

# 9-13 Jan 2012 AFPVE Course Scorecard

**Course makeup:** 15 Active Duty and Civilian Coast Guard, 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	Jan-12	Jan-11	Dec-10	Oct-10*	Dec-09
Critique response rate	82.6%	91.7%	73.1%	96%	84%
Quality fill	89.9%	90.9%	90.1%	92.5%	61.8%
Class critique overall average	4.27	4.54	4.51	4.56	4.27
Class critique overall median	4	5	5	5	4
Class critique overall standard deviation	0.69	0.57	0.62	0.58	0.71
Average # FPV exams by CG attendees	20.9	29.2	30.1	16.3	16.9
Average time in Marine Safety field by CG attendees	12.1	10.4	11.0	8.8	6.4
How well course prepared for FPV exams**	4.14	4.45	4.37	4.29	4.11
Training environment	4.41	4.36	4.42	4.46	4.29
Usefulness***	4.55	4.64	4.53	4.74	4.55
Training materials	4.05	4.27	4.53	4.5	4.19
Material presentation	4.23	4.50	4.74	4.33	4.29
Instructor knowledge & preparation	4.38	4.68	4.58	4.83	4.57
Usefulness of cruise ship visits	4.05	4.64	4.58	4.92	4.33
Time allotted	4.33	4.77	4.32	4.42	3.81

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

**Quality fill** measures how successful we were at targeting CG students (qualified, from active cruise ship port, conduct FPV exams or supervises/manages those that do, from a unit short of people that have attended the 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:** Each comment that identifies a gap or positive, or suggests an alternative method or process is documented and evaluated. We're not able to include all comments here; however below is a summary of the very frequent comments and our action:

Attendee Comment/Suggestion	CSNCOE Action/Response
Could use closer attention to detail in some presentations by using slides to give prompts and to make sure exact references are used.	Each instructor is to review and revise as required.
Maybe need to go on an older vessel and a new vessel.	Limited ship availability. This is a consideration when scheduling visits.
Expected more global discussions of issues	Group/student driven. For some participants it is considered GLOBAL
Scenarios are not explained well (specific task) and sometimes differently execute by different team leaders	Expectations are to be clearly briefed in the beginning and spoken too throughout the week.
Recommend ship visits have more methodical approach.	Minimum expectations and spaces to be viewed will be identified.
Exercise for lesson 2 awkward and unclear of tasking, I question benefit	Lesson 2 brief scenario will be revised
Some Instructors jumped around.	Concur and this has been addressed with those instructors.
I wish standardization of deficiencies and corrective actions was more thoroughly covered	This was covered. We will reemphasize the course objectives and purpose.
Big reference binder, lots of books hardly touched	Agree the reference binder was more underutilized than we anticipated. We will address for future courses.
Temperature cold at times (particularly with table under the vent) but overall great location	noted and communicated to the hotel
Change welcome aboard letter to reflect the course ended on Friday versus Saturday.	Noted and done
Grouped by tables a good thing	Agree
Ability to see/speak with industry stakeholders and CG provided great insight.	Concur
Include slides of MISLE prints so industry reps know what the database looks like (perhaps white-out VCP, or what a VCP contains).	Information is critical however we do not agree the actual format is necessary as this is internal to CG.
Use dry erase boards vs giant stick pads	Concur and corrected
It was easy to forget we are accumulating deficiencies. Maybe create a master power point slice with the accumulated deficiencies we have already identified.	Concur and corrected

## 9-13 Jan 2012 AFPVE Course Scorecard

Provide sample forms/certificates for class to look at (COC's, PSSC, IOPP, etc) for Sublime II.	This was done however it will be briefed better in the beginning of the week.
The security presentation should also cover how 33 CFR Sub H applies to foreign cruise ships (Definitions and 4 areas applicable to foreign vessels).	Concur
Discussion on white box is confusing and not useful if it isn't required by MARPOL why should we care?	Concur. Presentation has been revised accordingly
If a unit does not have sufficient qualified persons available what should they do about the recommended teams?	This was covered in lesson 2. The scope of the exam and exam workload remains consistent regardless of team size. If you only have one qualified person that one person must examine the entire ship.
I would like to see a video on MES Operations or visit company who services them and watch inspection.	Concur and done
Would like to attend for a week with one of the staff conducting COC aboard vessel. Discuss items found, write-ups & get input for better hands-on experience.	The opportunity is available. Contact the CSNCOE staff directly.
Good training regarding machinery/pollution/waste streams.	Thanks
Trainers were good, need to add something to fire fighting to keep subject interesting	Concur. LP4 presentation is being revised
Need to have more table space	Concur a new table layout will be tested
Arrange everything so everyone can see without turning heads and chairs.	Unable to achieve this given room size/budget constraints
Add SANS to list of Acronyms	Concur completed
Can HQ establish a direct path to Equasis to avoid field personnel having to establish separate password?	We will look into this.
Emphasize at the beginning that the Sublime II assessment parts are a major part of the course. Every scenario issued should be put in the blue binder in the correct lesson plans.	Concur. This will be emphasized in lesson 1
MISLE notes need to be looked into. If whitebox is no longer used and can be bypassed, remove the pollution statements from MISLE	We will look into this.
Give sample of what the narrative would look like in MISLE.	Concur. This will be added to lesson 9
Give example of ideal COC remarks.	Concur. This will be added to lesson 9
Add statement to COC for Sublime II for annual, periodic inspections covering all parts of lesson plan 9.	Concur. This will be added to lesson 9
Add drawings of symbols usually seen on passenger vessels (i.e. pods, bow thrusters, stabilizers, loadline, etc).	This is considered prerequisite knowledge but we will point out different hull markings during ship visits.
Take more/better pictures. Some were dark/fuzzy and could not be seen clearly from the back of the room.	Concur. All presentations are being reviewed
Make a copy of the job aid for students to carry on board vessel.	Concur and completed
Instructor needs to be more engaged to prevent one team member from doing all the work/talking.	Concur. Facilitator roles have been clarified.
Visual aids preferred to conference type training. Use the projector more.	Concur and addressed with those instructors
Instructors would present questions to the class, many people would provide widely different answers, but instructor would move on without confirming which answer is correct.	Concur and addressed with those instructors
Recommend having ship officers explain function of systems onboard ships. Instructors explain testing/inspection requirements.	This can only be done when the ships officer is willing and capable
Need copies of tender COC's, VCP with special notes, IOPP with white box listed	We will provide as appropriate
Perhaps rotate seating order once or twice during the week for better networking.	The ship visits and possibly a social will support this to some degree
Would have liked to discuss specific cases a little more detailed.	This is done as much as possible. The class dynamic really drives this.
Some presentations gave additional info than what was in the student guide and made the lesson more interesting. Others gave only the information in the student guide.	Noted and discussed with instructors
Organize one common dinner or lunch at the beginning of the week so participants have the possibility to get to know each other in a different situation.	This will be considered for future courses. Past attempts have not proven to be well attended.
LP 2, 3, and 4 should be smoother.	Noted and discussed with instructors. New dryrun of these lessons will be conducted prior to the March course.
Covered a lot in a short time for ship visit. May be misleading in some areas.	The ship visit is a snapshot. We are limited on how much time we have aboard.
Did not fully understand the role of the table facilitators in the first few days of the course. When we did, it resulted in more improved exercise.	This will be better explained/briefed from the very beginning of the week.