

APPENDIX XI

Workshop to Review the Format and Handling of Post Cruise Evaluation Reports

This workshop was held in conjunction with the 1995 meeting of the RVOC and was held on board the Research Vessel ROBERT GORDON SPROUL.

Attending this session were Dr. Linda Goad, Tim Pfeiffer, Robert Hinton, Capt. Louis Zimm, Annette DeSilva, Dr. Inguar Emilsson and Enrique Aranda.

The RVOC was charged by the UNOLS council and given some guidance by the Fleet Improvement Committee (FIC) regarding the need to review the post cruise evaluation reports prepared by the Chief Scientists, Captains and Marine Technicians. This includes a set of Goals and Objectives provided by the FIC which is attached. Included in a customer satisfaction survey conducted by the FIC and the Council were comments suggesting that follow up to post cruise reports back to the person that prepared it was lacking in the current system. A concern raised by the RVOC regarding the current system was that it was being used as a de-facto method for evaluating the relative performance of individual research vessels and to show the overall performance of the UNOLS fleet. This was being done while at the same time the format of the report and the fact that it was not mandatory resulted in incomplete data and fairly subjective interpretation of the results.

As a result of some of these concerns a draft revised report was created that was styled after a customer satisfaction survey with scaled responses to a number of questions. A revised version of this draft was prepared by the RVTEC and presented to RVOC for consideration. These forms are attached.

During the course of the workshop discussion two things became clear almost immediately. First of all, the majority of those in the workshop did not see the value in the customer satisfaction survey format and in the subsequent assembly of numerically based evaluation reports. Secondly, the use of the Captain's post cruise report as a means for providing written feedback to the ship operators management was considered a useful tool. This was expanded to include a written report from the Chief Scientist and the Marine Technicians if those reports were routed through the Marine Superintendent.

After some discussion about how the reports should be used, how they should be formatted and how they should be handled the following recommendations were made:

1. The reports should be mandatory or at least formally requested of all Chief Scientists, Captains and Marine Technicians after each cruise.
2. The format of the reports should be the same for all three category of reporters.
3. The reports should be made directly to the Marine Superintendent (or equivalent) and forwarded to the UNOLS office or as otherwise required after appropriate responses are made.
4. The ship operator's management would respond to and/or acknowledge all reports.
5. The format of the report should be simplified and should encourage a substantive report designed to improve the operation of the vessel and to acknowledge positive aspects of the operation.
6. Subsequent summary reports should be more narrative in format, based on an evaluation of the written reports. Statistics and short summaries of key words were not viewed as useful. It was recommended that the ship inspection personnel, funding agencies and the UNOLS council should be further consulted to determine the management requirements of any compiled or summary reports.

The following is a draft of a revised report:

- 1) Ship's Name: _____
- 2) Chief Scientist: _____
- 3) Master: _____
- 4) Marine Technician: _____
- 5) Cruise dates: _____
- 6) Did this ship meet the science objectives of the cruise? __yes __no
Please explain, especially if objectives were not met
- 7) Number of days lost _____ Reasons for lost days
- 8) Are there changes you would recommend before you would use this ship again that would improve the results or result in a safer operation?
- 9) Name/position of person completing this form: _____
- 10) Return e-mail address: _____

UNOLS Goals and Objectives for Post-Cruise Assessment Reports

Chris Mooers, FIC Chair
29 Jul 95

- **Goals**
 - To help ensure that the UNOLS Fleet meets the needs of the ocean science community.
 - To help ensure that the UNOLS Fleet meets the highest quality operational and safety standards of all research vessel operations in the U.S. , preferably the world.
- **Objectives**
 - To provide a means for chief scientists to evaluate the UNOLS Fleet, including research vessel condition and operations, safety issues, marine technician support, shore support, standard shipboard equipment and scientific instrumentation, and data processing facilities.
 - To provide a mechanism for improvement of UNOLS fleet operations through continual feedback from chief scientists.
 - To provide feedback to ship operators, marine technicians, the UNOLS membership, and the federal funding agencies on the effectiveness of the UNOLS Fleet.
 - To provide accountability to the scientific community (esp. chief scientists) by engendering reports on the follow-ups by ship operators.

FIRST DRAFT, PREPARED PRIOR TO WORKSHOP

UNOLS

Research Vessel Cruise Assessment
By Chief Scientist

Ship: _____

Cruise Dates: _____

Name of Person completing this form: _____ Institution _____

Other Information needed to identify cruise, ship, program, etc. (Could be same as old form or changed. I don't have strong feeling about this.)

Please rate the results of this cruise, the performance of the Research Vessel, Crew, Technician staff and support staff with 5 being a high rating and 1 the lowest. Use additional pages for comments as necessary. This information will be used by operators, UNOLS and the funding agencies to help keep the UNOLS fleet safe, effective and efficient.)

12. The cruise was successful in terms of your Scientific Project:

1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5 ___

Comments:

13. Pre-cruise information, planning and co-ordination was thorough and complete.

1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5 ___

Comments:

14. The Research Vessel was suitable for the project.

1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5 ___

Comments:

15. The professionalism (competence and cooperativeness (PLEASE FIND A NEW WORD FOR THIS)) of the captain met your expectations

1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5 ___

Comments:

16. The professionalism (competence and cooperativeness) of the crew met your expectations

1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5 ___

Comments:

17. The professionalism (competence and cooperativeness) of the marine technician met your expectations

1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5 ___

Comments:

18. The professionalism (competence and cooperativeness) of the shore support staff met your expectations

1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5 ___

Comments:

19. The ship was clean, well maintained and ready for the cruise.

1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5 ___

Comments:

20. The ship and its equipment operated correctly during the cruise.

1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5 ___

Comments:

22. The Scientific Equipment provided by the operator was adequate and operated correctly.

1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5 ___

Comments:

23. The adherence to safety regulations and the safety of operations were adequate.

1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5 ___

Comments:

24. List any safety related or other problems in order of priority that require follow up:

(You will receive a written response to these items and to other items if appropriate)

25. Comments, details of problems suggestions and praise if appropriate:

RVTEC Draft

Post Cruise Report

1. Length of cruise, including transit: less than 7 days 7 -14 days more than 14 days

2. Number of days lost due to: weather ship's equipment scientific

3. Did the cruise meet the scientific objectives? No Exceeded objectives

4. To what extent did each of the following factors effect the success of the cruise?

a. Weather, not applicable or

Greatly harmed Greatly helped

b. Precruise planning with ship operations, not applicable or

Greatly harmed Greatly helped

c. Precruise planning with technical support, not applicable or

Greatly harmed Greatly helped

d. Precruise planning of scientific party, not applicable or

Greatly harmed Greatly helped

e. Ship's equipment(winches, cranes, generators, boats), not applicable or

Greatly harmed Greatly helped

f. Ship's scientific instrumentation, not applicable or

Greatly harmed Greatly helped

g. Instrumentation provided by the scientific party, not applicable or

Greatly harmed Greatly helped

h. Performance of Captain, not applicable or

Greatly harmed Greatly helped

i. Performance of crew, not applicable or

Greatly harmed Greatly helped

j. Performance of ship's technician, not applicable or

Greatly harmed Greatly helped

k. Performance of scientific party, not applicable or

Greatly harmed Greatly helped

4. List any safety concerns or problems:

5. Additional comments:
