



WEBINAR COURSE EVALUATION SUMMARY

Training: 3023 IAF MD Training **Facilitator(s):** Ganesh Bhat, Ramesh Ramachandran
Location: Webinar **Date:** 24-25 May 2021

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

Participant Feedback	IAS Response
The MDs supplement 17021 requirements and it would have been beneficial to include some of the 17021 requirements, even if it means an extra day.	Good point. This can be done, but participants would have to agree to a three-day course. Alternatively, we could require participants to have taken a 17021-1 course as a pre-requisite to this course. This second approach is the most common in the industry.
The Class exercises were good however the Case Study #2 was based on a withdrawn MD and should have been removed from the course. The course material is rather dry and boring and some variety in the presentation styles would be beneficial.	Noted. This material has now been removed from the course.
I was completely lost on the Green House Gas section as I have no understanding of the standards requirements. It would have been better if reading that was a pre-requisite. Providing a copy of the PPT would be good.	Agreed. This portion of the course has been removed.
Training was good but in my opinion offsite training involved more discussion, new ideas and participation compare to onsite training, Online training still needs improvement/new ideas/contents to achieve this.	Agreed. The trainers are looking for ways to promote engagement and participation.



Participant Feedback	IAS Response
<p>Class exercise and Team discussion is very good session. It will be very much helpful if the right answer sheet with explanation will be provided.</p>	<p>Agreed. Trainers are going to concentrate more on answers than questions.</p>
<p>The trainers did a good job delivering a content however it does feel at times quite dry due to the presentations being very text heavy. The discussions are good but it would benefit from more case studies or real life examples to bring the content to life so it is less textbook like and introduce more interactivity. The class exercises were a good way for everyone to participate and I would have liked to see more of these. The assessor encouraged participation by the entire group and also helped facilitate discussions.</p>	<p>Agreed. While the trainers currently use line-by-line examination of the documents, they are looking for ways to push the discussion out to the participants. This will include real-life examples from three perspectives for most requirements. The perspective of the CAB, the AB, and the certified customer.</p>
<p>IAF MD 5 and MD11 is very new concepts that required more simple practical applications for me to understand the basics. Prefer to be explained basics with very basic scenarios etc.</p>	<p>Agreed. The case studies for MD5 and 11 are not very useful. Participants will get more value from discussions regarding each point of the MD, rather than just an exercise with 50 variables for which there is no right answer.</p>

Other comments:

- Thanks again for your profession lecture.