

VARIOUS CHECKLISTS

FOR THE KEWAUNEE INITIAL EXAMINATION - FEB 2004

Facility: Kewaunee Date of Examination: 2/2/2004

Examinations Developed by: Facility / (NRC) (circle one)

Target Date*	Task Description / Reference	Chief Examiner's Initials
-180	1. Examination administration date confirmed (C.1.a; C.2.a & b)	CP
-120	2. NRC examiners and facility contact assigned (C.1.d; C.2.e)	CP
-120	3. Facility contact briefed on security & other requirements (C.2.c)	CP
-120	4. Corporate notification letter sent (C.2.d)	CP
[-90]	[5. Reference material due (C.1.e; C.3.c)]	CP
-75	6. Integrated examination outline(s) due (C.1.e & f; C.3.d)	CP
-70	7. Examination outline(s) reviewed by NRC and feedback provided to facility licensee (C.2.h; C.3.e)	N/A
-45	8. Proposed examinations, supporting documentation, and reference materials due (C.1.e, f, g & h; C.3.d)	CP
-30	9. Preliminary license applications due (C.1.i; C.2.g; ES-202)	CP
-14	10. Final license applications due and assignment sheet prepared (C.1.i; C.2.g; ES-202)	CP/
-14	11. Examination approved by NRC supervisor for facility licensee review (C.2.h; C.3.f)	CP
-14	12. Examinations reviewed with facility licensee (C.1.j; C.2.f & h; C.3.g)	CP
-7	13. Written examinations and operating tests approved by NRC supervisor (C.2.i; C.3.h)	CP
-7	14. Final applications reviewed; assignment sheet updated; waiver letters sent (C.2.g, ES-204)	CP
-7	15. Proctoring/written exam administration guidelines reviewed with facility licensee and authorization granted to give written exams (if applicable) (C.3.k)	CP
-7	16. Approved scenarios, job performance measures, and questions distributed to NRC examiners (C.3.i)	CP

* Target dates are keyed to the examination date identified in the corporate notification letter. They are for planning purposes and may be adjusted on a case-by-case basis in coordination with the facility licensee.

[] Applies only to examinations prepared by the NRC.

Facility:		Date of Examination:			
Item	Task Description	Initials			
		a	b*	c#	
1. W R I T T E N	a. Verify that the outline(s) fit(s) the appropriate model per ES-401.	MCS CDY	N/A	CP	
	b. Assess whether the outline was systematically and randomly prepared in accordance with Section D.1 of ES-401 and whether all K/A categories are appropriately sampled.	MCS CDY	N/A	CP	
	c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics.	MCS CDY	N/A	CP	
	d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate.	MCS CDY	N/A	CP	
2. S I M	a. Using Form ES-301-5, verify that the proposed scenario sets cover the required number of normal evolutions, instrument and component failures, and major transients.	MCS CDY	N/A	CP	
	b. Assess whether there are enough scenario sets (and spares) to test the projected number and mix of applicants in accordance with the expected crew composition and rotation schedule without compromising exam integrity; ensure each applicant can be tested using at least one new or significantly modified scenario, that no scenarios are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s)*, and scenarios will not be repeated over successive days.	MCS CDY	N/A	CP	
	c. To the extent possible, assess whether the outline(s) conform(s) with the qualitative and quantitative criteria specified on Form ES-301-4 and described in Appendix D.	MCS CDY	N/A	CP	
3. W / T	a. Verify that: (1) the outline(s) contain(s) the required number of control room and in-plant tasks, (2) no more than 30% of the test material is repeated from the last NRC examination, (3)* no tasks are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s), and (4) no more than 80% of any operating test is taken directly from the licensee's exam banks.	MCS CDY	N/A	CP	
	b. Verify that: (1) the tasks are distributed among the safety function groupings as specified in ES-301, (2) one task is conducted in a low-power or shutdown condition, (3) 40% of the tasks require the applicant to implement an alternate path procedure, (4) one in-plant task tests the applicant's response to an emergency or abnormal condition, and (5) the in-plant walk-through requires the applicant to enter the RCA.	MCS CDY	N/A	CP	
	c. Verify that the required administrative topics are covered, with emphasis on performance-based activities.	MCS CDY	N/A	CP	
	d. Determine if there are enough different outlines to test the projected number and mix of applicants and ensure that no items are duplicated on successive days.	MCS CDY	N/A	CP	
4. G E N E R A L	a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam section.	MCS CDY	N/A	CP	
	b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate.	MCS CDY	N/A	CP	
	c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5.	MCS CDY	N/A	CP	
	d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections.	MCS CDY	N/A	CP	
	e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage.	MCS CDY	N/A	CP	
	f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO).	MCS CDY	N/A	CP	
a. Author	Michael E. Biolby Charles D. Zoia	Printed Name	Michael E. Biolby Charles D. Zoia	Signature	Date 11/5/04
b. Facility Reviewer (*)	NOT APPLICABLE - NRC Developed exam			N/A	
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	Charles Phillips		Charles Phillips		6/27/04
d. NRC Supervisor	RJ Lankesbury		RJ Lankesbury		1/30/04

