

05-09 January 2015 FPVE Course Scorecard

Course makeup: 18 Active Duty and Civilian Coast Guard, 11 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 15	Mar 14	Feb 14	Jan 14	Mar 13	Feb 13
Critique response rate	97%	100%	96%	100%	96%	96%
Quality fill	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	67%	72%
Class critique overall average	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.42	4.65
Class critique overall median	4.63	4.62	4.63	4.63	4.42	4.8
Class critique overall standard deviation	.18257	.10842	.09094	0.11573	0.0371	0.0775
Average # FPV exams by CG attendees	10.7	13.3	18.5	15.9	15.7	22.5
Average time in qualified as a FPV Examiner	1.0	4.3	8.0	1.2	7.1	5.3
How well course prepared for FPV exams	4.50	4.63	4.63	4.41	4.38	4.55
Training environment	4.61	4.60	4.46	4.63	4.25	4.64
Usefulness	4.29	4.64	4.58	4.67	4.58	4.73
Training materials	4.64	4.68	4.71	4.59	4.42	4.55
Material presentation	4.89	4.48	4.67	4.67	4.42	4.64
Instructor knowledge & preparation	4.36	4.76	4.67	4.78	4.63	4.77
Usefulness of cruise ship visits	4.21	4.76	4.75	4.59	4.63	4.68
Time allotted	4.54	4.48	4.58	4.48	4.08	4.64

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 Now that the course will be a prerequisite for the qualification, a quality fill metric will no longer maintained.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
The assessments could have had more details. Additionally it would have been helpful if the "Hiatusport" details could be in a separate binder making it easier to use them during the assessment. Would have liked reference sites in the notes.	The assessments are left with minimal details. The facilitators provide any other information requested. With the limited space at the tables we are trying to minimize the number of binders.
The assessment sessions felt rushed and unorganized (out of order, attempting to do multiple at once and trying to make completed projects before the end)	The assessments are meant to encourage dialog at the tables to evaluate each specific scenario posed. Timeframes are based on past experience. This will be reiterated to each table facilitator to prevent from happening again.
The assessments seem like they are a bigger hindrance than helpful. Any PSCO should know how to write a form B and it isn't something that industry people need to practice doing. Instead I think that they could have been divided and could be used for assessments but also for discussion between industry and CG participants.	The course is designed for Coast Guard students and the Form B's are critical in evaluating completion of the assessments. Unfortunately without the assessments our only other choice is to conduct tests after each lesson which is not preferred. We always hope to have good dialog with CG and industry participants.
My knowledge of FPVE is exponentially improved	Thank You
Tables too small for number of people and amount of materials. Otherwise the facility was great	Thanks, we have reduced the number of items on the tables but will evaluate again.
Extremely helpful. Will inform my future involvement in CG exams and improve my understanding of CG drivers	Thank You
Some discrepancies between slides shown and student guide. Some content in slides not in guide and vice versa.	This will be addressed to ensure better alignment.
Extremely engaging and with well managed breaks	Thank You

05-09 January 2015 FPVE Course Scorecard

Extremely knowledgeable instructors, Any questions not known when asked were quickly looked up and shared with the group	Thank you
Group size is too large on ship visit. Should probably be broken into 4 groups. Difficult for 14-15 people to adequately gather in some smaller spaces on the ship.	Appreciate the comment, unfortunately smaller group sizes places a larger burden on the ship for escorts. It will be re-emphasized to the instructors to ensure all students can hear learning points.
All major topics were given enough time to achieve an idea of how it is incorporated holistically.	Thank you
It's a little fatiguing to walk machinery spaces for 4 hours straight without a break. At the end of the walkthrough everyone seemed distracted and anxious to finish. A 10-15 minute break in the middle should be adequate to help everyone digest previous information and refocus.	Thanks for the comment we will look into this.
Instructors very well prepared. Surprised by the dynamic presentation of all instructors. Very motivating for the participants to dig into matters	Thank you
Course helped to reiterate what I learned during the exam I shadowed	Thank you
Access to the basic course would be helpful	Currently we are in the process of posting all modules for the basic training to our internal CG website. This is still a work in progress but CG participants can access: https://cgportal2.uscg.mil/units/csncoe/SitePages/Home.aspx And click on lower left under VO PQS Guidance.
It was also very helpful to have participated in an exam prior to the course so that I had some context for the course material presented. I would recommend this for any industry rep who does not have shipboard experience and/or experience w/ USCG marine inspections.	Great idea and we will continue to offer up this service and the cruise lines have been supportive of this also.
Some of the slides had more information than student guide	The intent is to have alignment between the student guide and slides but in some areas we do include more in the slides on purpose to facilitate discussion and learning.
Some topics need deeper discussion	Agreed! Unfortunately we are limited by time.
I knew very little about the CG before attending. I now feel I have an understanding of the CG goals/aims and the reasoning behind inspections	Thank You
I enjoyed the assessments and discussions. The fact that we go through SOLAS, I thought was excellent and really enjoyed	Thank You
I found some of the assessment questions a bit confusing	We will look into the questions again and stress to upcoming classes to utilize the facilitators.
Very impressed with the instructors ability to answer questions and also sight SOLAS/ reg etc to give the exact reason/source	Thank you
I really enjoyed the ship visit and thought it was a great that what was discussed in the classroom is repeated on board helping to cement learning	Thank you
Additional shipboard visits would be helpful.	Agreed, unfortunately we are limited by time.
I thoroughly enjoyed the course and felt that I learned more here than at my unit because of the dedicated training. With the limited time onboard ships during inspections training is lacking tremendously at my unit.	Thank You
Reduce the number of sheets in Assessment #4. Also add the sheets to the powerpoint presentation to facilitate review	Thanks for the comment, this has been changed.
A few more days that allowed for more in depth exercises and ship visits. I learned a lot during the assessments and would have appreciated more discussion time.	Agreed, unfortunately we are limited by time/budget. We are working on many other products to help enhance learning. We encourage you to look at our portal website: https://cgportal2.uscg.mil/units/csncoe/SitePages/Home.aspx .

