

COLLATION OF PARTICIPANT COMMENTS

Training: CAEAL Uncertainty Training **Location:** Westin Hotel, Edmonton

Session (s): 24 May 2001 **Facilitator(s):** Peter Fowlie, Bill Mills, Wes Johnson

Item	Met Participant Needs?					Tot
	1 No	2	3 OK	4	5 Yes	
Course Objectives:	<i>√ as appropriate below</i>					
Were you given the opportunity to help define them?	20	4	9	9	1	43
Where they well defined?	1	2	17	12	11	43
Where they achieved?	1	5	13	17	5	41
Course Content:						
Was the material appropriate?	0	2	18	17	14	51
Complexity (too complex) or (too simple) <i>circle one</i>	0	1	25	5	6	37
Clarity (clear) or (fragmented/unclear) <i>circle one</i>	0	1	19	10	6	36
Volume (too much) or (not enough) <i>circle one</i>	0	4	22	5	6	37
Did the handouts fit with this training - did they help?	0	2	13	12	10	37
Facilitator Methods						
Did the facilitator allow sufficient discussion?	0	1	9	10	15	35
Did the facilitator encourage participation?	0	1	13	11	17	42
Did the facilitator help bring out new group ideas?	1	4	14	9	12	40
Did the facilitator help close out discussions?	0	3	14	8	11	36
Would you accept this facilitator again?	0	2	17	8	19	46

Major Issues for Participants

#	Issue	Potential Resolution
1	Three facilitators repeated the same discussion. Was expecting alternate methods, CAEAL not addressing the problem.	Have experienced first run. Will refine for future delivery by trainers throughout the year
2	Good discussion, but needs more attention regarding the topic.	Will have longer sessions as training responds to specific disciplines during future sessions.
3	Excellent discussion at the end.	Will continue this trend.

Other Comments:

- All facilitators did a good job given the time restraint.
- Training should be extended to a full day, with actual exercises.
- Training items were good as well as panel discussions.
- Good presentation.
- Content clear.
- Many spelling mistakes, and unclear documentation including this form.
- Content too complex, clear, volume was too much.
- Very good, too much info in such little time. Info was kept at proper level to complete presentation time
- Built on Wes Johnson's presentation well. Good detail, explained well. Very good.
- Table set-up poor.
- Calculations overwhelming. Not enough sample quality/size/transport etc as source of uncertainty. Discussion of SOP – good. Excellent discussion at the end.
- Info too complex for such little time.
- Content too complex, volume too much.
- Very informative, speaker knowledgeable.
- Information not very applicable, good speaker.
- Content too simple, not enough volume of content.
- The most valuable part of exercise was to identify the greatest sources of uncertainty.
- Excellent discussion at the end.
- Content was clear (x3)
- Content too simple (x3), clear (x3), not enough.
- Capital letters on overhead hard to read.
- Content too complex (x2), fragmented/unclear (x2), not enough(x2).
- Good content, but should have worked through example better.
- Time constraint made it rushed, didn't explain content fully.
- Facilitator was clear and didn't overwhelm participants.
- Emphasised alternate approach, balance of improvement and cost.
- Excellent discussion at the end.