Note: * Not applicable for NRC-developed examinations.
Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 2/2/04 as of the date of my signature. I agree that I will not knowingly divulge any information about these examinations to any persons who have not been authorized by the NRC chief examiner. I understand that I am not to instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants scheduled to be administered these licensing examinations from this date until completion of examination administration, except as specifically noted below and authorized by the NRC. Furthermore, I am aware of the physical security measures and requirements (as documented in the facility licensee's procedures) and understand that violation of the conditions of this agreement may result in cancellation of the examinations and/or an enforcement action against me or the facility licensee. I will immediately report to facility management or the NRC chief examiner any indications or suggestions that examination security may have been compromised.

2. Post-Examination

To the best of my knowledge, I did not divulge to any unauthorized persons any information concerning the NRC licensing examinations administered during the week(s) of 2-2-04. From the date that I entered into this security agreement until the completion of examination administration, I did not instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants who were administered these licensing examinations, except as specifically noted below and authorized by the NRC.

PRINTED NAME	JOB TITLE / RESPONSIBILITY	SIGNATURE (1)	DATE	SIGNATURE (2)	DATENOTE
1. David Mielke	Operations Supervisor	<i>David Mielke</i>	1-12-04	<i>D Mielke</i>	2-9-04
2. Norman Wernborne	BPA	<i>Norman Wernborne</i>	1/13/04	<i>Norman Wernborne</i>	2/5/04
3. Jeff Z. Stoeger	Assist Ops Mgr	<i>Jeff Z Stoeger</i>	1/13/04	<i>Jeff Z Stoeger</i>	2/5/04
4. Gmceiszperger	NCO	<i>Gmceiszperger</i>	1/14/04	<i>Gmceiszperger</i>	2/5/04
5. Stephen N. Hull	Shift Manager	<i>S Hull</i>	1/14/04	<i>S Hull</i>	2/5/04
6. Dan Brown	NCO	<i>D Brown</i>	1-14-04	<i>D Brown</i>	2/5/04
7. JAMES DINH	PPCS ENGINEER	<i>JM Dinh</i>	1-15-04	<i>JM Dinh</i>	2/17/04
8. THOMAS J. PAPLOCKI	PPCS ENGINEER	<i>Thomas Paplocki</i>	1-15-04	<i>Thomas Paplocki</i>	2/17/04
9. JIM LANCER	SHIFT MANAGER	<i>J Lancer</i>	1-16-04	<i>J Lancer</i>	2/13/04
10. Roger Schuid	IS/C Tech	<i>R Schuid</i>	1-30-04	<i>R Schuid</i>	2/20/04
11. Roy Sackachewsky	Operations Instructor	<i>Roy Sackachewsky</i>	2-2-04	<i>Roy Sackachewsky</i>	2/5/04
12. Robert D. De	OPERATIONS INSTRUCTOR	<i>Robert D. De</i>	2/2/04	<i>Robert D. De</i>	2/5/04
13. Ron Giuliani	OPS INST.	<i>R Giuliani</i>	2/2/04	<i>R Giuliani</i>	2-5-04
14. GREGORY VETH	OPS TENG CLAISSON	<i>G Veth</i>	2-2-04	<i>G Veth</i>	2-6-04
15. SM BURANOWSKI	OPS INSTRUCTOR	<i>SM Buranowski</i>	2-3-04	<i>SM Buranowski</i>	2/5/04

