



APLAC EVALUATORS – QUALIFICATIONS, TRAINING AND MONITORING OF PERFORMANCE

PURPOSE

This document details:

- (a) The terms of reference of the APLAC MRA Council's Evaluator Performance Working Group and sets out the procedures to be followed to meet those terms of reference, and;
- (b) The terms of reference of the APLAC MRA Council's Evaluator Training Working Group and sets out the typical elements of an evaluator training course.

AUTHORSHIP

This publication has been written jointly by the APLAC Mutual Recognition Arrangement Council's Working Group on Evaluator Performance and Working Group on Evaluator Training.

COPYRIGHT

The copyright of this text is held by APLAC. APLAC publications may not be copied for sale by any individual or body other than APLAC member organisations.

FURTHER INFORMATION

For further information about this publication, contact the APLAC Secretariat, which may be contacted at:

NATA
Level 1
675 Victoria Street
Abbotsford VIC 3067
Australia
Tel: + 61 3 9274 8200
Fax: + 61 3 9421 0887
Email: secretariat@aplac.org
Web site: www.aplac.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose	2
Authorship	2
Copyright	2
Further Information	2
1. Introduction	4
2. Terms of Reference	4
3. Qualifications of Evaluators	6
4. Appointment and Reappointment of Lead Evaluators	7
5. Monitoring the Performance of Evaluators	7
6. Complaints and Appeals in Relation to Evaluator Performance	8
7. Training and Development	8
8. Maintenance of Evaluator Records	10
Appendix 1 Qualifications of Evaluators and Technical Experts	11
Appendix 2 APLAC Evaluator and Technical Expert Summary Biography	15
Appendix 3 APLAC MRA Evaluator & Technical Expert Performance Log	17
Appendix 4 APLAC MRA Evaluation Team Leader Performance Log	19
Appendix 5 Example Letter: Performance of APLAC MRA Evaluation Team	21
Appendix 6 Example Letter: Evaluation Observers Feedback	22
Appendix 7 Typical Elements of an Evaluator Training Course	26
Appendix 8 APLAC Evaluator Trainee Monitoring Form	28
Appendix 9 APLAC Evaluator Training Course: Course Evaluation	29

1. Introduction

To implement the APLAC MRA effectively, the APLAC MRA Council needs the services of a panel of trained and experienced evaluators who are fully familiar with accreditation criteria (ISO/IEC 17011; ISO/IEC 17025; ISO/IEC 17020; ISO 15189; ISO Guide 34; ISO/IEC 17043), and with the Procedures for Establishing and Maintaining the APLAC Mutual Recognition Arrangement Among Accreditation Bodies (APLAC MR 001).

The Council needs to be confident that its evaluators are competent to perform MRA evaluations and that any of their recommendations arising from such evaluations can be accepted with confidence. Reassurance is also needed that evaluators can conduct evaluations in an objective, impartial manner and are able to communicate effectively with the bodies under evaluation and through the reports they prepare for both the accreditation bodies and the APLAC MRA Council.

The membership of the Evaluator Performance Working Group (EPWG) is comprised of the APLAC Chair, the APLAC MRA Council Chair and the Immediate Past Chair of APLAC. The Working Group is convened by the Immediate Past Chair, unless otherwise endorsed from time to time by the APLAC MRA Council.

The Evaluator Training Working Group (ETWG) is comprised of a convenor appointed by the APLAC MRA Council, and other individuals from APLAC member accreditation bodies who are approved by the APLAC MRA Council.

2. Terms of Reference

2.1 The MRA Council's EPWG has the following terms of reference:

- Develop and maintain the system for monitoring the performance of evaluators;
- Review the summary CV forms and supporting statements for nominated evaluators to ensure that the nominees meet the criteria detailed in Appendix 1;
- Review evaluator and evaluation team leader feedback forms;
- Review evaluation reports to ensure they meet the format requirements of APLAC MR 009, and that they clearly state findings against the relevant clauses of ISO/IEC 17011, APLAC MR 001 and other applicable criteria documents;
- Arrange for the provision of suitable feedback to evaluators with regard to their performance with the goal of improving performance;
- In consultation with the APLAC MRA Council's ETWG, identify and plan training opportunities for evaluators;
- Make recommendations to the MRA Council for the appointment and reappointment of lead evaluators, and;

- Handle complaints about alleged unacceptable performance of evaluators in a discreet, tactful manner so as not to publicly embarrass either party to such a complaint.

2.2 The MRA Council's ETWG has the following terms of reference:

Mission

ETWG is responsible to the MRA Council for the training of APLAC evaluators.

Specific Objectives and Limitations

- Trained evaluators meet international best practices in terms of the skills required to conduct effective evaluations.
- The conduct of evaluator training is based on ISO 19011.
- The content of evaluator training is based on the requirements of ISO/IEC 17011, APLAC MR 001 and other relevant documents, procedures, and interpretations adopted by APLAC.
- Evaluator training course content is continually improved, considering international developments in evaluator training from other regional bodies and ILAC, and considering feedback from previous courses, member bodies, evaluator performance records, APLAC internal audits, and ILAC regional evaluations of APLAC.

