

## FACILITATOR EVALUATION FORM

**Training:** T45-02 Internal Auditor Course

**Location:** Ministry of Environment, T.O.

**Date:** November 4 to 6, 2002

**Facilitator(s):** Ned Gravel

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?	0	0	1	1	18
Were they well defined?	0	0	1	3	16
Were they achieved?	0	0	1	6	13
<b>Course Content:</b>					
Was the material appropriate?	0	0	3	6	11
Complexity (1=too complex or too simple ← → Perfect=5)	0	0	5	5	10
Was the material clear to you?	0	0	2	7	11
Volume (1=too much or not enough ← → Perfect=5)	0	0	6	4	10
Did the handouts fit with this training - did they help?	0	0	3	6	11
<b>Facilitator Methods</b>					
Did the facilitator allow sufficient discussion?	0	0	0	2	18
Did the facilitator encourage participation?	0	0	0	2	18
Did the facilitator help bring out new group ideas?	0	0	2	4	14
Did the facilitator help close out discussions?	0	0	1	3	15
Would you accept this facilitator again?	0	0	1	0	19

Other Comments/Concern	Remedial Action
If you assign groups in the future, please rotate the assignment of members daily so that a group doesn't have to do all the work for an individual who won't participate & so that people get a better chance to network.	Agreed. Good idea
I found Exercise 5 - Gathering Objective Evidence - a very confusing question. I had no idea what you were looking for. Other than that the course was great!	Will rephrase the wording to eliminate the confusion.

**Other Comments:**

- Course content and facilitator methods were useful and helpful. The requirements of some of the exercises were not always completely clear to me as a participant. There was some repetition in the exercise, which is helpful for learning but can grow tiresome. An appropriate balance was struck in this regard.

- In our lab an internal audit would be a method audit or a sample audit (there is also annual quality system review, conducted by corporate director of QA). The method or sample audit would involve one auditor, and usually one, sometimes 2 or 3 auditees. It generally takes on the order of 1/2 to one day. Opening and closing meetings seem to be uncalled-for when, most often there are 2 people involved: a.) one auditor, one auditee. The findings, of course will be more widely disseminated, b.) department manager, general manager, possibly corporate QA director, and of course, the auditee.

The notion of an "audit team" going to do an audit or audits is not very meaningful in our department of 2 people. Sometimes, we will audit together, but most often, it will be one or the other of us doing it, alone.

However, there were several valuable concepts put forth, that are applicable to our lab: The ideas of proper planning and structure, formal but relaxed demeanour, responsibilities, attributes, transparency, put the auditee at ease because he's scared of you.

Even the elements of the opening and closing meetings (even though we don't have the meetings) can be adapted to our situation: they can be a verbal preamble and summary to the couple of hours we spend with the auditee.

I thought it was also very useful to be repeatedly looking through 17025, 10011, and TC002 to find things - the exercises and presentations were effective in getting us more familiar with the standards.

- This is an entirely new field for me and I got the opportunity to know a new subject. I hope the information which I got will be helpful for me and my sponsor.
- Good humour and examples make the course very interesting and fast moving. Ned delivered the course in a clear manner with group work to real life situations. Great actor as auditee!
- Enthusiasm for material helped to energise group.
- I was not expecting the instructor to be so articulate + animated + enthusiastic. He made the course a little easier to swallow + I learned a great deal. I feel confident that I can use what I've learned in my laboratory
- Ned was a great facilitator. He had good examples, answered questions, a good delivery + involved all the participants in the course activities
- I really enjoyed this course. The facilitator was very good. My appreciation of CAEAL is increased a lot
- Test time was a little 'short', but overall a very informative and enjoyable course.

- Ned Gravel is a very effective facilitator. He has made the course interesting and easier to understand by his knowledge, techniques and methods of doing it. He has established a good training relationship between facilitator and participants. This course is one of the best that I have attended. More power, Ned!
- The specific examples given and group discussions were extremely helpful. Differences explained between other standards i.e. ISO 9000 was of interest.
- Ned did a great job. Didn't like the exam too much. Overall it was a positive program