

PCAR (post cruise assessment)

Bob Collier (**Chair**), Mary-Lynn Dickson,
Joe Malbrough, Mary Jane Perry

Last hard look was 2007 report
(included data to Sept. 2006)

This year, abbreviated review

- only 3 ships
- only 2008
- only Chief Scientist forms
- mostly focused on % return

We might want a more detailed analysis next time

Savannah - Joe Malbrough

reviewed 23 PCA forms submitted by the Chief Scientist in 2008 out of 34 cruises for days at sea = 68% return.

Ship and crew are **very highly ranked**.

Cape Hatteras – Bob Collier

7 forms 4/12/08 – 10/03/08. (posted ship schedule suggests two other cruises– November and December; 78% return).

Ship and crew are **very highly ranked**.

Wecoma – MJP

13 out of 15 returned forms (86%); transits not counted.

Most users **rated ship and crew excellent**.

Suggestions for **increased return rate** of Ch. Sci. forms

- for multiple trip report for repeat user, short cruises
- time form to Fastlane annual/final report (for NSF)

Other committee comments

Cape Hatteras – Bob Collier

Recently-installed **electronic communication system** (e.mail and internet) seemed to be a unanimous disappointment. Probably a matter of expectations that need to be clearly communicated ahead of time when cruises are planned. It might also help to do a UNOLS-wide investigation of how this is being done on all ships (this probably HAS been done) and to identify if there are any other common solutions.

Wecoma – MJP

A few issues were raised – particularly one on Norovirus that CS felt they should have been forewarned (**public health issue**).

Recommendations from 2007 report

(a) **Report Distribution.** *The reports should be treated as privileged communications and not distributed beyond those to whom they are addressed (Chief Scientist, Principal Investigator, Marine Superintendent, Technical Services Manager, Ship's Master, Ship's Technician, Agency Ship Manager, Agency Science Manager, UNOLS Office). The practice that most concerns us is the posting of PCAs on a ship's bulletin board which should cease as it discourages a Chief Scientist from making any negative comments.*

Collier - should be only for use by those on distribution list (not to be posted by the galley)

Joe - says he agrees, but should be up to the Marine Superintendent on whether or not he distributes the PCA to the crew. Should be by email commending a particular seaman for his/her performance.

MJP – agree; makes it awkward

(b) Discontinue Self Rating. *Self rating should be discontinued and reports from the Captain and Marine Technician simplified.*

The Captain is in the best position to estimate time lost due to weather, failure of the ship's machinery, restrictions to navigation, etc. The Marine Technician should report on problems with the ship's scientific equipment. Both the Captain and Marine Technician could also provide suggestions to the Chief Scientist on improvement of the operation and conduct of the science party. Similarly, the Chief Scientist should not be asked to rate himself, e.g. respond to question 14 on the current PCA, but it is useful to continue to ask the chief scientist to estimate loss of time due to weather, etc (question 21).

Self rating

Collier – Agree (but not strongly).

Note that asking the Captain to rate the ship's machinery (and possibly it's maintenance) and the MarTech to rate the performance of the science support gear is not much different than asking the scientist for self assessment. This may translate into 3 versions of the form (Ch.Sci/Master/Tech) with appropriate items removed.

Joe – Agree, but different forms should be instated for the Captain and Techs. Question 15 should be removed from the Captains and techs forms.

MJP - Agree – it is odd, for example:

Master rates scientists contribution to the science.

Is there a better way to phrase the question, to get information desired?

(c) **Rating Scale.** *In conjunction with implementation of (b), the rating scale should be changed. The main change that is needed to provide for a more balanced set of grading criteria between 100% and 50%. Any standard grading system should work.*

Collier – This is fine, it seems as though the NSF system has already been incorporated (see below)

Joe – agree.

MJP – agree

1. To what extent were the planned science objectives of this cruise met?

91-100%

81-90%

71-80%

61-70%

60% or Below

N/A

Please provide a BRIEF, 1-2 sentence description of the science objectives for this cruise (ie. CTD casts, survey transects, mooring deployment, etc.). Please specify how the service and support of the ship contributed to the factors that affected the completion of the science objectives, especially if not all of the objectives were met (ie. weather, equipment failure, etc.).

Remaining Characters: 2000

(d) Question 13 *should continue to focus on the extent to which the service and support of the ship contributed to the achievement of science objectives.* It should be recognized that the primary factor effecting cruise success is usually weather which is beyond the control of those on board. Chief scientist descriptions of cruise objectives should be limited to one sentence.

Possible revisions to the PCA form used by the Chief Scientist have been suggested by Mike Reeve and Wilf Gardner and are appended for possible future use.

Collier - agree that this should CAPTURE the extent to which the **service and support of the ship contributed to the achievement of science objectives**. ... A science program manager should be able to see if the objectives have been met, and that weather could be among the list of circumstances. NO ONE should interpret question 13 as a ranking of performance of the ship/crew/services - there are other specific lines for that. This is THE place to communicate the success of the GOAL of having gone to sea in the first place. Do not limit the author to "one line", brevity should be encouraged, but interdisciplinary cruises may have 10 unrelated "big" objectives and could be ranked separately. If UNOLS or the operators don't want to read that detail, then just skip over it.

Joe - agree this question should remain the same.

MJP - agree this question should remain the same.

3) Council's PCA Role

Collier - – Agreed, continue review and gather statistics with help of UNOLS office; completed PCAR forms, they seemed to be functioning fairly well.

Joe - I agree that the council should continue to support the PCAs.

MJP – Basic question is **how are these surveys used?** How could they be better used?

- 1) We only did Ch. Sc. Report. Who does Master and Tech review?
- 2) Query how NSF (facilities and science) and ONR use the form; other users? Any data not now collected that should be?
- 3) Could data (form) delivery be improved? (for examples, to get forms directly to NSF/ONR program officers? For NSF, link to fastlane and annual/final report?)
- 4) Also, we only did 2008. Last report went to mid-Sept 2006.