

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, in accordance with ES-401.	AS	ML	✓
	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.	AS	ML	✓
	c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics.	AS	ML	✓
	d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate.	AS	ML	✓
2. S I M U L A T O R	a. Using Form ES-301-5, verify that the proposed scenario sets cover the required number of normal evolutions, instrument and component failures, technical specifications, and major transients.	AS	ML	✓
	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, and ensure that 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 that scenarios will not be repeated on subsequent days.	AS	ML	✓
	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.	AS	ML	✓
3. W / T	a. Verify that the systems walk-through outline meets the criteria specified on Form ES-301-2: (1) the outline(s) contain(s) the required number of control room and in-plant tasks distributed among the safety functions as specified on the form (2) task repetition from the last two NRC examinations is within the limits specified on the form (3) no tasks are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s) (4) the number of new or modified tasks meets or exceeds the minimums specified on the form (5) the number of alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA tasks meet the criteria on the form.	AS	ML	✓
	b. Verify that the administrative outline meets the criteria specified on Form ES-301-1: (1) the tasks are distributed among the topics as specified on the form (2) at least one task is new or significantly modified (3) no more than one task is repeated from the last two NRC licensing examinations	AS	ML	✓
	c. Determine if there are enough different outlines to test the projected number and mix of applicants and ensure that no items are duplicated on subsequent days.	AS	ML	✓
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 sections.	AS	ML	✓
	b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate.	AS	ML	✓
	c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5.	AS	ML	✓
	d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections.	AS	ML	✓
	e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage.	AS	ML	✓
	f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO).	AS	ML	✓
a. Author	Gerald Gaudin / Gerald Gaudin		Printed Name/Signature	Date
b. Facility Reviewer (*)	Marios K. Katsaris / Marios K. Katsaris			9/27/06
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	M36 / J. V. Kish			11/14/06
d. NRC Supervisor	MARVIN SYKES / Marvin D.			11/16/06
Note: # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c"; chief examiner concurrence required.				

NC.TQ-WB.ZZ-0027(Z)

ATTACHMENT 6 NRC EXAMINATION SECURITY AGREEMENT

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 12/11/06 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 12/11/06. 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)	DATE	NOTE
NHAN V NGUYEN	SIM SUPPORT	<i>[Signature]</i>	10/26/06	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/19/06	
WAYNE MIRAN	SIM SUPPORT	<i>[Signature]</i>	10/26/06	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/19/06	
JEFF MILLER	SIM INSTRUCTOR	<i>[Signature]</i>	10/26/06	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/19/06	
SCOTT ZANE	NCO	<i>[Signature]</i>	10/27/06	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/19/06	for Zane per telecon
SCOTT BICKHART	NCO	<i>[Signature]</i>	10/27/06	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/19/06	for Scott Bickhart per telecon
THOMAS CASTALDO	HARDWARE SPEC	<i>[Signature]</i>	11/13/06	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/19/06	
PETER HARSH	Instructor	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/11/06	<i>[Signature]</i>	12-19-06	
GLENN MARSHALL	Instructor	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/11/06	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/19/06	
JOHN OLIVER	Instructor	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/11/06	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/19/06	
WAYNE						

[Signature]
12/11/06
Submit this completed attachment with examination records

INDIA ILT

NC.TQ-WB.ZZ-0027(Z)

ATTACHMENT 6 NRC EXAMINATION SECURITY AGREEMENT

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 12/11/06 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 12/11/06. 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)	DATE	NOTE
<u>GERALD GAUDING</u>	<u>EXAM DEVELOPER</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>7/17/06</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>12/19/06</u>	
<u>JAMES BURLING</u>	<u>EXAM DEVELOPER</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>7/17/06</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>12/19/06</u>	
<u>Ed Gallagher</u>	<u>Exam Review</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>7-18-06</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>12/19/06</u>	
<u>Arlene E. Pank</u>	<u>Exam Developer</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>8-22-06</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>12/19/06</u>	
<u>Marion Kofantais</u>	<u>OTM</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>9/1/06</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>12/19/06</u>	
<u>Michael Buckner</u>	<u>OTPS Reviewer</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>9/28/06</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>12/19/06</u>	
<u>John Garecht</u>	<u>SOS/Exam review</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>10/3/06</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>12/19/06</u>	
<u>PAUL WILLIAMS</u>	<u>Simulator</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>10/3/06</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>12/19/06</u>	
<u>Tom Headman</u>	<u>Sim Coordinator</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>10/19/06</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>12/19/06</u>	
<u>SCOTT HESS</u>	<u>EXAM VALIDATION</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>10-24-06</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>12/19/06</u>	
<u>PAUL MARTIN</u>	<u>EXAM VALIDATION</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>10-24-06</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>12/19/06</u>	