NOTES:

KEWAUNEE

ES-201

Examination Security Agreement

Form ES-201-3 (R8, S1)

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 2/2/04 as of the date of my signature. I agree that I will not knowingly divulge any information about these examinations to any persons who have not been authorized by the NRC chief examiner. I understand that I am not to instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants scheduled to be administered these licensing examinations from this date until completion of examination administration, except as specifically noted below and authorized by the NRC. Furthermore, I am aware of the physical security measures and requirements (as documented in the facility licensee's procedures) and understand that violation of the conditions of this agreement may result in cancellation of the examinations and/or an enforcement action against me or the facility licensee. I will immediately report to facility management or the NRC chief examiner any indications or suggestions that examination security may have been compromised.

2. Post-Examination

To the best of my knowledge, I did not divulge to any unauthorized persons any information concerning the NRC licensing examinations administered during the week(s) of 2/2/04. From the date that I entered into this security agreement until the completion of examination administration, I did not instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants who were administered these licensing examinations, except as specifically noted below and authorized by the NRC.

PRINTED NAME	JOB TITLE / RESPONSIBILITY DATE NOTE	SIGNATURE (1)	DATE	SIGNATURE (2)
1. <u>Bill Swanson</u>	<u>SHIFT MANAGER / EXAM REVIEW</u>	<u>Bill Swanson</u>	<u>1/21/04</u>	<u>2/27/04</u> <u>Bill Swanson</u>
2. <u>Bill Behrendt</u>	<u>Control Room Sup / EXAM REVIEW</u>	<u>William R Behrendt</u>	<u>1/21/04</u>	<u>William R Behrendt</u> <u>2-27-04</u>
3. <u>Kenneth Resler</u>	<u>RO / EXAM REVIEW</u>	<u>Kenneth Resler</u>	<u>1/21/04</u>	<u>Kenneth Resler</u> <u>2/17/04</u>
4. <u>MIKE SEVEY</u>	<u>RO / EXAM REVIEW</u>	<u>Mike Sevey</u>	<u>1/21/04</u>	<u>Mike Sevey</u> <u>2/16/04</u>
5. <u>Dave Fitzwater</u>	<u>TRAINING SUPERVISOR - LAB</u>	<u>Dave Fitzwater</u>	<u>2/5/04</u>	<u>Dave Fitzwater</u> <u>2/15/04</u>
6. <u>Dennis Borkenhagen</u>	<u>RO EXAM REVIEW</u>	<u>Dennis Borkenhagen</u>	<u>2/4/04</u>	<u>Dennis Borkenhagen</u> <u>2/15/04</u>
7. <u>Jon ROBB</u>	<u>STA/SRO / EXAM REVIEW</u>	<u>Jon Robb</u>	<u>2/4/04</u>	<u>Jon Robb</u> <u>2-13-04</u>
8. <u>John Owens</u>	<u>Supervisor</u>	<u>John Owens</u>	<u>2/4/04</u>	<u>John Owens</u> <u>2/15/04</u>
9. <u>MICHAEL AZURE</u>	<u>INSTRUCTOR</u>	<u>Michael Azure</u>	<u>2/5/04</u>	<u>Michael Azure</u> <u>2/5/04</u>
10. <u>BILL SWANSON</u>	<u>SHIFT MANAGER / EXAM REVIEW</u>	<u>Bill Swanson</u>	<u>2/19/04</u>	<u>Bill Swanson</u> <u>2/27/04</u>
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				

