

06-10 January 2014 AFPVE Course Scorecard

Course makeup: 19 Active Duty and Civilian Coast Guard, 8 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 14	Mar 13	Feb 13	Jan 13	Apr 12	Mar 12
Critique response rate	100%	96%	96%	96%	100%	87%
Class critique overall average	4.6	4.42	4.65	4.3	4.5	4.53
Class critique overall median	4.63	4.42	4.8	4.5	5	5
Class critique overall standard deviation	0.11573	0.0371	0.0775	0.251	0.17	0.14
Average # FPV exams by CG attendees	15.9	15.7	22.5	22.3	12.9	29.7
Average time in qualified as a FPV Examiner	1.2	7.1	5.3	6.9	7.3	12.5
How well course prepared for FPV exams	4.41	4.38	4.55	4.32	4.5	4.45
Training environment	4.63	4.25	4.64	4.68	4.5	4.65
Usefulness	4.67	4.58	4.73	4.41	4.79	4.70
Training materials	4.59	4.42	4.55	3.82	4.33	4.30
Material presentation	4.67	4.42	4.64	4.41	4.33	4.40
Instructor knowledge & preparation	4.78	4.63	4.77	4.41	4.71	4.55
Usefulness of cruise ship visits	4.59	4.63	4.68	4.14	4.46	4.55
Time allotted	4.48	4.08	4.64	4.23	4.38	4.65

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

Red highlights the lowest overall mark and green is the highest mark.

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 most constructive comments and our action:

Attendee Comment/Suggestion	CSNCOE Action/Response
Hotel conference room was great environment. Created a non-retribution atmosphere.	Agree this was a new location for us and it worked out very well.
Enjoyed roundtable seeing especially the incorporation of industry. I would have liked to see more class society representation.	Thank you. We actively solicit industry and try to keep even distribution.
Ship visit should be used to start class allowing students to gauge knowledge growth after week ending with ship visit.	Good Idea. We have tried this but there is just not enough time in the week to make this work.
I would have liked to have more time onboard the cruise ships but I do realized there are time requirements.	Agree
Assessment scenarios left a lot of open ended questions that made it difficult to make decisions in scenarios that required expanded exams.	Done by design. Groups must ask questions to facilitator as they would to Captain /Staff aboard ship.
Very knowledgeable instructors. Great diversity and background.	Thank you
Great info on Class A/B doors, smoke and daily use.	Thank you
Liked the clarification on Annual and Periodic Exams.	Thank you
I don't like that instructors have different views on acceptable equivalencies for ways to correct defs that would normally be no sails and then contradict themselves later in the course when it comes to using human interface for a short period of time.	Agree. We will take for action but thought this issued was cleared up during the session. If you left with doubt as to proper answer please contact us.
Great course. Really got me thinking outside the box.	Thank you
I feel much more confident about combining all parts of the exam and using the Holistic approach.	Thank you
Course onboard ship for a week would be ideal.	Agree
Course was very well presented. All instructors were very knowledgeable and clear in presentations.	Thank you

03-07 February 2014 AFPVE Course Scorecard

Course makeup: 16 Active Duty and Civilian Coast Guard, 10 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	Feb 14	Jan 14	Mar 13	Feb 13	Jan 13	Apr 12
Critique response rate	96%	100%	96%	96%	96%	100%
Quality fill	N/A	N/A	67%	72%	78%	77.3%
Class critique overall average	4.6	4.6	4.42	4.65	4.3	4.5
Class critique overall median	4.63	4.63	4.42	4.8	4.5	5
Class critique overall standard deviation	.09094	0.11573	0.0371	0.0775	0.251	0.17
Average # FPV exams by CG attendees	18.5	15.9	15.7	22.5	22.3	12.9
Average time in qualified as a FPV Examiner	8.0	1.2	7.1	5.3	6.9	7.3
How well course prepared for FPV exams	4.63	4.41	4.38	4.55	4.32	4.5
Training environment	4.46	4.63	4.25	4.64	4.68	4.5
Usefulness	4.58	4.67	4.58	4.73	4.41	4.79
Training materials	4.71	4.59	4.42	4.55	3.82	4.33
Material presentation	4.67	4.67	4.42	4.64	4.41	4.33
Instructor knowledge & preparation	4.67	4.78	4.63	4.77	4.41	4.71
Usefulness of cruise ship visits	4.75	4.59	4.63	4.68	4.14	4.46
Time allotted	4.58	4.48	4.08	4.64	4.23	4.38

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

Quality fill measured 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). Now that the course will be prerequisite for the qualification a quality fill metric will no longer maintained.

Red highlights the lowest overall mark and green is the highest mark.

