

# FACILITATOR EVALUATION SUMMARY

Training: 4021-1305 Understanding ISO/IEC 17065 Facilitator(s): Ned Gravel  
 Location: Chicago, IL Date: 3 & 4 October 2013

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

Participant Feedback	MOTIVA Response
Due to my English capability, I had trouble following the slides. I believe I missed many important explanations made by Ned during discussions. If available, I would like to take 17067 course.	This participant was looking for information on a related but different discipline (scheme ownership instead of certification body operation). I am hoping that they acquired enough to engage in learning it.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Binder clips are bent &amp; allows pages to fall out.</li> <li>Rings in notebook binder made it difficult to jump to different sections when needed.</li> </ul>	This has been passed to the course sponsor.
Because course objectives are somewhat moving targets established by participants, determination of achievement is not easy.	Agreed in some cases. Adult learning requires trust in the participants knowing, at least a little, of what they want. MOTIVA believes in working towards them first, and standard training goals second.

<b>Participant Feedback</b>	<b>MOTIVA Response</b>
Volume – too much in time frame allotted, did not allow depth of knowledge I desired, but this also maybe due to my focussed knowledge of 17025 and other standards.	Unfortunately, no two-day course can take the place of experience and hands-on operation. In the case of a person comfortable in 17025, a paradigm shift is needed to commence building a similar level of comfort in 17065.
May want to consider reducing the quantity of quiz questions to allow systematic review of requirement in the standard clause by clause.	In this response, the participant is referring to the MOTIVA use of “quiz” questions to generate discussion on the specific and related clauses of 17065. This method is used to generate discussion on certification processes instead of just going through the standard clause-by-clause. Such an approach has been considered and all clauses are indeed covered by the current approach. It is felt that the current approach gives participants a better high level overview than clause-by-clause discussion.
It would be very helpful if the participants were informed to read the ISO/IEC 17065 standard prior to the course.	While this is true, it is not something we can ask participants to do as a pre-requisite. This course is designed to discuss the processes of certification and then discuss the applicable parts of the standard.
Focus was not on “implementation” but “requirements” of the standard. Implementation is on the CB, but we might have got into more about how to judge effectiveness once implemented.	Very valid comment. Discussion down to this level is really a function of the time available. This group had such diverse interests and expectations that covering them all did not allow us to get into this level of implementation detail.

**Other Comments:**

- Ned did an excellent job in presenting the materials. I fully expected “Clause 1: Scope.....” but it was not presented in this manner. I enjoyed the open discussion points and the willingness to present and discuss issues even when it might have a negative impact.