05-09 January 2015 FPVE Course Scorecard

<p>This is just a suggestion. As instructors, prepare a list of areas/equipment that we will see on each ship visit. Allow the students to be in groups or individuals to choose one of those areas we visit. The students will then prepare a short brief on that area to present to the group. Each group can choose an area of weakness to help them learn even more. They can cover what they CG will look for or just talk about the system.</p>	<p>This is a very interesting idea and we will evaluate it, thanks.</p>
<p>Materials were well formatted. Space categorization exercise could be minimized.</p>	<p>Space categorization is typically one of the areas where students have the most problems. Recently we also created a study guide for space categorization and it is posted on our website.</p>
<p>Based on my personal volume of FPVE visits, I found it more of a refresher than an overall advanced experience.</p>	<p>The "Advanced" has been removed from the name and it is now a pre-requisite in the PQS. However, we still get varied experience levels in the course.</p>
<p>Yes the days were long but filled with an adequate amount of learning material</p>	<p>Thank You</p>
<p>The course solidified my previous knowledge with FPV exams and enhanced my awareness of new regulations and procedures. It was a good forum to share information with other units, class and industry. My expectation of consistency with all of the above aforementioned was met.</p>	<p>Thank you</p>
<p>The hotel was excellent. Very good location and holding class on sight is an added bonus.</p>	<p>Thank you</p>
<p>Overall I think the course was great and the instructors were very knowledgeable. I would add that maybe the course would be great on a ship</p>	<p>Thank you</p>
<p>Everything I have learned this week will be put to use in some form in the field</p>	<p>Thank you</p>
<p>CD is awesome</p>	<p>Thank you</p>
<p>Very well presented. I would have preferred even more focus on process, but I recognize it is difficult with such a broad audience.</p>	<p>Thank you</p>
<p>Ship visit very useful and good to split between deck and engine over two days. I think even more concentration on process as inspector/examiners during these visits would be good or even just conducting a mock exam.</p>	<p>Thank you, we have looked into using role play opportunities however have to be mindful to minimize impact on the cruise ship for our training.</p>
<p>A week was perfect amount of time, although I believe a week long PSSC shadow in conjunction with this class is imperative.</p>	<p>Agreed, if you are interested in shadowing class during a PSSC please contact our office to get help in facilitating that opportunity.</p>
<p>I liked reviewing the expectations at the end of the course, good measurement indicator</p>	<p>Thank You</p>
<p>Have a little more time/facilitation for dialogue between different units and between CG and industry...discussing methods and approaches to standard interpretation and preparation for exams. Some this happened naturally of course.</p>	<p>Agreed, instructors do their best to facilitate dialog in the class as each student has a unique perspective and experience we can all learn from.</p>
<p>One of the best run courses in recent memory. Time allotted and time management was exceptional. I will admit that I should have attended the basic course first but I gained a wealth of knowledge in this course. I highly recommend this course to those already qualified or those who have obtained 50% of the PQS signatures.</p>	<p>Thank You</p>
<p>Lesson 2 powerpoint presentation was not clearly understood by members from Industry at the table. The lesson and powerpoint did not correlate.</p>	<p>We will work to better align the powerpoints and student guides.</p>