Operational Details

- Monitor the demand for evaluators and provide advice to MRA Council on identification of training needs.
- Develop evaluator training syllabi and content.
- Maintain a pool of at least three qualified evaluator training facilitators from member bodies.
- Attempt to hold training sessions in conjunction with other APLAC events.
- Participate in IAF/ILAC forums on the development of evaluator training course content.
- Cooperate with other regional bodies in the development of evaluator training course content, and in the provision of evaluator training activities.
- Maintain records of evaluator training materials and course content, including the feedback provided by participants.
- Review outcomes of training, evaluate participant feedback, and identify any opportunities for improvement. Report to MRA Council on the results of evaluator training.

- Avoid duplication of APLAC Training Committee work and ensure continuing liaison with that Committee.
- The convenor of ETWG is appointed by the APLAC MRA Council. Members of ETWG are self identified and approved by the MRA Council.

3. Qualifications of Evaluators

There are three grades of evaluator: lead evaluator, evaluator and provisional evaluator. APLAC also maintains a category of technical expert. Only lead evaluators are qualified to lead evaluation teams while all grades of evaluator, plus technical experts, are eligible to be members of an evaluation team. The qualification requirements for lead evaluators, evaluators, provisional evaluators and technical experts are specified in Appendix 1.

Persons nominated as potential evaluators shall undertake an APLAC evaluator training course (or equivalent, as determined by the Evaluator Performance Working Group) prior to appointment as a provisional evaluator, unless they have attended such a course prior to the nomination. The names of the nominees shall be placed on a separate list to be invited to attend the next planned APLAC evaluator training course.

A provisional evaluator is introduced into a team that comprises experienced evaluators. Attendance as an observer in an evaluation team is another mechanism to develop provisional evaluators. A provisional evaluator shall also participate satisfactorily in at least one evaluation as a team member before being confirmed as an evaluator.

APLAC Full members and Associate members may nominate in writing potential evaluators or technical experts to the Chair of the APLAC MRA Council. The nomination shall include a description of the relevant experience and the scopes of activity of each proposed evaluator, and a statement that the nominee has the attributes required of an evaluator, as detailed in Section 3 of Appendix 1, including sufficient English language skills and a statement that the accreditation body will support the proposed evaluator's participation in APLAC evaluations. The nomination shall be accompanied by a completed evaluator/technical expert form (see Appendix 2), and include email address, relevant professional qualifications, professional experience, area(s) of CAB assessment expertise, and details of any relevant training courses. Area(s) of technical expertise should be expressed as calibration (specify calibration areas), testing (specify testing areas, e.g. chemical, mechanical, ISO 15189, etc), inspection, reference material producers, proficiency testing providers, and/or proficiency testing.

The Chair of the APLAC MRA Council shall ask the EPWG to assess if the nominee meets the criteria. Once a nominee is assessed as meeting the criteria, the Chair of the APLAC MRA Council shall advise the APLAC Secretary who shall update the evaluator list accordingly.

The team leader shall provide a report on the performance of a provisional evaluator, including a recommendation on whether or not appointment as an evaluator is recommended. If appointment as an evaluator is recommended, the convenor of the EPWG shall consult with the other members of the Working Group and then advise

the Secretary to change the status from provisional evaluator to evaluator in the evaluator listing.

4. Appointment and Reappointment of Lead Evaluators

The APLAC MRA Council shall maintain a list of all evaluators and oversee their performance in accordance with the criteria in Appendix 1.

It is the responsibility of the Chair of the APLAC MRA Council to consult with lead evaluators who have worked with the potential candidate before an evaluator is promoted to lead evaluator. Such consultation should also include the convenor of the EPWG, who may have information available on the past evaluation performance of the proposed lead evaluator.

A procedure for monitoring performance of lead evaluators and other evaluators is detailed in section 5. To ensure that lead evaluators continue to maintain the necessary expertise, the EPWG shall:

- a) Review the list of APLAC lead evaluators annually to ensure that listed lead evaluators continue to be actively involved in accreditation activities and have conducted a sufficient number of evaluations to maintain expertise;
- b) Review the ongoing re-appointment of any lead evaluator who has been the subject of a poor rating from the evaluator monitoring process, or who has been the subject of any complaint which, after investigation, is found to be justified. This also applies to any other evaluation team members.

Each lead evaluator is appointed for a 3 year term that can be renewed.

The procedure for appointment of the team leader and team members for a specific evaluation is given in APLAC MR 008 and APLAC MR 001.

5. Monitoring the Performance of Evaluators

Team leaders are responsible for the effective conduct of all APLAC MRA evaluations. They are also responsible for monitoring the performance of each of the members of their evaluation team.

Each team leader shall complete a brief Evaluator and Technical Expert Performance Log (see Appendix 3) and return the completed form to the convenor of the EPWG within one month of the completion of the on-site evaluation. This Evaluator and Technical Expert Performance Log is also to be used for provisional evaluators.

Team members should also submit any comments on the team leader to the convenor of the EPWG. They should use the form in Appendix 4 for this purpose.