NOTES:

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 2/2/04 as of the date of my signature. I agree that I will not knowingly divulge any information about these examinations to any persons who have not been authorized by the NRC chief examiner. I understand that I am not to instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants scheduled to be administered these licensing examinations from this date until completion of examination administration, except as specifically noted below and authorized by the NRC. Furthermore, I am aware of the physical security measures and requirements (as documented in the facility licensee's procedures) and understand that violation of the conditions of this agreement may result in cancellation of the examinations and/or an enforcement action against me or the facility licensee. I will immediately report to facility management or the NRC chief examiner any indications or suggestions that examination security may have been compromised.

2. Post-Examination

To the best of my knowledge, I did not divulge to any unauthorized persons any information concerning the NRC licensing examinations administered during the week(s) of 2-2-04. From the date that I entered into this security agreement until the completion of examination administration, I did not instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants who were administered these licensing examinations, except as specifically noted below and authorized by the NRC.

PRINTED NAME	JOB TITLE / RESPONSIBILITY	SIGNATURE (1)	DATE	SIGNATURE (2)	DATENOTE
1. Stephen P. Johnson	Instructor / Exam Liaison	<i>Stephen P. Johnson</i>	5/6/03	<i>Stephen P. Johnson</i>	2/16/04
2. Kay Stangel	BPA	<i>Kay Stangel</i>	8/18/03	<i>Kay Stangel</i>	2/5/04
3. Scott Cieslewicz	SRO / Exam Reviewer	<i>Scott Cieslewicz</i>	12/15/03	<i>Scott Cieslewicz</i>	2/13/04
4. Larry Waterman	RO / Exam Reviewer	<i>Larry Waterman</i>	12/15/03	<i>Larry Waterman</i>	2/13/04
5. THOMAS HUOT	OPS TRG SUPV / EXAM REVIEWER	<i>Thomas Huot</i>	12/15/03	<i>Thomas Huot</i>	2/15/04
6. ROLAND RASMUSSEN	SIM HW/TNG	<i>R. Rasmussen</i>	1/9/04	<i>R. Rasmussen</i>	2-6-04
7. Jim Rozell	SIM TESTING	<i>Jim Rozell</i>	1/9/04	<i>Jim Rozell</i>	2-9-04
8. SCOTT ZEPPLIN	SIM SOFTWARE	<i>Scott Zepplin</i>	1/9/04	<i>Scott Zepplin</i>	2/9/04
9. Jesse Arcand	I+C Tech	<i>Jesse Arcand</i>	1/12/04	<i>Jesse Arcand</i>	2-20
10. Wyatt Godes	ops Trng Co-Sup/Instr	<i>Wyatt Godes</i>	1/12/04	<i>Wyatt Godes</i>	2/16/04
11. CHRISTOPHER STANKE	RO / JPM VALIDATION	<i>Christopher Stanke</i>	1-12-04	<i>Christopher Stanke</i>	2-14-04
12. Rick Smythe	RO / JPM VALIDATION	<i>Rick Smythe</i>	1-12-04	<i>Rick Smythe</i>	2-13-04
13. Gary Miller	Mech Maint. Planner	<i>Gary Miller</i>	1-12-04	<i>Gary Miller</i>	2-26
14. Greg McClair	Mech Maint. Mechanic	<i>Greg McClair</i>	1-12-04	<i>Greg McClair</i>	2-20
15. KENN KROPP	COPIER REPAIRMAN	<i>Kenneth Kropp</i>	1-12-04	<i>Kenneth Kropp</i>	2-18-04