23-27 February 2015 FPVE Course Scorecard

Course makeup: 19 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	Feb 15	Jan 15	Mar 14	Feb 14	Jan 14	Mar 13
Critique response rate	99%	97%	100%	96%	100%	96%
Class critique overall average	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.42
Class critique overall median	4.67	4.63	4.62	4.63	4.63	4.42
Class critique overall standard deviation	.14619	.18257	.10842	.09094	0.11573	0.0371
Average # FPV exams by CG attendees	19.4	10.7	13.3	18.5	15.9	15.7
Average time in qualified as a FPV Examiner	1.4	1.0	4.3	8.0	1.2	7.1
How well course prepared for FPV exams	4.64	4.50	4.63	4.63	4.41	4.38
Training environment	4.76	4.61	4.60	4.46	4.63	4.25
Usefulness	4.68	4.29	4.64	4.58	4.67	4.58
Training materials	4.52	4.64	4.68	4.71	4.59	4.42
Material presentation	4.72	4.89	4.48	4.67	4.67	4.42
Instructor knowledge & preparation	4.92	4.36	4.76	4.67	4.78	4.63
Usefulness of cruise ship visits	4.68	4.21	4.76	4.75	4.59	4.63
Time allotted	4.44	4.54	4.48	4.58	4.48	4.08

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
It was good to tour ships of different lines as it shows different onboard culture	Thank You
Very Nice Training Course	Thank You
It would be nice to add more SOLAS Cites in more particular and detailed way inside the book	The student guide is to be used as a reference and for notes. All applicable reference cites are listed in the beginning of each section and other specific cites are mentioned by the instructors.
Some of the PPT presentation was a bit different than the booklet	We will work to correct this.
It was a pleasure and an honor to listen to the lectures they were professional, patient, available and very nice	Thank You
I appreciated the approach of the lectured/trainer during the on field inspection. There was no distinction in the treatment between industry and the Coast Guard. Very much appreciated.	Thank You
The schedule was nice. I appreciated the breaks every 50-60 minutes. They help to keep the mind fresh and concentrated during the speeches.	Thank You
A lot of important information was given during the course. A good education and knowledge refresher.	Thank You
Instructors were very well prepared.	Thank You
The ship visits were excellent. You see things in real life with the Coast Guard eye. Very interesting	Thank You
Reduce the noise from the adjacent room	We will work with the hotel to correct this problem.
I would like to have a summary guide that consolidates pertinent information from the various references by topic.	All reference material is included in the reference CD.
This was a good occasion to have an exchange of opinion and knowledge between the USCG and Industry.	Thank You

23-27 February 2015 FPVE Course Scorecard

A good portion of the course was a repeat of the basic course. Recommend removing the portion covered by the basic cause.	The course is set up to focus on the process of the exam.
Some instructors could have spoken louder	We will work to correct this.
Very good course. The TTP document needs to be used more in the course	Thank you, we will continue to focus on the TTP and process.
Great to see the CG process and how you deal with things found during inspections	Thank You
Great job explaining Coast Guard Expectations from exam and balancing the turn around.	Thank You
Provided a much better explanation of enforcement and where to find applicable regulations.	Thank You
Overall this course exceeded expectations. I will be able to confidently lead and exam and will have the knowledge to apply the international and CG regulations.	Thank You
Presenters were excellent, well-prepared and answered all of our questions.	Thank You
Great to do field trips to ships and see what we were learning about.	Thank You
Overall I thought this was an excellent course and I definitely learned a lot of good information that will make me a better cruise ship inspector.	Thank You
The reference disc is a great add.	Thank You
I think the form B writing was good but writing all 18 deficiencies as a bit much. Maybe we should write just the top 5 defs or so we could still get the point across without spending too much time on it.	This is necessary to complete the assessments and we feel better than completing a test after each section.
Clearer definition and discussion of the total flooding regulation. It was a bit confusing just because the term FLOODING can be misleading.	We will focus additional time to make this clearer for future classes.
I would like to have had more hands on training it was difficult for me to visualize process.	Unfortunately we are very limited by time in the course and can't find time outside of the ship visits. However, we are working on getting a virtual exam created which will help this issue. There are also some visual learning products on our internal website: https://cgportal2.uscg.mil/units/csncoe/SitePages/Home.aspx .
I thought the basic class was more helpful to my knowledge growth and preparation. This process piece is more difficult for me to learn from. In many ways this class was more basic than the basic class.	Each course targets different backgrounds and glad that both added value for you.
All instructors did an outstanding job.	Thank You
Excellent course This was my last requirement before my board and I feel ready now.	Thank You
Excellent instructors a great mix of experience in the class having industry members as students is a great idea.	Thank You
The class has given me a great deal of confidence to conduct exams.	Thank You
Instructors had an excellent grasp on the material.	Thank You
Good training. However the ambiguous use of guidance by certain instructors could be followed by concrete examples and policy.	We will communicate to each instructor to stress policy during their modules.
MSC/NCOE mission and interaction could have been expanded/Clearer.	We will add more in future classes.
Course was very informative and the overall concept was excellent. Instead of teaching regs the practical approach seems to help in understanding how to do an exam.	Thank you
This did not cover much more than the basic course.	This course focuses on process, but we will work to minimize any overlap with the basic training.