Should the performance of any team member be considered to be unsatisfactory, or there are training or development needs proposed for an evaluator, the convenor of the EPWG shall discreetly consult with the other members of this EPWG and with the relevant evaluator on the areas of performance that may require improvement. In extreme cases, or where an evaluator is unwilling to accept proposals for

improvement, the EPWG may recommend removal of the evaluator from the MRA Council's list of evaluators.

To monitor the performance of team leaders, each MRA signatory or applicant shall be asked to reply to a letter (see Appendix 5 for a typical example) from the convenor of the EPWG asking for comment on the performance of the evaluation team, and particularly of the team leader. This letter shall be sent out to the accreditation body following the APLAC MRA Council meeting at which the evaluation report was considered by the Council.

The EPWG shall also review the format (rather than specific comments or recommendations) of each evaluation report to determine whether the reporting requirements of APLAC MR 009 are met. Any perceived deficiencies in a report shall be advised to the MRA Council Chair, who shall consider all comments on an individual lead evaluator and, in consultation with the other members of the EPWG, take any necessary action to advise the person of areas for improvement. Once again, in extreme cases, it may be necessary to remove the person from the MRA Council's list of lead evaluators.

In addition, the EPWG shall also solicit feedback from non-APLAC member observers of evaluations. Following the decision of the MRA Council on an evaluated MRA signatory or applicant, where the evaluation was observed by interested parties outside the APLAC membership, the MRA Council Chair shall obtain the contact details of the observers from either the evaluated accreditation body and/or the evaluation team leader and ask the observers to reply to a letter (see Appendix 6 for a typical example) asking for their comment on the evaluation process and the APLAC MRA.

6. Complaints and Appeals in Relation to Evaluator Performance

In most cases the convenor of the EPWG shall personally undertake any investigation of such complaints and make recommendations to the APLAC MRA Council Chair for possible action. If the convenor's involvement may lead to a conflict of interest another member of the EPWG shall review the complaint and advise the MRA Council Chair of the outcome. After such investigation and consideration by the MRA Council Chair, the convenor of the EPWG will advise the complainant of the outcome of the complaint.

An evaluator may appeal against any recommendation of the EPWG. Appeals shall be submitted in writing to the APLAC MRA Council Chair. The APLAC Board of Management shall be the Appeals Committee. Any member of the Board of Management whose involvement in the appeal may lead to a conflict of interest shall not participate in the review of the appeal. The decision on the appeal by the APLAC Board of Management shall be final.

7. Training and Development

The training and development activities for APLAC evaluators are developed and delivered by the APLAC MRA Council's ETWG, including APLAC evaluator training courses for nominated evaluators.

Appendix 7 gives an outline of typical elements of an evaluator training course, designed to develop the skills and knowledge of evaluators. All nominated potential

evaluators shall undertake appropriate training by APLAC or an equivalent regional cooperation prior to listing as a provisional evaluator, unless they have attended an acceptable training course prior to the nomination.

The ETWG shall report to each meeting of the APLAC MRA Council on any issues of evaluator performance arising from its review of feedback forms and evaluation reports that could affect the content of APLAC training courses for evaluators.

APLAC evaluator training courses shall be provided on an “as needed” basis, as deemed necessary by the APLAC MRA Council. If other APLAC Committees have suggestions for training needs for evaluators, the Committee may present these to the MRA Council for consideration through the following mechanisms:

- Directly to the MRA Council Chair and/or the Convener of the ETWG;
- Directly at MRA Council meetings, either during the ETWG report agenda item or as Other Business.

At each meeting the APLAC MRA Council shall consider the need to provide training courses in the next twelve months. Matters to consider include:

- nomination of potential evaluators who have not participated in a training course;
- changes to relevant standards;
- changes to APLAC MRA documents and procedures.

The Council shall decide on the timing and venue of the training courses and shall apply to the APLAC General Assembly for appropriate funding. In general funding should be sought to cover the following:

- economy class airfare for each course presenter;
- 4 nights accommodation for each course presenter;
- hire of venue and equipment;
- lunches and refreshments;
- subsidy to cover part of costs for each trainee.

The amount of the subsidy and whether or not the amount varies depending upon the distance to be travelled by the trainees shall be decided when the budget for the course is set.

The convener of the APLAC ETWG shall, in consultation with the Chair of the APLAC MRA Council, appoint appropriate course facilitators (usually 3).

Class size shall be restricted to 20 – 25.

APLAC shall provide a three day training course for new evaluators and, normally, a two day “refresher” course/workshop for lead evaluators.

A certificate of attendance, signed by the APLAC Chair, shall be provided to each participant who completes the course.

Participants in each course shall be asked to complete an APLAC Evaluator Training Course: Course Evaluation form (an example is given in Appendix 8). The

comments in the completed forms shall be analysed and used to modify the content of future training courses, as necessary.