Submit this completed attachment with examination records

Page 1 of 2

Facility:	Date of Examination:	Operating Test Number:
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).	J MK r
b.	There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination.	J MK r
c.	The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s). (see Section D.1.a.)	J MK r
d.	Overlap with the written examination and between different parts of the operating test is within acceptable limits.	J MK r
e.	It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level.	J MK r
2. Walk-Through 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 • operationally important 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 	J MK r
b.	Ensure that any changes from the previously approved systems and administrative walk-through outlines (Forms ES-301-1 and 2) have not caused the test to deviate from any of the acceptance criteria (e.g., item distribution, bank use, repetition from the last 2 NRC examinations) specified on those forms and Form ES-201-2.	J MK r
3. Simulator Criteria		-- -- --
The associated simulator operating tests (scenario sets) have been reviewed in accordance with Form ES-301-4 and a copy is attached.		J MK r
	Printed Name / Signature	Date
a.	Author <u>Baudin Gerald Gauding / G. Haller</u>	<u>10/30/06</u>
b.	Facility Reviewer(*) <u>[Signature]</u>	<u>10/30/06</u>
c.	NRC Chief Examiner (#) <u>[Signature] / J. DANJON</u>	<u>11/14/06</u>
d.	NRC Supervisor <u>MARVIN SYKES / Marvin S.</u>	<u>11/16/06</u>
NOTE: * The facility signature is not applicable for NRC-developed tests. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c"; chief examiner concurrence required.		

Facility: <u>Salem</u>		Date of Exam: <u>11/10</u>		Scenario Numbers: / /		Operating Test No.:	
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.	QA	ML	✓			
2.	The scenarios consist mostly of related events.	QA	ML	✓			
3.	Each event description consists of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) 	QA	ML	✓			
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.	QA	ML	✓			
5.	The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics.	QA	ML	✓			
6.	Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives.	QA	ML	✓			
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.	QA	ML	✓			
8.	The simulator modeling is not altered.	QA	ML	✓			
9.	The scenarios have been validated. Pursuant to 10 CFR 55.46(d), any open simulator performance deficiencies or deviations from the referenced plant have been evaluated to ensure that functional fidelity is maintained while running the planned scenarios.	QA	ML	✓			
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.5 of ES-301.	QA	ML	✓			
11.	All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios).	QA	ML	✓			
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).	QA	ML	✓			
13.	The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position.	QA	ML	✓			
Target Quantitative Attributes (Per Scenario; See Section D.5.d)		Actual Attributes		-	-	-	
1.	Total malfunctions (5-8)	7	7	6	QA	ML	✓
2.	Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2)	3	3	2	QA	ML	✓
3.	Abnormal events (2-4)	3	3	2	QA	ML	✓
4.	Major transients (1-2)	1	1	2	QA	ML	✓
5.	EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	2	2	2	QA	ML	✓
6.	EOP contingencies requiring substantive actions (0-2)	0	0	1	QA	ML	✓
7.	Critical tasks (2-3)	4	4	3	QA	ML	✓

Facility: Salem Generating Station Date of Exam: 12/11/2006 Operating Test No.: India

A P P L I C A N T	E V E N T T Y P E	Scenarios													T O T A L	M I N I M U M (*)		
		1			2			3			4							
		C R E W P O S I T I O N			C R E W P O S I T I O N			C R E W P O S I T I O N			C R E W P O S I T I O N							
		S R O	A T C	B O P														
												R	I	U				
SRO-I	RX	1				1								2	1	1	0	
	NOR	1				1								2	1	1	1	
	I/C	5				5								10	4	4	2	
	MAJ	1				1								2	2	2	1	
	TS	3												3	0	2	2	
SRO-I	RX		1		1									2	1	1	0	
	NOR		1		1									2	1	1	1	
	I/C		4		6									10	4	4	2	
	MAJ		1		1									2	2	2	1	
	TS				3									3	0	2	2	
	RX														1	1	0	
	NOR														1	1	1	
	I/C														4	4	2	
	MAJ														2	2	1	
	TS														0	2	2	
	RX														1	1	0	
	NOR														1	1	1	
	I/C														4	4	2	
	MAJ														2	2	1	
	TS														0	2	2	