NOTES:

Facility: Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant		Date of Examination: 02/02/04		Operating Test Number: 2004301	
1. GENERAL CRITERIA			Initials		
			a	b*	c#
a.	The operating test conforms with the previously approved outline; changes are consistent with sampling requirements (e.g., 10 CFR 55.45, operational importance, safety function distribution).	MES CDY	N/A		LF
b.	There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination.	MES CDY	N/A		LF
c.	The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s)(see Section D.1.a).	MES CDY	N/A		LF
d.	Overlap with the written examination and between operating test categories is within acceptable limits.	MES CDY	N/A		LF
e.	It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level.	MES CDY	N/A		LF
2. WALK-THROUGH (CATEGORY A & B) CRITERIA			--	--	--
a.	Each JPM includes the following, as applicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • initial conditions • initiating cues • references and tools, including associated procedures • reasonable and validated time limits (average time allowed for completion) and specific designation if deemed to be time critical by the facility licensee • specific performance criteria that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - detailed expected actions with exact criteria and nomenclature - system response and other examiner cues - statements describing important observations to be made by the applicant - criteria for successful completion of the task - identification of critical steps and their associated performance standards - restrictions on the sequence of steps, if applicable 	MES CDY	N/A		LF
b.	The prescribed questions in Category A are predominantly open reference and meet the criteria in Attachment 1 of ES-301.	MES CDY	N/A		LF
c.	Repetition from operating tests used during the previous licensing examination is within acceptable limits (30% for the walk-through) and do not compromise test integrity.	MES CDY	N/A		LF
d.	At least 20 percent of the JPMs on each test are new or significantly modified.	MES CDY	N/A		LF
3. SIMULATOR (CATEGORY C) CRITERIA			-	-	-
a.	The associated simulator operating tests (scenario sets) have been reviewed in accordance with Form ES-301-4 and a copy is attached.	MES CDY	N/A		LF
a. Author	Printed Name / Signature <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="text-align: left;"> <u>Charles D. Zoia (CER)</u> Charles D. Zoia (CER) </div> <div style="text-align: right;"> <u>Michael E. Bielby</u> Michael E. Bielby </div> </div>				Date 1/22/04
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	NOT APPLICABLE				N/A
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	Charles J. Phillips <u>Charles J. Phillips</u>				1/26/04
d. NRC Supervisor	Roger D. Lanksbury <u>R D Lanksbury</u>				1/30/04
NOTE: * The facility signature is not applicable for NRC-developed tests. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.					

Facility: Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant		Date of Examination: 02/02/04		Operating Test Number: 2004301		
QUALITATIVE ATTRIBUTES			Initials			
			a	b*	c#	
1.	The initial conditions are realistic, in that some equipment and/or instrumentation may be out of service, but it does not cue the operators into expected events.	MES COM	N/A	CF		
2.	The scenarios consist mostly of related events.	MES COM	N/A	CF		
3.	Each event description consists of • the point in the scenario when it is to be initiated • the malfunction(s) that are entered to initiate the event • the symptoms/cues that will be visible to the crew • the expected operator actions (by shift position) • the event termination point (if applicable)	MES COM	N/A	CF		
4.	No more than one non-mechanistic failure (e.g., pipe break) is incorporated into the scenario without a credible preceding incident such as a seismic event.	MES COM	N/A	CF		
5.	The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics.	MES COM	N/A	CF		
6.	Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives.	MES COM	N/A	CF		
7.	If time compression techniques are used, the scenario summary clearly so indicates. Operators have sufficient time to carry out expected activities without undue time constraints. Cues are given.	MES COM	N/A	CF		
8.	The simulator modeling is not altered.	MES COM	N/A	CF		
9.	The scenarios have been validated. Any open simulator performance deficiencies have been evaluated to ensure that functional fidelity is maintained while running the planned scenarios.	MES COM	N/A	CF		
10.	Every operator will be evaluated using at least one new or significantly modified scenario. All other scenarios have been altered in accordance with Section D.4 of ES-301.	MES COM	N/A	CF		
11.	All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios).	MES COM	N/A	CF		
12.	Each applicant will be significantly involved in the minimum number of transients and events specified on Form ES-301-5 (submit the form with the simulator scenarios).	MES COM	N/A	CF		
13.	The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position.	MES COM	N/A	CF		
TARGET QUANTITATIVE ATTRIBUTES (PER SCENARIO; SEE SECTION D.4.D)		Actual Attributes		--	--	--
1.	Total malfunctions (5-8)	6 / 6 / 7	MES COM	N/A	CF	
2.	Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2)	2 / 2 / 1	MES COM	N/A	CF	
3.	Abnormal events (2-4)	3 / 3 / 4	MES COM	N/A	CF	
4.	Major transients (1-2)	1 / 1 / 1	MES COM	N/A	CF	
5.	EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	1 / 1 / 2	MES COM	N/A	CF	
6.	EOP contingencies requiring substantive actions (0-2)	1 / 0 / 0	MES COM	N/A	CF	
7.	Critical tasks (2-3)	3 / 3 / 2	MES COM	N/A	CF	

