

6-11 Dec 2010 AFPVE Course Scorecard

Course makeup: 16 Active and Civilian CG, 9 Cruise Industry stakeholders (cruise lines, class societies)

Course critique summary: Responses are from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest). For each course date red denotes lowest rating(s), green the highest rating(s)

| Course Date | Dec-10 | Oct-10* | Dec-09 | Nov-09 | Oct-09 |
|---|--------|---------|--------|--------|--------|
| Critique response rate | 73.1% | 96% | 84% | 40.9% | 75% |
| Quality fill | 90.1% | 92.5% | 61.8% | 70.3% | 47.3% |
| Class critique overall average | 4.51 | 4.56 | 4.27 | 4.22 | 4.01 |
| Class critique overall median | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Class critique overall standard deviation | 0.62 | 0.58 | 0.71 | 0.61 | 0.85 |
| Average # FPV exams by CG attendees | 30.1 | 16.3 | 16.9 | 11 | 5.2 |
| Average time in Marine Safety field by CG attendees | 11.0 | 8.8 | 6.4 | 4.9 | 3.5 |
| How well course prepared for FPV exams** | 4.37 | 4.29 | 4.11 | 3.89 | 3.88 |
| Training environment | 4.42 | 4.46 | 4.29 | 4.67 | 3.94 |
| Usefulness*** | 4.53 | 4.74 | 4.55 | 4.22 | 4.11 |
| Training materials | 4.53 | 4.5 | 4.19 | 4.00 | 4.17 |
| Material presentation | 4.74 | 4.33 | 4.29 | 4.11 | 3.94 |
| Instructor knowledge & preparation | 4.58 | 4.83 | 4.57 | 4.22 | 4.11 |
| Usefulness of cruise ship visits | 4.58 | 4.92 | 4.33 | 4.67 | 4.17 |
| Time allotted | 4.32 | 4.42 | 3.81 | 4.00 | 3.69 |

Critique response rate is the % of attendees that provided written course feedback.

Quality fill measures how successful we were at targeting CG students. Weighted parameters are: CG attendee qualification, is attendee from active cruise ship port, does attendee unit have a gap in FPVE's that have attended course.

*Course delivery was modified and lessons repackaged starting with Oct 2010 course.

** The wording of this question was changed into two parts (CG and non-CG) for the Dec 2010 course.

***The wording on this question was changed into two parts (CG and non-CG) for the Dec 2009 course.

Comments: We had over 70 comments/suggestions submitted for the Dec 2010 course. Each comment that identifies a gap or positive, or suggests an alternative method or process is documented and evaluated. Because of the high number of comments, they cannot all be included here. Below is a summary of the very frequent comments (most fall into one of these anyway) and our action:

| Attendee Comment/Suggestion | CSNCOE Action/Response |
|---|---|
| Having industry was huge plus | This is something we will continue to strive for |
| Answers to questions during exercises need to be the same | Have developed standard answers and created a facilitator data sheet to ensure consistent answers to scenario questions |
| Would like to see CDC representation | We have been in discussion with CDC VSP for a couple of months and are discussing their formal involvement in FY2012 classes. Depending on their schedule, they may be able to have one or more inspectors sit in during the Jan course |
| Some topics can be expanded (i.e. security, LP4, LP8) | We continually revisit/review all lesson plans to ensure the latest information is being presented, this is an ongoing process |
| Classroom small, lighting, hard to read | We requested extra lamps but this was still not enough. We are addressing with hotel & continue to search for an ideal venue |
| Would like to see more pictures substandard | Our goal is to teach attendees to evaluate the ship, not find non-conformities. We mix pics of standard and substandard conditions to achieve this. We will remove duplicates. |
| Ensure review of all anchored questions | As answers are obtained the results are articulated to the class; we will go over the entire anchorage at the end of the course for reinforcement |
| Great location hotel | Thanks |

6-11 Dec 2010 AFPVE Course Scorecard

| | |
|--|--|
| Great minimum power point outstanding | The result of good instructor training |
| Great 840 job aid | Thanks, let us know if you id any need to change |
| Great using headsets in Engine Room | Thanks, this will definitely be continued |
| Develop helo landing area lesson / discussion | This remains under discussion, perhaps it will fit in firefighting |
| Talk about flash lights tripping flame detector | We will research this and see if specific cases can be incorporated, we also heard that UF radios cause some lifejacket lights to illuminate |
| Include additional cruise industry CG policy updates | On disk provided to students |
| Provide intumescent, azipod, sewage data. | On disk provided to students |
| Provide this course to senior shipboard officers & fleet | We agree and are going to seek fleet participation in the future |
| Advanced course data to include additional new pubs amendments | The newest policies are being discussed & our pubs and references will be updated by the January convening. |
| Provide list of acronyms | Good point, we will strive to reduce the number of acronyms but develop an acronyms list just in case. |
| Reduced passenger manning scenario needed for a class exercise | We agree, and thanks, this is being added to the scenarios |
| Drive home SMS point discussion - suggest include this in 840 job aid for drill review | SMS is imbedded into all topics of the course and referenced in lesson plans job aid |
| Identify method to ensure participants are seated timely after breaks | The ground rules are covered and posted, the instructors will review the ground rules daily in the future |
| Scenario table questions very good promoted discussion | Thanks |
| Suggest CSNCOE develop power point to state in writing position on issues and deficiencies | Every condition needs to be evaluated separately for determination if it meets the intent of the regulation, the same condition on separate vessels may or may not be a deficiency |
| Aimed holistic approach to the examination process | Thanks |
| Guest speaker from industry would be beneficial | This is a definite goal for the future but was not a reasonable option for 2011 since the curriculum, exercises in particular, had been updated and we were not quite sure on the time needed. |
| Ship visits are good, suggest more | We are discussing. It is difficult to maintain current lesson structure and course time-frame and then add new visits. |
| Great CD as tool | Thanks |
| Suggest more discussion on older ship regulations applicability | We disagree. We cover the most recent and prevalent international standards and their applicability |
| Suggest using term RO/RSO not class society | We will continue to use the terms "Administration or Flag" and/or "Class society on behalf of the administration or flag" |
| Student notes could be more extensive | Student notes reflect the latest revision update or regulatory requirement |
| Suggest more data regarding vessel stability | Vessel stability, though critical to understand in general, is not a topic we plan to cover in any more detail for cruise ships. |
| Expand VGP discussion | This is a definite goal for the future; we will revisit this during this during the next course curriculum approval process |
| Use of term PSCO vs MI | We actually prefer to use the term examiner and the term MI is usually not appropriate |