunity to review the materials prior to training and this can certainly be arranged. This comment has been passed to the hosting organization and the approach will be suggested for all future courses.

**Other comments:**

- This training did not directly affect me, but it gave me an understanding of more than I had prior to this.
- You created a great atmosphere for discussion and we took advantage of it!! (That was the plan.)
- Ned made this course interesting. Really appreciate it!!
- Excellent speaker! Entertaining as well as informative. Thoroughly knowledgeable.
- Mr. Gravel was an excellent trainer for this course. He sought out our goals and prompted thorough discussion and alternative viewpoints on key aspects that we are dealing with. We will recommend him highly and consider him for our future training needs.