MES
COM

OPERATING TEST NO. 2004301:

Applicant Type	Evolution Type	Minimum Number	Scenario Number			
			1	2	3	4
RO / BOP	Reactivity	1	1 / -		6 / -	
	Normal	1	- / 1		- / 1	
	Instrument / Component	4	3,6 / 2,4,7		2,4,5 / 3,4,5,8	
	Major	1	5 / 5		7 / 7	
As RO	Reactivity	1	-		-	
	Normal	0	-		-	
	Instrument / Component	2	-		-	
	Major	1	-		-	
SRO-I (N/A)						
As SRO	Reactivity	0	-		-	
	Normal	1	-		-	
	Instrument / Component	2	-		-	
	Major	1	-		-	
SRO-U	Reactivity	0	-		-	
	Normal	1	1		1	
	Instrument / Component	2	2, 3, 4, 6, 7		2, 3, 4, 5, 8	
	Major	1	5		7	

- Instructions:
- (1) Enter the operating test number and Form ES-D-1 event numbers for each evolution type.
 - (2) Reactivity manipulations may be conducted under normal or *controlled* abnormal conditions (refer to Section D.4.d) but must be significant per Section C.2.a of Appendix D.
 - (3) Whenever practical, both instrument and component malfunctions should be included; only those that require verifiable actions that provide insight to the applicant's competence count toward the minimum requirement.

Author:

Charles D. Zoia
 Charles D. Zoia (CERT) / M. Bielby

NRC Reviewer:

Michael E. Bielby *Charles Phillips* *Charles Phillips*

Competencies	Applicant #1 RO			Applicant #2 SRO-U			Applicant #3 SRO-I		
	SCENARIO			SCENARIO			SCENARIO		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Understand and Interpret Annunciators and Alarms	2,3,4 5,6,7		2,3,4 5	2,3,4, 5,6,7		2,3,4 5			
Diagnose Events and Conditions	2,3,4 5,6,7		2,3,4 5,6,7 8	2,3,4, 5,6,7		2,3,4 5,6,7,8			
Understand Plant and System Response	2,3,4 5,6,7		2,3,4 5,6,7 8	2,3,4, 5,6,7		2,3,4 5,6,7,8			
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	2,3,4 5,6,7		2,3,4 5,6,7 8	2,3,4, 5,6,7		2,3,4 5,6,7,8			
Operate Control Boards (2)	2,3,4 5,6,7		2,3,4 5,6,7 8						
Communicate and Interact With the Crew	2,3,4 5,6,7		2,3,4 5,6,7 8	2,3,4, 5,6,7		2,3,4 5,6,7,8			
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)				2,3,4, 5,6,7		2,3,4 5,6,7,8			
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)				2,3		4			

Notes:
 (1) Includes Technical Specification compliance for an RO.
 (2) Optional for an SRO-U.
 (3) Only applicable to SROs.

