

**Summary of Student Reviews**

**Introduction**

Five PERO Courses have been run, for a total of 50 delegates have attended, with the lowest number of delegates on a course being 6, and the highest being 14.

**Course Development**

The first two courses were run to a longer programme, than the later three courses. In formatting the shorter course, sessions on Pipeline Features and Stress were removed, and the LPG demonstration, which was highly thought of, had to be dropped due to the College deeming it to be unacceptably hazardous.

On the first two courses, the practical exercise took place within a building, and involved the whole course in a first strike rescue of a casualty who had become overcome by fumes from a leaking pipe.

For the third course, an exercise based on a fictitious pipeline system running through the College grounds was introduced. This exercise ran once on the 3<sup>rd</sup> course, with all the students participating, with difficulty due to the large numbers involved. Some students formed an incident controlroom team, whilst the others either formed the PERO and assistants, or had role playing tasks to perform. On the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> courses, this exercise was run twice, with the inside team and the outside team swapping over. It is proposed for the next course to run this exercise twice again, but using different scenarios at different locations within the College each time it is run.

**Student Feedback**

The following table on the following page summarises the student feedback from the College's standard questionnaire. Some of the questions have been combined to reduce the number of entries, and make the data easier to follow. On some courses, some delegates did not return a review form; the number of returns is listed below the number of delegates.

The 5 columns labelled 1 to 5 respectively contain the statistics for each of the five courses. The number quoted against each topic, is the mean of the values returned by all the students who marked that topic.

The College Feedback forms ask students to mark the Topics as 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5, as being poor, unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good and excellent.

### Summary of Student Reviews

Course	1	2	3	4	5
Students	8	6	14	12	10
Review Returns	6	4	14	10	9
<b>Topic</b>					
Practical Facilities	4.50	4.75	4.27	3.91	4.42
Study Material, College	3.82	4.20	3.49	3.97	3.78
Study Material, Visiting Lecturers	4.35	4.22	3.75	4.23	3.82
Teaching	4.83	4.75	3.81	4.18	4.56
Teaching Methods	4.67	4.42	3.68	4.45	4.61
Videos	4.25	3.50	3.83	4.22	4.00
Assessment	3.90	3.63	3.40	3.62	3.87
Lecture Rooms	3.75	3.88	2.33	3.87	3.67
Relevance of Course	4.17	4.50	3.46	4.09	4.33
Meeting Course Objectives	4.17	4.25	3.18	4.09	3.89
Appropriateness of Aims	4.17	4.25	3.45	4.00	4.00
Length of Course	3.67	4.25	2.69	3.09	2.44
Course Admin	4.17	4.50	3.15	4.18	3.33
<b>Average</b>	4.19	4.24	3.42	3.99	3.90

On this course there have been a number of marks below 3, which is disappointing. The most significant of these were on the 3<sup>rd</sup> course where the lecture room facilities fell far short of the normal standard of comfort due to problems with the heating system, and an extra session was inserted on the afternoon of the first full day, making the course even shorter for its content than the other courses.

#### Specific Student Comments

Further feedback is invited in the way of written comment on the feedback form. The most significant comments are given below. I have not included the many unspecific comments about the course being a good course, but concentrated on reporting those with specific recommendations or concerns. Also not reported below are the many verbal comments made in the course feedback session at the end of the course.

**Summary of Student Reviews**

Course 1.

More input on behaviour of gases

Demonstration on behaviour of LPG considered to be very worthwhile (Subsequently dropped from course due to time constraints, and concern from College about the risks associated with the demonstration)

More time requested for table tops and case studies.

The tactical circuit exercise seen by some to be inappropriate, but by others appropriate. (Includes carrying out simple tasks wearing BA and chemical protection suite)

The practical exercise would benefit from having a typical pipeline module as its basis. (The College did start work on a simulated pumping station, but at this time the work is incomplete.)

Course 2.

Quality of teaching rooms not up to scratch.

Sessions could have benefited from being longer.

Tactical circuit exercise very valuable.

Session on gas detectors unnecessary, know that as part of my job.

The practical exercise could involve more role playing, and be directed more to a pipeline scenario. (This exercise has been replaced by a different exercise which is more appropriate to the role of the PERO.)

Issue a warrant type card for successful attendees, with revalidation every 3 years.

Course 3.

Several complaints about standard of lecture rooms, cold, hard seats. (The main lecture room provided was just about to be refurbished, now done, but more significantly, the College staff were unable to deal with the heating problem)

Course needs to be longer.

Quality of catering services variously reported as unacceptable and good !

Course aims and objectives should have been clearly stated at the course introduction. (Done on subsequent courses).

It would be more useful to rate each session individually, using forms provided at the start of the course.

**Summary of Student Reviews**

Course 4.

Course condensed.

Gas behaviour lecture should be longer, (2 comments).

Input on gas detectors very valuable.

Practical sessions not long enough.

Practical exercises were artificial, but the way they were set up allowed me to appreciate the problems and difficulties, which might arise in my role as a PERO.

Course should be longer, (2 comments).

Course timing should be restructured to leave delegates adequate time to get home in the afternoon/evening, (2 comments).

Emergency exercises should be extended in time and made more realistic, (real fires?)

Course 5.

Course is too short, (4 comments) (Two also commented about travelling and lack of time to study for assessment.)

Tactical Circuit exercise not necessary, (2 comments)

Some rooms not warm enough, (2 comments)

More time should be devoted to environmental aspects of incidents.

Role playing by students during Practical Exercise is a waste of time.

Consider use of Police, Fire Service and others Role Playing during table top exercise.

**Future Developments**

Provision of a suitable gas rig for the practical exercise would help to make this a much more realistic exercise.

More time is needed for the Gas Dispersion lecture

There is also a request to include an input about what happens when a pipeline fails to rupture. A speaker from Advantica has been identified, and has delivered an input once, but was unavailable for the two subsequent courses. However, the current time table is not conducive to including this input.

Insufficient time is available to allow delegates to revise prior to their assessment.

### Summary of Student Reviews

A restructured programme would return to a lunchtime start, followed by 2 full days, then a lunchtime finish on the 4<sup>th</sup> day. This would in effect be a 3 day course, with staff away from base for 4 days. This would allow more time for Gas Behaviour, allow the inclusion of the Effects of a Pipeline Failure, and allow the input on the role of the PERO to be developed in more depth. It would also allow more flexibility for exercises, and possibly allow another exercise or a case study to be included.

#### The Delegates

The delegates who have attended the 5 courses have come from the companies detailed in the following table.

Course	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Company						
BG Transco	2		9	3	3	17
BP Chemicals	2	2	1			5
British Pipeline Agency					4	4
BP Oil					2	2
Huntsman	2	2	1	1		6
Powergen				2		2
Shell Chemicals	1	1	2	2		6
Shell Expro	1	1	1		1	4
Unipen				3		3
Others				1		1
<b>Total</b>	8	6	14	12	10	50

Others includes a student from the Kuwait National Guard.

#### Assessment

I do not have statistics for the assessment results.

The pass rate per course has varied from a high of 100% to a low of 50%, with the overall pass rate being of the order of 80%. The pass mark is 70%.