

FACILITATOR EVALUATION FORM

Training: T21-05 - B Understanding Lab QMS

Date: April 4-5, 2005

Facilitator(s): Ned Gravel

Location: Lord Elgin Hotel, 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?	6	6	19	27	29
Were they well defined?	2	5	25	31	24
Were they achieved?	5	4	35	22	21
Course Content:					
Was the material appropriate?	6	6	19	27	29
Complexity (1=too complex or too simple ← → Perfect=5)	2	5	25	31	24
Was the material clear to you?	5	4	35	22	21
Volume (1=too much or not enough ← → Perfect=5)	6	6	19	27	29
Did the handouts fit with this training - did they help?	2	5	25	31	24
Facilitator Methods:					
Did the facilitator allow sufficient discussion?	0	1	7	21	58
Did the facilitator encourage participation?	0	1	5	16	65
Did the facilitator help bring out new group ideas?	2	2	7	22	54
Did the facilitator help close out discussions?	3	0	10	28	46
Would you accept this facilitator again?	0	1	7	18	61
Catering and Facility:					
Was the seminar facility appropriate for the course?	2	0	16	28	41
Was the lunch and breaks service acceptable?	0	1	23	22	41

Other Comments:

Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough time. • Did not cover all topics – incomplete discussions. • Too focused on one or two items. There were other issues that could have been raised, but not enough time • Didn't have time to read the relevant material • Too long on topic of expired standards, etc... • Spent way too much time on one issue... and that is all that was discussed. It did not meet my expectations at all. Sorry, don't mean to be so blunt or direct, but I was frustrated and found it to be a waste of my time. • Hard to cover all “volume” in time allotted • Didn't have time to read the materials 	<p>We attempted far too much in this short session. It was run twice and was too short for the amount of material to cover and consensus to attain. Will learn from this and structure sessions to fit the topics and the time required to finish. If topics are too long, then they will be prioritized and scheduled later.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback on consensus is essential for topics covered 	<p>See above</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Room was too cramped 	<p>Will cut off participation at the expected level of 50 only.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flipping between binders was inconvenient 	<p>Some material is required by assessors to use (assessor binder) and some is information from training.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overheads to follow flow of topics would have been helpful 	<p>Tried to not push the discussion in any one direction – but will use overheads next time to raise the topics.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You should have kept on pressing for an opinion from the group. Felt like you got a point of enlightenment for the group but you allowed us to squirm out of the hard decisions. • No resolutions 	<p>Was willing to accept “enlightenment” on some issues and forego the fighting for the hard issues for the time being.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more scenarios 	<p>Already too many topics – did not foresee time for scenario discussions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues regarding calibration standards still not clear 	<p>Policy will be published on the CAEAL website. Decision was made last year by the Advisory Panel.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QMS topic of content of the workshop doesn't match 	<p>Topic was “understanding QMS” and it was clear that there was little consensus on how to understand a lab QMS. Will redo this topic next time.</p>

Concern	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group dragged on by itself • No defined topic. Facilitator had difficulty to control out of topic conversation (not his fault though!) Things got dragged on for so long with expired chemical standards. Personally, I think that it's up to each individual lab to make the decision and include in their QM. Let Ned have the opportunity to discuss more of the QMS left out. • Some people allowed to talk too much – if side issue, do side bar later • Tend to deviate from initial objectives of the meeting. • A list of what is to be accomplished and then a follow-up list of what was achieved. 	<p>It is obvious that the group had very divergeant opinions on how to examine the conformance of specific aspects of lab QMS that were part of the discussion. Will attempt to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publish the CAEAL approach on these issues that has already been agreed by the Program Committee and Advisory Panel • Focus on the most contentious issues for continuing discussion, and • Re-attempt to promote consensus across the assessor pool
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verification/calibration – does this also apply to method validation/verification (especially reference methods that have been “validated”)? 	<p>Will clarify the differences of these separate considerations in published documentation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need better beverage services during health breaks 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials not provided to late comers 	<p>Staff was prepared to issue from available spares. Did not know that a latecomer was missing anything. Will attempt to let latecomers know that they can speak to CAEAL staff to acquire the materials received by the others.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a mixer on Sunday night so the assessors can all meet. We can play games where we have to find, say 10 micro people, 7 tox people, person from farthest north, person farthest south, etc. 	<p>Will consider a no-host mixer on the Sunday night for the next session. Will solicit the group for activities.</p>

- Ned was great, as always
- Good discussion
- Very good discussion of a difficult set of concepts
- Fine facilitator!
- Huge topic
- Good discussions
- Kept me awake

Other suggestions:

- I think you're doing a fine job with all the information we're getting through letters. Also, it is my opinion that we, as assessors, need a common approach, which is best done by CAEAL recommending “best practices”