Instructions:

Circle the applicant's license type and enter one or more event numbers that will allow the examiners to evaluate every applicable competency for every applicant.

Author: Raymond Keith Walton / Charles D. Zoia
Raymond Keith Walton / Charles D. Zoia

NRC Reviewer: Charles Phillips / Claude J. Sullivan

Facility:		Date of Exam:			Exam Level: RO/SRO		
Item Description					Initial		
					a	b*	c#
1.	Questions and answers technically accurate and applicable to facility	any	RKW	MGB	CP		
2.	a. NRC K/As referenced for all questions b. Facility learning objectives referenced as available	any	RKW	MGB	CP		
3.	RO/SRO overlap is no more than 75 percent, and SRO questions are appropriate per Section D.2.d of ES-401	any	RKW	MGB	CP		
4.	Question selection and duplication from the last two NRC licensing exams appears consistent with a systematic sampling process						CP
5.	Question duplication from the license screening/audit exam was controlled as indicated below (check the item that applies) and appears appropriate: <input type="checkbox"/> the audit exam was systematically and randomly developed; or <input type="checkbox"/> the audit exam was completed before the license exam was started; or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the examinations were developed independently; or <input type="checkbox"/> the licensee certifies that there is no duplication; or <input type="checkbox"/> other (explain)	any	RKW	MGB	CP		
6.	Bank use meets limits (no more than 75 percent from the bank at least 10 percent new, and the rest modified); enter the actual question distribution at right	Bank	Modified	New	RWK any	MGB	CP
		21	5	74			
7.	Between 50 and 60 percent of the questions on the exam (including 10 new questions) are written at the comprehension/analysis level; enter the actual question distribution at right	Memory	C/A		RWK any	MGB	CP
		41	59				
8.	References/handouts provided do not give away answers	any	RKW	MGB	CP		
9.	Question content conforms with specific K/A statements in the previously approved examination outline and is appropriate for the Tier to which they are assigned; deviations are justified		RKW any	MGB	CP		
10.	Question psychometric quality and format meet ES, Appendix B, guidelines	any	RKW	MGB	CP		
11.	The exam contains 100, one-point, multiple choice items; the total is correct and agrees with value on cover sheet	any	RKW	MGB	CP		
a.	Author Under Instruction	Charles 2019 Raymond Keith Walton / Raymond Keith Walton				Date 1/20/2004	
b.	Author of Record (*)	Michael E. Bielby / Michael E. Bielby Sr				1/21/04	
c.	NRC Chief Examiner (#)	Charles Phillips / Charles Phillips				1/21/04	
d.	NRC Regional Supervisor	R. Lankburg / R. Lankburg				1/20/04	
Note: • The facility reviewer's initials/signature are not applicable for NRC-developed examinations. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.							