8. Maintenance of Evaluator Records

In accordance with the above procedures, the following key evaluator records are maintained as indicated:

- *APLAC Evaluator and Technical Expert Summary Biography* – initially received by the Chair of the MRA Council, the Chair shall ensure the completed biography is passed to the Secretariat following review by the EPWG.
- *APLAC Evaluator Trainee Monitoring Form* – submitted to the MRA Council Chair by the Training Facilitators, with a copy to the Convener of the Evaluator Performance Working Group who transfers a copy to the Secretariat following review.
- The APLAC Evaluator List – maintained by the Secretariat.
- *APLAC MRA Evaluator and Technical Expert Performance Log* and *APLAC MRA Evaluation Team Leader Performance Log* – initially received by the convener of the EPWG, the convener maintains all completed Performance Logs. These are transferred to the Secretariat on a regular basis, generally annually, for maintenance and archiving in the APLAC files; and,
- Letters to evaluated accreditation bodies (titled *Performance of APLAC MRA Evaluation Team*) and subsequent responses – these letters are generated by, and responses initially received by the convener of the EPWG. The convener maintains all correspondence, and transfers all records to the Secretariat on a regular basis, generally annually, for maintenance and archiving in the APLAC files.

QUALIFICATIONS OF EVALUATORS AND TECHNICAL EXPERTS

1. APLAC Lead Evaluators

1.1 An APLAC lead evaluator shall be able:

- 1.1.1 To lead the evaluation in an efficient and effective way, and be able to distribute the evaluation tasks equitably amongst team members;
- 1.1.2 To evaluate whether an accreditation body complies with the requirements of the appropriate ISO(/IEC) standard(s), and its accredited organisations comply with the requirements of the appropriate ISO(/IEC) standard(s);
- 1.1.3 To organize an evaluation team with an appropriate composition (maximum coverage of scope of the accreditation body and minimum number of members);
- 1.1.4 To decide from the submitted documentation any areas requiring special examination during the evaluation;
- 1.1.5 To report clearly and succinctly the findings of all team members, in compliance with APLAC MR 001;
- 1.1.6 To determine the criticality of the nonconformities, concerns and comments;
- 1.1.7 To evaluate whether the corrective actions undertaken by the accreditation body are effective;
- 1.1.8 To adapt quickly and easily to different accreditation cultures.

1.2 In order to meet these criteria, an APLAC lead evaluator shall:

- 1.2.1 Be an experienced person, working in an accreditation body or similar organisation, who has relevant accreditation work experience and has an appropriate technical background and experience in assessment activities (at least 3 years);
- 1.2.2 Have participated as a team member in at least two APLAC (or equivalent) evaluations of accreditation bodies;
- 1.2.3 Have a sound knowledge of the application of the appropriate ISO(/IEC) standards and relevant APLAC MRA documents;
- 1.2.4 Be able to understand and to express him/herself clearly in English, in speaking and writing, to the APLAC MRA Council;
- 1.2.5 Have experience in chairing meetings and in reaching consensus on matters of contention;
- 1.2.6 Have good interpersonal skills.

1.3 The APLAC MRA Council shall arrange periodic meetings for lead evaluators in order to improve and maintain the harmonization of the evaluations.

2. APLAC Evaluators, Provisional Evaluators and Technical Experts

2.1 An APLAC evaluator, provisional evaluator or technical expert shall be able:

2.1.1 For evaluators and provisional evaluators, to evaluate whether an accreditation body complies with the requirements of the appropriate ISO(/IEC) standard(s) and other APLAC application documents;

2.1.2 For all, evaluate whether an accreditation body's accredited organisations comply with the requirements of the appropriate ISO(/IEC) standard(s) and other APLAC application documents;

2.1.3 To report findings clearly and succinctly in English;

2.1.4 To determine the criticality of the findings.

2.2 An APLAC provisional evaluator shall:

2.2.1 Be an experienced person or assessor, within his/her accreditation body or similar organisation, who has relevant working experience in accreditation and the appropriate technical background in the assigned areas of the evaluation (at least 3 years);

2.2.2 Have successfully completed an APLAC evaluator training course(s), or equivalent;

2.2.3 Have a sound knowledge of the application of appropriate ISO(/IEC) standards, and relevant MRA supplementary requirements;

2.2.4 Have good interpersonal skills;

2.2.5 Be able to be understood and to express him/herself clearly in English;

2.2.6 Follow the instructions given by the team leader.

2.3 In addition to meeting the requirements of clause 2.2 above, an APLAC evaluator shall have participated as an active team member as a provisional evaluator for at least one evaluation, and have received a satisfactory report on performance from the team leader.

2.4 An APLAC technical expert shall:

2.4.1 Be a technical assessor (or equivalent, by whatever title), who has relevant experience in doing assessments, and the appropriate technical background in the assigned areas of the evaluation (at least 3 years);

2.4.2 Have a sound knowledge of the application of appropriate ISO(/IEC) accreditation standards;

2.4.3 Have good interpersonal skills;

2.4.4 Be able to be understood and to express him/herself clearly in English;

2.4.5 Follow the instructions given by the team leader.

NOTE 1: Technical experts are chosen specifically for their technical expertise when that expertise is not available otherwise to the evaluation team. There shall be no more than one technical expert in any evaluation team.

NOTE 2: In general, technical experts should not be asked to evaluate on their own any aspects of ISO/IEC 17011 other than through the witnessing of assessments or providing specific technical input, e.g. in relation to measurement traceability. They should be closely supervised by the team leader. Exceptions to this may be when a technical expert has been previously qualified as an evaluator / lead evaluator, and thus the same restrictions or level of supervision may not be needed. Each case shall be considered on its merits by the team leader.