23-27 February 2015 FPVE Course Scorecard

<p>First I believe this course is a good course with good information and the best teachers. However after taking the basic course I find that his is extremely similar just without the regulations and maybe a focus on process. I believe that after taking the basic cruise ship course this course should be waived as I feel the vast majority is a review. The basic course I thought was much more beneficial and provides more info regs may be the basic and advanced cruise ship can be combined.</p>	<p>Thanks for the comments, unfortunately the basic training targets people working on their qualification and focuses on reviewing the PQS tasks. This training is process focused and allows for a unique opportunity to interact with industry.</p>
<p>Great exposure to interact with different FPVE at different background as well as industry.</p>	<p>Thank You</p>

23-27 March 2015 FPVE Course Scorecard

Course makeup: 19 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	Mar 15	Feb 15	Jan 15	Mar 14	Feb 14	Jan 14
Critique response rate	100%	99%	97%	100%	96%	100%
Class critique overall average	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Class critique overall median	4.65	4.67	4.63	4.62	4.63	4.63
Class critique overall standard deviation	.15881	.14619	.18257	.10842	.09094	0.11573
Average # FPV exams by CG attendees	11.1	19.4	10.7	13.3	18.5	15.9
Average time in qualified as a FPV Examiner	1.0	1.4	1.0	4.3	8.0	1.2
How well course prepared for FPV exams	4.43	4.64	4.50	4.63	4.63	4.41
Training environment	4.68	4.76	4.61	4.60	4.46	4.63
Usefulness	4.86	4.68	4.29	4.64	4.58	4.67
Training materials	4.61	4.52	4.64	4.68	4.71	4.59
Material presentation	4.68	4.72	4.89	4.48	4.67	4.67
Instructor knowledge & preparation	4.86	4.92	4.36	4.76	4.67	4.78
Usefulness of cruise ship visits	4.68	4.68	4.21	4.76	4.75	4.59
Time allotted	4.46	4.44	4.54	4.48	4.58	4.48

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
The basic course help prepare me for the board. This course helped but the basic course was more detailed.	The FPVE course is designed to cover the exam process. The basic course is meant to be PQS focused or knowledge based which is why there is a difference.
Having the training onsite at the hotel was great.	Thank you
Loved the head sets.	Thank you
The course should follow the process guide...Team 1 does this Team 2 does this etc.	We are trying to modify to better follow the TTP. Thanks for the suggestion.
The course thoroughly prepared me. But I liked how the basic course provided cites for everything.	The difference in the two courses is from knowledge to skill and the application of skill. The basic course is knowledge only.
The wording in some of the scenarios was vague and confusing.	Thank you. By design the scenarios are intended to be vague much like observations initially identified on a ship exam.
Room temperature was inconsistent.	We are working with the hotel about this.
Great location for training	Thank you
Instructors were great	Thank you
Enjoyed the ship visits. Would be better if we could actually manipulate the systems onboard.	We are working on the development of videos to fill this gap. Additionally, the CG has a PSSC Shadow program where you would be able to see the crew test various systems which is not possible in training.
Need more time for subdivision and space categorization.	This is a major piece of the course but we will take a look at how we can modify delivery to make this better. Additionally, we have developed a training aid for subdivision and it is available here: http://www.uscg.mil/hq/cg5/csncoe/fpveknowledge.asp

23-27 March 2015 FPVE Course Scorecard

I was disappointed I had to wait so long to get orders to this course and then come and find 10 industry people. But after being here I was happy to be seated with industry. The technical knowledge and experience from their point of view was great.	At our maximum we only have 45 Coast Guard Billets annually. Recent budget cuts reduced this to 41. The industry pays their own way and Coast Guard throughput is restricted by funding. We agree that there is great value to having industry in the class.
Excellent course	Thank you
Instructors were all very knowledgeable, approachable and organized.	Thank you
Recommend remove redundant material from the basic course.	We are going to modify some of the delivery points now that the basic course is up and running.
Would like to see more videos	Agreed. As stated above we are working on videos to align with the PQS and hope to have them up and running for next year's courses.
The assignments were confusing. Recommend each table have an instructor assigned to help with questions and act as ship's crew	Each table has an assigned staff member. It will be reiterated at future courses to the staff and students.
Having industry in class was very valuable	Thank you
Make ship visits like a real exam	We will continue to tailor the course to follow the TTP and hopefully the ship visits will be more valuable.