



# FACILITATOR EVALUATION SUMMARY

Training: 17025 Facilitator(s): Ned Gravel  
 Location: Toronto - Canada Date: 4-5 February 2019

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

Participant Feedback	IAS Response
Suggestion; Larger room to accommodate a discussion – style learning environment. The room was too small.	Understood. Hotel promised size did not match with actual dimensions. We are not using this facility again.

**Other comments:**

- Thank you! Training was very informative and engaging.
- Initially expected course to be seminar like, where someone lectured, we listened. Pleasantly surprised at the effectiveness of a group discussion on the principles of ISO/IEC 17025.
- The facilitator was very knowledgeable and was very successful in engaging the students. I feel very confident in making revisions to my Quality System prior to my next IAS Audit.
- On occasion, material was unexpectedly complex, useful to different participants not hard to follow for others. Other times had anticipated more potential applications within organizations. Overall, excellent course. For every anticipated personal objective not met, some other need or unknown was introduced and explained. The intent of the standard is better delivered in this format versus clause by clause review. Open class discussions enabled the class to understand the intent of the standard better.