3. Evaluator and Technical Expert Attributes

3.1 Evaluators and technical experts should:

3.1.1 Be open minded and mature;

3.1.2 Possess sound judgement, analytical skills, and tenacity;

3.1.3 Have the ability to perceive situations in a realistic way, to understand complex operations from a broad perspective, and to understand the role of individual units within an organisation.

3.2 Evaluators and technical experts should be able to apply the attributes of 3.1 in order to:

3.2.1 Obtain and assess objective evidence fairly;

3.2.2 Remain true to the purpose of the evaluation without fear or favour;

3.2.3 Evaluate constantly the effects of evaluation observations and personal interactions during an evaluation;

3.2.4 Treat concerned personnel in a way that will best achieve the evaluation objective;

3.2.5 React with sensitivity to the local conventions of the area in which the evaluation is performed;

3.2.6 Perform the evaluation process without deviating due to distractions;

3.2.7 Commit full attention and support to the evaluation process;

3.2.8 React effectively in stressful situations;

3.2.9 Arrive at generally acceptable conclusions based on evaluation observations;

- 3.2.10 Remain true to a conclusion despite pressure to change that is not based on evidence.



Appendix 2

APLAC Evaluator and Technical Expert Summary Biography

(Please complete this form electronically in MS Word and forward to the Convener of the APLAC MRA Council Evaluator Performance Working Group)



Family Name:	
Given Name:	Mr/Ms/Dr (please indicate)
Organisation:	
Position within Organisation:	
Economy:	
Email Address:	
Post-Secondary Educational Qualifications; <i>including technical areas of qualification:</i>	
Accreditation Body Experience; <i>including dates/time periods, description:</i>	
Lead Assessor and/or Evaluator Training Courses, <i>including dates, length of course, course provider:</i>	
Evaluation Competencies: <i>(please answer “yes” or “no” to each category)</i>	
Yes/No	Testing (ISO/IEC 17025) Specify areas:

Yes/No	Medical Testing (ISO 15189)
Yes/No	Calibration. Specify areas:

Yes/No	Inspection
Yes/No	Reference Material Producer (RMP) accreditation
Yes/No	Proficiency Testing Provider (PTP) accreditation
Yes/No	PT ¹

¹ Competency in PT is not related to the accreditation of PT Providers, but rather to the ability to critically evaluate how PT programs are operated (generally in accordance with ISO/IEC 17043 expectations) and critically evaluate PT performance.

Other Relevant Professional Experience (prior to joining accreditation body):

Other Relevant Experience (e.g. standards body membership; experience as a trainer in the area of accreditation):

In accordance with APLAC MR 004, Section 3 (para. 4), please attach a statement from the applicant's accreditation body, MRA Council Delegate or Alternate that the applicant possesses the attributes required of an APLAC Evaluator or Technical Expert and that the applicant will have his/her accreditation body's support to participate in APLAC evaluations.

Date of Completion of this Summary Biography form: / /

For Evaluator Performance Working Group (EPWG) use only:

Application Accepted (vs. MR 004, §3 & Appendix 1):

YES

NO

Stated competencies accepted:

YES

NO

If NO, commentary / actions required:

Review completed by:

DATE

NAME (Convener – EPWG)

Follow-up Review (if required) – Commentary & Decision:

Follow-up completed by:

DATE

NAME (Convener – EPWG)

Convener – EPWG to forward completed form to APLAC Secretariat



Appendix 3

APLAC MRA EVALUATOR & TECHNICAL EXPERT PERFORMANCE LOG

CONFIDENTIAL

(Please complete this form electronically in MS Word and forward to the Convener of the APLAC MRA Council Evaluator Performance Working Group)

<u>Evaluator / Expert:</u> _____ (Name)	<u>Employer:</u> _____ (APLAC Member)
<u>Evaluated AB:</u> _____	
<u>Evaluation Dates:</u> _____	<u>Team Leader:</u> _____ (Name)

Please score each of the performance categories according to the following scale^(see Note below).
 (For scores of 1 or 2, please detail specifics in the Comments section below.)

1 = Poor	2 = Weak	3 = Satisfactory	4 = Good	5 = Exceptional
----------	----------	------------------	----------	-----------------

- (a) Evaluator’s overall performance
- (b) Evaluator’s evaluation techniques
- (c) Evaluator’s understanding of MR001, ISO/IEC 17011 & other MRA requirements
- (d) Evaluator’s understanding of the relevant ISO & ILAC accreditation criteria
 (i.e. ISO/IEC 17025, ISO 15189, ISO/IEC 17020, ISO Guide 34 and/or ISO/IEC 17043; ILAC A & P-documents)
- (e) Evaluator’s preparation for the visit
- (f) Evaluator’s written and/or spoken communication

If the evaluator is a **Provisional Evaluator**, do you recommend appointment as an APLAC Evaluator? (Yes / No / n.a.)

Comments: (As appropriate, please relate comments to each relevant category above. Attach extra pages if needed.)

