

FACILITATOR EVALUATION SUMMARY

Training: Root Cause and Corrective Action Course **Facilitator(s):** Ned Gravel
Location: SMRTL, Salt Lake City, UTAH **Date:** 7 Jan 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?			2	2	10
Were they well defined?				3	11
Were they achieved?		1		3	10
Course Content:					
Was the material appropriate?			2	3	9
Complexity (1=too complex or too simple ← → Perfect=5)			4	1	9
Was the material clear to you?		1	3	2	8
Volume (1=too much or not enough ← → Perfect=5)			2	3	9
Did the handouts fit with this training - did they help?				4	10
Facilitator Methods:					
Did the facilitator allow sufficient discussion?				1	13
Did the facilitator encourage participation?				2	12
Did the facilitator help bring out new group ideas?			1	2	11
Did the facilitator help close out discussions?			2	4	8
Would you accept this facilitator again?				4	11
Catering and Facility:					
Was the seminar facility appropriate for the course?			1	5	8
Was the lunch and breaks service acceptable?			4	4	6

Participant Feedback	MOTIVA Response
First exposure to this concept. Still absorbing information to feel comfortable with appropriate application and utilization.	And that is as it should be. Well done.
Some of the material was discussed too quickly before definitions were clearly presented, namely Chapter 3. Overall good.	Good comment. Next time, we will try and make the definitions clear at the very beginning. They are important to understanding the overall concepts.

Participant Feedback	MOTIVA Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some examples are too vague. • Examples could be less vague and have fewer correct answers. 	<p>This is a valid comment for those looking for absolutes. The examples are not meant to provide absolute answers, but to create the discussion which is a pre-requisite for the learning process. In a real situation there will always be more than one correct response.</p>
<p>Some of the scenario descriptions did not match up with the root causes or their solutions. They should be edited or revised to be more consistent.</p>	<p>Very good comment. Our discussion pointed out logic flaws in the examples used and these will be modified over the next year.</p>

Other comments:

- Good job
- We got a good understanding of when and how to implement root cause analysis. It was interesting that not all non-conformances need RCA.