Facility:		Date of Exam:			Exam Level: <u>RO/SRO</u>			
Item Description					Initial			
					a	b*	c#	
1.	Questions and answers technically accurate and applicable to facility	any	RKW	MSB	CP			
2.	a. NRC K/As referenced for all questions b. Facility learning objectives referenced as available	any	RKW	MSB	CP			
3.	RO/SRO overlap is no more than 75 percent, and SRO questions are appropriate per Section D.2.d of ES-401	any	RKW	MSB	CP			
4.	Question selection and duplication from the last two NRC licensing exams appears consistent with a systematic sampling process						CP	
5.	Question duplication from the license screening/audit exam was controlled as indicated below (check the item that applies) and appears appropriate: <input type="checkbox"/> the audit exam was systematically and randomly developed; or <input type="checkbox"/> the audit exam was completed before the license exam was started; or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the examinations were developed independently; or <input type="checkbox"/> the licensee certifies that there is no duplication; or <input type="checkbox"/> other (explain)	any	RKW	MSB	CP			
6.	Bank use meets limits (no more than 75 percent from the bank at least 10 percent new, and the rest modified); enter the actual question distribution at right	Bank	Modified	New	any	RKW	MSB	CP
		30	9	61				
7.	Between 50 and 60 percent of the questions on the exam (including 10 new questions) are written at the comprehension/analysis level; enter the actual question distribution at right	Memory	C/A		any	RKW	MSB	CP
		45	55					
8.	References/handouts provided do not give away answers	any			MSB		CP	
9.	Question content conforms with specific K/A statements in the previously approved examination outline and is appropriate for the Tier to which they are assigned; deviations are justified	any	RKW		MSB		CP	
10.	Question psychometric quality and format meet ES, Appendix B, guidelines	any	RKW		MSB		CP	
11.	The exam contains 100, one-point, multiple choice items; the total is correct and agrees with value on cover sheet		RKW		MSB		CP	
a.	Author Under Instruction	Charles Zoia Printed Name / Signature <i>Charles Zoia</i>					Date	
b.	Author of Record (*)	Raymond Keith Walton / <i>Raymond Keith Walton</i>					1/20/04	
c.	NRC Chief Examiner (#)	Michael E. Bielby / <i>Michael E. Bielby</i>					1/21/04	
d.	NRC Regional Supervisor	Charles Phillips / <i>Charles Phillips</i>					1/27/04	
		RO Lunsbury / <i>RO Lunsbury</i>					1/30/04	
Note: * The facility reviewer's initials/signature are not applicable for NRC-developed examinations. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c"; chief examiner concurrence required.								

Facility: <u>Kewanee</u>		Date of Exam: <u>2/5/04</u>		Exam Level: RO <u>(SRO)</u>	
Item Description	Initials				
	a	b	c		
1. Clean answer sheets copied before grading	MES CMY	NA	CF		
2. Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented	MES CMY	NA	CF		
3. Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations)	MES CMY	NA	CF		
4. Grading for all borderline cases (80% +/- 2%) reviewed in detail	MES CMY	NA	CF		
5. All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified	MES CMY	NA	CF		
6. Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants	MES CMY	NA	CF		
a. Grader		Printed Name / Signature <u>Michael F. Bielby</u> <u>Charles D. Ziegler</u>		Date <u>2/18/04</u>	
b. Facility Reviewer(*)		<u>N/A</u>			
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)		<u>Charles Phillip</u> <u>Charles Phillip</u>		<u>2/17/04</u>	
d. NRC Supervisor (*)		<u>RD Lanksbury</u> <u>RD Lanksbury</u>		<u>2/4/04</u>	
(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.					

Facility: <u>Kewanee</u>		Date of Exam: <u>2/5/04</u>		Exam Level: <u>RO/SRO</u>	
Item Description	Initials				
	a	b	c		
1. Clean answer sheets copied before grading	^{MES} CMJ	NA	CP		
2. Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented	^{MES} CMJ	N/A	CP		
3. Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations)	^{MES} CMJ	N/A	CP		
4. Grading for all borderline cases (80% +/- 2%) reviewed in detail	^{MES} CMJ	N/A	CP		
5. All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified	^{MES} CMJ	N/A	CP		
6. Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants	^{MES} CMJ	N/A	CP		
a. Grader	Printed Name / Signature <u>Michael E. Bieltz Sr / Michael E. Bieltz</u> <u>Charles D. Zog / Charles D. Zog</u>		Date <u>2/18/04</u>		
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>N/A</u>				
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)	<u>Charles Phillips / Charles Phillips</u>		<u>2/17/04</u>		
d. NRC Supervisor (*)	<u>RD Brinksbury / RD Brinksbury</u>		<u>3/4/04</u>		
(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.					