List two of the evaluator’s / expert’s key strengths:

- 1.
- 2.

Suggest two areas of improvement for future evaluations:

- 1.
- 2.

Any additional comments:

Team Leader: _____ Date: _____



(Name or Signature)

(Completion of this form)

NOTE: For consistency purposes, the following definitions shall be considered while scoring an evaluator's performance:

Poor = Did not meet a majority of APLAC's expectations. Removal from the list of APLAC evaluators may need to be considered.

Weak = Does not meet all of APLAC's expectations. Significant areas for improvement were identified and communicated to the evaluator. Performance needs to improve to meet APLAC's expectations.

Satisfactory = Meets, but does not exceed, APLAC's minimum expectations. Areas or improvement could be identified.

Good = Exceeds APLAC's minimum expectations, but minor areas for improvement could be identified.

Exceptional = Sets the standard that all evaluators should follow; little room for improvement. This score would only be applied to the very best.

For Evaluator Performance Working Group (EPWG) use only:

Scores Entered in Database:

YES

Provisional Evaluator to Evaluator?

YES

NO

N/A

Reviewed Completed By:

DATE

NAME (Convener – EPWG)

Comments / Actions:

Convener – EPWG to forward completed form to APLAC Secretariat

Appendix 4

APLAC MRA EVALUATION TEAM LEADER PERFORMANCE LOG

CONFIDENTIAL

(Please complete this form electronically in MS Word and forward to the Convener of the APLAC MRA Council Evaluator Performance Working Group)

<u>Team Leader:</u>	<u>Employer:</u>					
(Name)	(APLAC Member)					
<u>Evaluated AB:</u>						
<u>Evaluation Dates:</u>	<u>Team Member:</u>					
(Name)						
<p>Please score each of the performance categories according to the following scale^(see Note below). (For scores of 1 or 2, please detail specifics in the Comments section below.)</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px 10px;">1 = Poor</td> <td style="padding: 2px 10px;">2 = Weak</td> <td style="padding: 2px 10px;">3 = Satisfactory</td> <td style="padding: 2px 10px;">4 = Good</td> <td style="padding: 2px 10px;">5 = Exceptional</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li style="margin-bottom: 10px;">(a) Team Leader’s overall performance <input type="checkbox"/> <li style="margin-bottom: 10px;">(b) Team Leader’s leadership & evaluation techniques <input type="checkbox"/> <li style="margin-bottom: 10px;">(c) Team Leader’s understanding of MR001, ISO/IEC 17011 & other MRA requirements <input type="checkbox"/> <li style="margin-bottom: 10px;">(d) Team Leader’s understanding of the relevant ISO & ILAC accreditation criteria (i.e. ISO/IEC 17025, ISO 15189, ISO/IEC 17020, ISO Guide 34 and/or ISO/IEC 17043; ILAC A & P-documents) <input type="checkbox"/> <li style="margin-bottom: 10px;">(e) Team Leader’s preparation for the visit <input type="checkbox"/> <li style="margin-bottom: 10px;">(f) Team Leader’s written and/or spoken communication <input type="checkbox"/> 		1 = Poor	2 = Weak	3 = Satisfactory	4 = Good	5 = Exceptional
1 = Poor	2 = Weak	3 = Satisfactory	4 = Good	5 = Exceptional		
<p>Comments: (As appropriate, please relate comments to each relevant category above. Attach extra pages if needed.)</p> <p>List two of the Team Leader’s key strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. <p>Suggest two areas of improvement for future evaluations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. <p>Any additional comments:</p>						
<u>Team Member:</u>	<u>Date:</u>					



(Name or Signature)

(Completion of this form)

NOTE: For consistency purposes, the following definitions shall be considered while scoring a Team Leader's performance:

Poor = Did not meet a majority of APLAC's expectations. Removal from the list of APLAC lead evaluators may need to be considered.

Weak = Does not meet all of APLAC's expectations. Significant areas for improvement were identified. Performance needs to improve to meet APLAC's expectations.

Satisfactory = Meets, but does not exceed, APLAC's minimum expectations. Areas or improvement could be identified.

Good = Exceeds APLAC's minimum expectations, but minor areas for improvement could be identified.

Exceptional = Sets the standard that all lead evaluators should follow; little room for improvement. This score would only be applied to the very best.

For Evaluator Performance Working Group (EPWG) use only:

Scores Entered in Database:

YES

Reviewed Completed By:

DATE

NAME (Convener – EPWG)

Comments / Actions:

Convener – EPWG to forward completed form to APLAC Secretariat

Example Letter: Performance of APLAC MRA Evaluation Team

Appendix 5

<<Date>>

<<Name>>

<<Designation>>

<<Organisation>>

Dear <<Name>>

Performance of APLAC MRA Evaluation Team

The APLAC MRA Council's Working Group on Evaluator Performance is responsible for monitoring the performance of APLAC MRA evaluation teams to ensure they are as effective and consistent as possible. Part of that monitoring involves the performance of the Team Leaders for APLAC MRA evaluations.

As your organisation has recently been evaluated by an APLAC MRA evaluation team, I am writing as convener of the Working Group on Evaluator Performance to seek your comments on the performance of the team which conducted the evaluation of your accreditation body.