Instructions:

1. Check the applicant level and enter the operating test number and Form ES-D-1 event numbers for each event type; TS are not applicable for RO applicants. ROs must serve in both the "at-the-controls (ATC)" and "balance-of-plant (BOP)" positions; Instant SROs must do one scenario, including at least two instrument or component (I/C) malfunctions and one major transient, in the ATC position.
2. Reactivity manipulations may be conducted under normal or controlled abnormal conditions (refer to Section D.5.d) but must be significant per Section C.2.a of Appendix D. (*) Reactivity and normal evolutions may be replaced with additional instrument or component malfunctions on a 1-for-1 basis.
1. 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 requirements specified for the applicant's license level in the right-hand columns.

Facility: Salem Generating Station		Date of Exam: 12/11/2006											Operating Test No.: India				
A P P L I C A N T	E V E N T T Y P E	Scenarios												T O T A L	M I N I M U M (*)		
		1			2			3			4						
		CREW POSITION			CREW POSITION			CREW POSITION			CREW POSITION						
		S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P				
												R	I	U			
SRO-I	RX	1			1				1							3	1
	NOR	1			1				1				3	1	1	1	
	I/C	5			4				3				12	4	4	2	
	MAJ	1			1				1				3	2	2	1	
	TS	3											3	0	2	2	
SRO-I	RX		1			1	1						3	1	1	0	
	NOR		1			1	1						3	1	1	1	
	I/C		4			3	5						12	4	4	2	
	MAJ		1			1	1						3	2	2	1	
	TS						2						2	0	2	2	
SRO-I	RX			1	1			2					4	1	1	0	
	NOR			1	1			1					3	1	1	1	
	I/C			1	5			3					9	4	4	2	
	MAJ			1	1			1					3	2	2	1	
	TS				3								3	0	2	2	
	RX													1	1	0	
	NOR													1	1	1	
	I/C													4	4	2	
	MAJ													2	2	1	
	TS													0	2	2	

Instructions:

- Check the applicant level and enter the operating test number and Form ES-D-1 event numbers for each event type; TS are not applicable for RO applicants. ROs must serve in both the "at-the-controls (ATC)" and "balance-of-plant (BOP)" positions; Instant SROs must do one scenario, including at least two instrument or component (I/C) malfunctions and one major transient, in the ATC position.
- Reactivity manipulations may be conducted under normal or *controlled* abnormal conditions (refer to Section D.5.d) but must be significant per Section C.2.a of Appendix D. (*) Reactivity and normal evolutions may be replaced with additional instrument or component malfunctions on a 1-for-1 basis.

- 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 requirements specified for the applicant's license level in the right-hand columns.

Facility: <u>S. Alam</u>		Date of Examination: <u>12-11-06</u>				Operating Test No.:										
Competencies	APPLICANTS															
	RO <input type="checkbox"/> SRO-I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SRO-U <input type="checkbox"/>				RO <input type="checkbox"/> SRO-I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SRO-U <input type="checkbox"/>				RO <input type="checkbox"/> SRO-I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SRO-U <input type="checkbox"/>				RO <input type="checkbox"/> SRO-I <input type="checkbox"/> SRO-U <input type="checkbox"/>			
	SCENARIO				SCENARIO				SCENARIO				SCENARIO			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Interpret/Diagnose Events and Conditions	2,3 4,5	2,3 4 5,6	1,2 3,5		2,3 4,5	2,3 4 5,6	1,2 3,5		2,3 4,5	2,3 4 5,6	1,2 3,5					
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	1,2 3,4,5	1,3 5,6	1,2 3,5		1,2 3,4,5	1,3 5,6	1,2 3,5		1,2 3,4,5	1,3 5,6	1,2 3,5					
Operate Control Boards (2)		1,2 3,4,5,6	1,2 4,5		1,2 4,5		1 3,5		1,3 5	1,3 4 5,6						
Communicate and Interact	1,2 3 4,5	1 Then 6	1,2 3 4,5		1,2 3 4,5	1 Then 6	1,2 3 4,5		1,2 3 4,5	1 Then 6	1,2 3 4,5					
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)	1,2 3 4,5					1,3 4 5,6					1,2 3 4,5					
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)	1,2					2,3 4					2,3					
Notes:		CRS PO RO				RO CRS PO				PO RO CRS						
(1) Includes Technical Specification compliance for an RO.																
(2) Optional for an SRO-U.																
(3) Only applicable to SROs.																

