



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

*Resident Inspector Office
at the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station*

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

Message to: Alan Slaney

Organization: _____

Voice No.: _____

Pages: 3 (including this page)

Message From:

____ Samuel Hansell, SRI

____ John Richmond, RI

☒ Sheryl Farrell, OA

Voice No.: (570)542-2134

FAX No.: (570)542-4573

Notes:

*Condition Report
2001 SSES Written Exam*





CONDITION REPORT FACT SHEET

Search Again
DSS Quick Navigation

Status Information | Event Information | Actions Taken | Significance Review | Evaluation | Trend Information | Affected Objects | Action Items

STATUS INFORMATION

Condition Report Number: 350472 Cycle:

Lead Group: Not Assigned

Significance Level: No Description

Reso Due: Not Assigned

Status: SCREEN

Reso Cmpl: Not Dispositioned

Closure Date: Not Closed

TOP

EVENT INFORMATION

Event Date: 10-AUG-01 04:08PM

Originator: TRUMP*MARK

Problem Statement: POST ADMINISTRATION CHANGES TO EXAMINATION EXCEED 5% INDICATOR THRESHOLD.

Description: EIGHT CHANGES TO THE NRC INITIAL LICENSING EXAM WERE MADE AFTER ADMINISTRATION AS A RESULT OF PROCTOR REVIEW AND STUDENT FEEDBACK (8/128 = 6.25%). ONE CHANGE WAS MADE PRIOR TO ADMINISTRATION. THIS EXAM HAD BEEN REVIEWED BY BOTH LINE AND TRAINING AND HAD BEEN VALIDATED WITH LINE PERSONNEL. THIS IS ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF THE PROBLEM IDENTIFIED IN CR 338870 THE EXAMINATION CHANGES AND ANALYSIS RESULTS ARE SUMMARIZED IN ATTACHED MEDIA.

TOP

SIGNIFICANCE REVIEW

Management Summary: No Comment Provided

Past Occurrences: No Comment Provided

Significance: No Comment Provided

Interim Actions: No Comment Provided

Classifier:

TOP

EVALUATION**Investigation:** No Comment Provided**Safety Assessment:** No Comment Provided**Causes:** No Comment Provided**Use-As-Is/Repair:** No Comment Provided

TOP

PRELIMINARY ACTIONS TAKEN**Action Date:** Not Assigned **Action Taken By:** Not Assigned**Action Text:** No Text Available

TOP

ACTION PLAN ITEMS**Item Number:** No Cra Association **Action Group:** No Cra Association**Due Date:** No Cra Association **Status:** No Cra Association**Description** No Cra Association

TOP

RELATED INFORMATION

TOP

TREND INFORMATION**Trend Code** **Trend Code Value****DEFICIENCY TAG** TAG NOT APPLIED

TOP

AFFECTED OBJECTS

Object Category	ID	Description
Design Component	NONE	NO COMPONENT AFFECTED
Not Assigned	Not Assigned	Not Assigned

TOP

Status Information | Event Information | Actions Taken | Significance Review | Evaluation | Trend
Information | Affected Objects | Action Items



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

*Resident Inspector Office
at the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station*

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

Message to: Alan Blum

Organization: _____

Voice No.: _____

Pages: 3 (including this page)

Message From:

_____ Samuel Hansell, SRI

_____ John Richmond, RI

☒ Sheryl Farrell, OA

Voice No.: (570)542-2134

FAX No.: (570)542-4573

Notes:

Condition Report

2001 SSES NRC Written Examination – August 10, 2001

Prior to Written Examination Administration

Prior to administration of the written examination to the candidates, a change to the answer key was made. The question is included in Enclosure A. Typographical errors were also identified and corrected but are not included in this report.

- Developers identified one answer key change and corrected the question and key; the NRC lead examiner was notified.
- Developers identified typographical errors and corrected them.

Administered Examination to the Candidates

During the administration of the examination the proctors made minor clarifications to nine questions in response to questions asked by the candidates. Refer to Enclosure B for the "Questions/Comments during Administration."

- During administration candidate questions were captured and nine clarifications were made to the examination. These clarifications were minor. Refer to questions RO2/SRO2, RO3/SRO3, RO30/SRO27, RO38, RO41/SRO33, RO53/SRO42, RO60, RO79/SRO58, and RO86/SRO64.

Post Examination Review with Candidates / Concurrent and Independent Review

As a result of the post-examination review with the students and an independent and concurrent review by several instructors, changes were made to eight questions on the examination. Of these changes, the changes to five questions were considered significant and the changes to three questions were considered not significant. Refer to Enclosure C for "Post Examination Comments" and the resolution of these comments. The concurrent and independent review by instructors identified question comments similar to those identified by the candidates and also identified some questions comments not identified by the candidates.

- Three questions had changes that were identified as not significant because although the questions had the wrong answer this was identified and reflected on the answer key before grading the examination. This required that the correct answer be changed but did not affect the question and answers for each of these questions. Refer to questions RO23/SRO21, RO54/SRO43, and RO50. The comments that resulted in these changes were identified by the candidates in two instances and were identified by the instructors for all three questions.
- One question had a change considered significant change because there was no correct answer and the question was deleted. Refer to question RO92/SRO68. The comments that resulted in this question change were not identified during the review with the candidates but was identified by the instructors. It is not known if there is a knowledge deficiency in this area but this will be further evaluated to determine if there is one.
- Four questions had changes considered significant because there were two correct answers for each of these four questions. Refer to questions RO95/SRO70, RO33/SRO29, RO67, and RO55/SRO44. The comments that resulted in these changes were identified by both the candidates during the post-examination review and by the instructors during the concurrent and independent examination review.

2001 SSES NRC Written Examination – August 10, 2001**Examination Analysis Results:**

The examination analysis confirmed the changes previously identified and showed no additional examination changes that warranted review. The examination analysis also revealed three topics where a knowledge deficiency may be present. RO15/SRO13 revealed a possible deficiency in limiting safety system settings and the bases for the settings for all candidates. RO88/SRO66 revealed a possible deficiency in required on-shift time to maintain an active license for the reactor operator candidates. RO66/SRO51 revealed a possible deficiency in RWM operation for the reactor operator candidates.