

FACILITATOR EVALUATION FORM

Training: T21-05C QA/QC Issues

Date: April 4-5, 2005

Facilitator(s): Ed Paski

Location: Lord Elgin, Ottawa

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?	14	3	15	13	19
Were they well defined?	1	5	20	17	21
Were they achieved?	2	10	23	14	15
Course Content:					
Was the material appropriate?	1	3	11	21	28
Complexity (1=too complex or too simple ← → Perfect=5)	5	5	15	20	19
Was the material clear to you?	1	3	13	23	24
Volume (1=too much or not enough ← → Perfect=5)	4	5	19	16	20
Did the handouts fit with this training - did they help?	1	3	11	19	30
Facilitator Methods:					
Did the facilitator allow sufficient discussion?	0	8	13	18	25
Did the facilitator encourage participation?	2	5	13	16	28
Did the facilitator help bring out new group ideas?	1	10	15	14	24
Did the facilitator help close out discussions?	3	10	16	18	17
Would you accept this facilitator again?	1	4	12	16	31
Catering and Facility:					
Was the seminar facility appropriate for the course?	0	2	18	17	27
Was the lunch and breaks service acceptable?	1	0	24	15	24

Other Comments:

Comment/Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus less on lab operations and more on assessment process Assessors at this level require a more practical (real-life) concept of calibration issues – workshop did not lend itself to easily applying concepts to methods commonly assessed at member laboratories Does not really apply to assessors as it is not relevant in most methods (ie. Calibration validation) 	Will use different approaches for these issues in the future.

Comment/Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much material – should just take one area and try to figure out how the assessors are to apply them in the field • Very good course but too much for a workshop • Too much detail • Too much material for time allotted • QC is a “hot” topic – labs do different things – could have been longer to discuss. Need to come up with consensus to assess control charts, etc. • Very interesting but could spend 1 day on this subject • Not sufficient time to go over these issues • Time restraint so did not accomplish as much as could 	Will use different approach for this material in future.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The room was too cold • Room too cold 	Will attempt to fix environmental conditions when these are known to not satisfy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Round tables are nice for discussion but when the bulk of material is presented on overheads it is either hard to write or hard to see if you back ends up towards the screen • Presentation style did not lead to open discussion – too many slides – end of presentation better • Not sure what was accomplished • The training was very much like a class, therefore discussion was hard to come about 	Will use different approach for this material in the future.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Again here, course was for chemistry methods, to my knowledge – very little of it applies to micro and toxicology • I don’t feel qualified to assess this facilitator or training as I’m not familiar with TCP or its calibrations (or most other <u>chemical</u> tests performed in environmental labs) 	Will attempt to let all participants know when the focus of an issue is analytical chemistry as opposed to micro or tox.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not rigorous enough statistically • Some background material contributes little but may draw fire from some “uber-assessors” • Consider omitting non-essential material or presenting it differently 	Will use different approach for this material in the future.

- This is an excellent theoretical presentation. Very well documented and full of examples
- Good technical for lab staff
- Very helpful to me. Good examples to use to initiate discussion with labs – particularly if lab having difficulty with PT samples
- I learned lots from this course, help to understand the new concept of establishing calibration curve (but not sure if going to use it or not!). Thanks Ed.
- Well done, simple to understand
- Most useful and well presented lecture I attended during this session

- I would appreciate this type of training provided as a general workshop I could send my analysts to attend
- Very excellent training
- Great!!
- I really found it a great learning class and I think the rest of the group did also by notes being taken

Other Suggestions:

- Online course on control charts – guidance for assessing suitability, acceptability
- CAEAL should provide a list – for assessors to discuss things regarding assessment issues