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 most constructive comments and our action:

Attendee Comment/Suggestion	CSNCOE Action/Response
Training environment could have been better. Layout of the room to view the instructors and the screen	Thank you and we have changed the room selection to accommodate this.
Job aids for tables 9.1-9.2 could be more easily understandable	Those are directly from SOLAS
I would have liked more on fire protection	Noted
The tempo of some lesson plans was too fast. Rushed through	Agreed. The over run on day one did make us move faster than scheduled.
The ship visits were the best part to see "LIVE" how issues were identified, evaluated, and resolved.	Thank You
Environmental was very fast	Noted
Good job of teaching standardization and required standards.	Thank You
Typos in assessments made things tricky	We will correct typos, however the assessments are meant to force the group to ask questions as you would on a ship
Would be good to talk about older ships and how SOLAS applies to them	Noted
Really liked the photos of deficiencies and things that are OK. It was a good exercise	Thank You
The projector needs to be brighter or better lighting controls	Noted
Recommend to not refer to cruise line industry as "them"	Noted
Would like to see more information on Safe return to port.	We will look to expand on this.
From industry perspective you still have much work to do with regard to consistency port to port.	Agreed as this is one of our primary focuses

03-07 February 2014 AFPVE Course Scorecard

Mr. Woodfords lecture was outstanding! If possible AM lectures followed by PM ship visits may help focus on advanced topics.	Hard to schedule but we will take a look
Some instructors were not up to speed in the assessments which added confusion and reduced the training value.	Noted
Testing of equipment to see proper operation and demonstrate training would be invaluable.	We are looking to do this through video
Excellent hotel choice good location and amenities.	Thank You
Great scenarios provided practical application	Thank You
Great interaction with industry	Agreed
Great follow on to the basic course.	Thank You
The course better defined and demonstrated the various exam procedures.	Agreed
Holistic approach is an improvement to how exams are conducted. Need to reach more people in the field to reinforce this policy.	Agreed
The timer was useful in keeping breaks timely. Appreciate how punctual everything was.	Agreed
The deck portion of the exam was good. The E/R portion was very similar to a cargo vessel.	Noted
Distribute a list of all attendees and their contact information on day one.	We will look to do this
The majority of the class is related to passenger vessels. However I feel multiple lessons and the onboard training consisted of general port state control items. Being an advanced class I believe it should focus on the additional passenger vessel items only.	We will look to remove any redundant information
PowerPoint's did not match note handouts when going over CVSSA. Class notes skip over some of the major components discussed in class. i.e. intumescent materials.	Agreed and we will fix this

03-07 March 2014 AFPVE Course Scorecard

Course makeup: 15 Active Duty and Civilian Coast Guard, 10 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	Mar 14	Feb 14	Jan 14	Mar 13	Feb 13	Jan 13
Critique response rate	100%	96%	100%	96%	96%	96%
Quality fill	N/A	N/A	N/A	67%	72%	78%
Class critique overall average	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.42	4.65	4.3
Class critique overall median	4.62	4.63	4.63	4.42	4.8	4.5
Class critique overall standard deviation	.10842	.09094	0.11573	0.0371	0.0775	0.251
Average # FPV exams by CG attendees	13.3	18.5	15.9	15.7	22.5	22.3
Average time in qualified as a FPV Examiner	4.3	8.0	1.2	7.1	5.3	6.9
How well course prepared for FPV exams	4.63	4.63	4.41	4.38	4.55	4.32
Training environment	4.60	4.46	4.63	4.25	4.64	4.68
Usefulness	4.64	4.58	4.67	4.58	4.73	4.41
Training materials	4.68	4.71	4.59	4.42	4.55	3.82
Material presentation	4.48	4.67	4.67	4.42	4.64	4.41
Instructor knowledge & preparation	4.76	4.67	4.78	4.63	4.77	4.41
Usefulness of cruise ship visits	4.76	4.75	4.59	4.63	4.68	4.14
Time allotted	4.48	4.58	4.48	4.08	4.64	4.23

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

Quality fill measured 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). Now that the course will be a prerequisite for the qualification, a quality fill metric will no longer maintained.

Red highlights the lowest overall mark and green is the highest mark.

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 most constructive comments and our action:

Attendee Comment/Suggestion	CSNCOE Action/Response
Air conditioning and the classroom neighbors were a distraction.	Agreed
Good focus on "Grey Area" issues	Thanks that is part of Holistic
In class assessments were good but expectations were not clear.	The assessments are designed to force the groups to ask questions
Holding more of the class onboard a real ship might be beneficial.	Noted
My expectations were fulfilled to better understand the scope of Coast Guard examinations.	Thank You
Try to limit USCG internal discussions about operational procedures not relevant to industry.	Noted
I recommend this course for all industry marine and technical professionals	Thank You
Much better understanding of Coast Guard procedures	Thank You
Class setup was good. Perfect size and group diversity.	Thank You
You should give the pre test again at the end rather than just go over everything.	We will look into it
Would like to see SOLAS cites on all slides	We will take a look at this
A lot of the same from the basic course.	Noted
It would be a good idea to email the industry personnel the applicable chapters of the MSM as many references were made on day one toward the MSM.	We will take a look at this

03-07 March 2014 AFPVE Course Scorecard

Engineering side could have been more in depth. Show actual demonstrations of water suppression testing, smoke detectors, section valves, etc.	We will take a look at this
More instructors on the ship would be better	Noted
Screen was hard to see.	Agree, will fix this for next class.