While I would welcome any comments of a general nature such as "satisfactory", "unsatisfactory", etc, I would invite you to consider the following aspects of the evaluation and, to comment on them:

- a) Was your organisation adequately briefed before the visit on the evaluation team's preparation needs (supply of documents, arrangement of visit schedule, etc)?
- b) Did the team conduct the evaluation in a comprehensive and objective manner?
- c) Were the questions and comments from the team communicated clearly?
- d) Was the exit meeting conducted effectively with appropriate opportunities for your comments on the team's findings?
- e) Was the report on the evaluation, in your view, accurate and clearly presented?
- f) Are there any other aspects of the evaluation on which you would wish to comment?

Naturally, we hope that your experiences were positive but if there are any issues of concern raised by you, these will be carefully considered by the Working Group to ensure any necessary improvements are made to our evaluation processes.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours sincerely

Convener, APLAC MRA Council Working Group on Evaluator Performance

Example Letter: Evaluation Observers Feedback

Appendix 6

<<Date>>

<<Name>>

<<Designation>>

<<Organisation>>

Dear <<Name>>

Further to your participation as an observer in the Asia Pacific Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation's (APLAC's) peer evaluation of <<name of evaluated accreditation body>> on <<dates>>, I am writing to thank you for your interest in the APLAC Mutual Recognition Arrangement (MRA) and our peer evaluation process.

The APLAC peer evaluation is a key process in establishing confidence in the accreditation systems of the APLAC MRA signatory partners and thus in assuring the equivalence of the accreditations granted. With a robust peer evaluation process, the APLAC MRA will provide increased confidence to regulatory authorities and other users of accreditation, with this confidence leading to acceptance of the MRA as the preferred means of recognition of accreditation bodies and their accredited organisations.

APLAC recognises that to achieve these goals we must ensure the needs of the users of the APLAC MRA are met to the greatest possible extent. As part of APLAC's ongoing efforts to improve our peer evaluation process and the effectiveness of the MRA, I would like to seek your feedback on the evaluation process that you have observed.

In particular, I would be interested in your feedback in the following areas:

1. Whether your objectives as an observer to the peer evaluation process were met, and if not, why.
2. Whether you were reassured that the evaluation process was effectively implemented and that the accreditation body had undergone a robust evaluation of its competence to accredit conformity assessment bodies, and if not, why.
3. Whether the outcome of the evaluation met your needs and expectations as a (potential) user of the APLAC MRA. If it did not fully meet your needs and expectations, which aspects of the process would you like to see strengthened.
4. Which aspects of the evaluation you felt were most valuable or effective.
5. Which aspects of the process you felt could be improved or could be more effective.
6. Any other comments you may wish to make in regard to the effectiveness of the APLAC MRA in meeting your needs regarding the recognition of accreditation, accreditation bodies and accredited conformity assessment bodies.

APLAC would be delighted to receive your views and suggestions in any format of your choice, but an APLAC Evaluation Observer Feedback Questionnaire is attached for your convenience should you wish to use this. Please return your feedback to the APLAC Secretariat at secretariat@aplac.org.

Thank you again for your interest in the APLAC MRA.

Yours sincerely

<<Name>>

Chair - APLAC MRA Council

c.c. <<APLAC MRA Council Delegate>>
<<Name of evaluated accreditation body>>

APLAC Evaluation Observer Feedback Questionnaire	
Observer Name:	
Organisation Represented:	
Accreditation Body Evaluated:	
Observation Dates:	
Areas of particular interest:	<input type="checkbox"/> Testing <input type="checkbox"/> Calibration <input type="checkbox"/> Inspection <input type="checkbox"/> Other- Specify:
What aspects of the evaluation did you observe?	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed Evaluation Team meetings <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation Opening meeting <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation at accreditation body offices <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment witnessing <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation Closing meeting <input type="checkbox"/> Other – Specify:
Were your objectives as an observer met? If No or Partly please explain why.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partly <input type="checkbox"/> No
Were you reassured that the evaluation process is effectively implemented? If No or Partly please explain why.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partly <input type="checkbox"/> No
Did the overall outcome of the evaluation meet your needs as a potential) user of the APLAC MRA? If No or Partly, please explain why.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Partly <input type="checkbox"/> No

Please provide two or three aspects of the evaluation you felt were most valuable or effective:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Please provide two or three aspects of the evaluation that could be improved or could be more effective:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Please include any other comments you may wish to make in regard to the effectiveness of the APLAC MRA in meeting your needs regarding the recognition of accreditation, accreditation bodies and accredited conformity assessment bodies.

Appendix 7

TYPICAL ELEMENTS OF AN EVALUATOR TRAINING COURSE

Typical topic areas

- Concepts of accreditation and conformity assessment
- Proficiency testing in the context of ISO/IEC 17011
- Review of ISO/IEC 17011 – key elements; possible “contentious” clauses; IAF/ILAC A5
- IAF/ILAC A2 and A3; APLAC MR 001, MR 002, MR 004, MR 008, MR 009, ILAC P-documents
- Planning an evaluation, including construction of a suitable team and assignment of tasks
- Evidence gathering, linkage to clauses of ISO/IEC 17011 and other requirements documents (needs to emphasise that findings must be linked to relevant clause of document)
- Report preparation and report writing

Possible group exercises

- Evidence needed to evaluate compliance with ISO/IEC 17011
- Planning an evaluation, based on an accreditation body scenario
- Examining the impartiality and related body clauses of ISO/IEC 17011
- Tactics for determining the appropriate evaluation duration and evaluation team composition, based on an accreditation body scenario
- Reporting of findings, classification of findings, linkage to ISO/IEC 10711 clauses and clauses of other requirements documents

Information provided to course participants in advance

- Agenda
- Full details of required reading prior to the course

Course participants to bring

- Copy of ISO/IEC 17025, ISO/IEC 17020, ISO 15189, ISO Guide 34, ISO/IEC 17043
- Copy of ISO/IEC 17011
- Copy of IAF/ILAC A2, A3, A5; ILAC P5, P8, P9, P10, P13, P14, G21; APLAC MR 001, MR 002, MR 003, MR 004; MR 007, MR 008; MR 009; MR 011

Formal Monitoring of Course Participants

- All course participants to be monitored using the form shown at Appendix 8. All training facilitators will meet and come to consensus on the rating of all participants.
- Participants will be scored on their:
 - Preparation for the course;
 - Demonstrated understanding of evaluation concepts;
 - Participation in their group discussions, and
 - Demonstrated ability to work within their teams.
- Successful completion of the course requires a passing score of 12
- Trainees that do not achieve a passing score of 12 will be counselled by the training facilitator on the steps to take to overcome the performance barriers noted during the course. The Chair of the MRA Council will be informed of the contents of such discussion.
- All scoring of participants is confidential between the training facilitators, the participants and the Chair of the MRA Council, who also serves on the Evaluator Performance Working Group.
- The Trainee Monitoring Forms will be submitted to the MRA Council Chair by the Training Facilitators, with a copy to the Convener of the Evaluator Performance Working Group.

APLAC EVALUATOR TRAINEE MONITORING FORM

Trainee (name): _____ Accreditation Body _____

Location: _____ Date: _____

Check Here	<u>To Be Completed for Each Trainee by Facilitators</u>	Worth	Score
Trainee Course Preparation:			
	The trainee was not prepared and had not read the material	1	
	The trainee was marginally prepared and had read some of the material	2	
	The trainee was mostly prepared and had read most of the material	3	
	The trainee was very well prepared and had read all of the material	4	
	The trainee was extremely well prepared and had examined outside material	5	
Trainee Understanding of Evaluation Concepts: (MRA evaluation philosophy, understanding and application of evaluation criteria, ability to formulate and articulate findings)			
	The trainee did not demonstrate any understanding of evaluation concepts	1	
	The trainee demonstrated marginal understanding of evaluation concepts	2	
	The trainee demonstrated appropriate understanding of evaluation concepts	3	
	The trainee demonstrated excellent understanding of evaluation concepts	4	
	The trainee demonstrated complete understanding evaluation concepts	5	
Trainee Participation:			
	The trainee did not participate in discussion with their peers.	1	
	The trainee participated somewhat in discussion with their peers.	2	
	The trainee participated in discussion with their peers.	3	
	The trainee participated very effectively in discussion with their peers.	4	
	The trainee made significant contribution to the success of their group.	5	
Trainee Teamwork:			
	The trainee did not demonstrate an ability to work with their peers.	1	
	The trainee demonstrated some ability to work with their peers.	2	
	The trainee demonstrated appropriate ability to work with their peers.	3	
	The trainee was at ease in working with their peers.	4	
	The trainee placed the success of their team foremost in their own approach.	5	
Overall Score (Pass = 12)			

FACILITATOR COMMENTS (Facilitator Name: _____)



APLAC Evaluator Training Course : Course Evaluation

Your feedback is important to us, and will help us to improve our course.

1. Course Objectives

Are you confident you can:

	Yes	Probably, with practice	No
a) Plan and conduct an APLAC MRA evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Effectively evaluate an AB's compliance with ISO/IEC 17011	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Distinguish between nonconformities, concerns and comments when preparing your report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Prepare a report on the evaluation of an AB that addresses all the elements of IAF/ILAC A3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Understand the evaluation and decision making process?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

2. Course Delivery

	Yes	Partly	No
a) Was there enough practical application in the course?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Did the activities improve your understanding of the topic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Were the course notes useful?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Do you think you will use the course notes in future?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Suggestions for improvements:

3. Course Presenters

- | | Yes | Partly | No |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Did the presenters have an adequate knowledge of the content? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Did the presenters make the course interesting? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Was the course well organised? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

4. Course venue

- | | Yes | Partly | No |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Was the venue in a good location? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Was the training room a suitable learning environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Were the refreshments adequate? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

5. Overall impression

- | | Yes | Partly | No |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Do you think you will be able to implement the techniques presented in this course in an APLAC MRA evaluation team? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Were your expectations for the course met? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

6. Further suggestions (eg. content, delivery)

Comments:

THANK YOU

Name (optional): _____

Course date: _____