Instructions:

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

Facility: <u>Salem</u>		Date of Examination: <u>12-11-06</u>				Operating Test No.:										
Competencies	APPLICANTS															
	RO <input type="checkbox"/>				RO <input type="checkbox"/>				RO <input type="checkbox"/>				RO <input type="checkbox"/>			
	SRO-I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				SRO-I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				SRO-I <input type="checkbox"/>				SRO-I <input type="checkbox"/>			
	SRO-U <input type="checkbox"/>				SRO-U <input type="checkbox"/>				SRO-U <input type="checkbox"/>				SRO-U <input type="checkbox"/>			
	SCENARIO				SCENARIO				SCENARIO				SCENARIO			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Interpret/Diagnose Events and Conditions	2,3		1,2		2,3		1,2									
	4,5		3		4,5		3									
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	1,2		1,2		1,2		1,2									
	3		3		3		3									
	4,5		3,5		4,5		3,5									
Operate Control Boards (2)			1,2		1,2											
			4,5		4,5											
Communicate and Interact	1,2		1,2		1,2		1,2									
	3		3		3		3									
	4,5		4,5		4,5		4,5									
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)	1,2						1,2									
	3						3									
	4,5						4,5									
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)	1,2						2,3									
Notes:																
(1) Includes Technical Specification compliance for an RO.																
(2) Optional for an SRO-U.																
(3) Only applicable to SROs.																

Instructions:

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

Facility: Salem		Date of Exam: 12-11-06		Exam Level: RO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SRO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Item Description	Initial					
	a	b*	c#			
1. Questions and answers are technically accurate and applicable to the facility.	AS	ML	R			
2. a. NRC K/As are referenced for all questions. b. Facility learning objectives are referenced as available.	AS	ML	R			
3. SRO questions are appropriate in accordance with Section D.2.d of ES-401	AS	ML	R			
4. The sampling process was random and systematic (If more than 4 RO or 2 SRO questions were repeated from the last 2 NRC licensing exams, consult the NRR OL program office).			R			
5. Question duplication from the license screening/audit exam was controlled as indicated below (check the item that applies) and appears appropriate: <input checked="" 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 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)	AS	ML	R			
6. Bank use meets limits (no more than 75 percent from the bank, at least 10 percent new, and the rest new or modified); enter the actual RO / SRO-only question distribution(s) at right.	Bank	Modified	New	AS	ML	R
	22/12	6/1	47/12			
7. Between 50 and 60 percent of the questions on the RO exam are written at the comprehension/ analysis level; the SRO exam may exceed 60 percent if the randomly selected K/As support the higher cognitive levels; enter the actual RO / SRO question distribution(s) at right.	Memory	C/A		AS	ML	R
	33/11	42/14				
8. References/handouts provided do not give away answers or aid in the elimination of distractors.	AS	ML	R			
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.	AS	ML	R			
10. Question psychometric quality and format meet the guidelines in ES Appendix B.	AS	ML	R			
11. The exam contains the required number of one-point, multiple choice items; the total is correct and agrees with the value on the cover sheet.	AS	ML	R			
a. Author		Printed Name /Signature		Date		
b. Facility Reviewer (*)		Gerald Gaudin / Gerald Gaudin		10/26/06		
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)		Mario K. Santos / Mario K. Santos		10/26/06		
d. NRC Regional Supervisor		MARVIN SYKES / Marvin D. Sykes		11/15/06		
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: RO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SRO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Item Description	Initials					
	a	b	c			
1. Clean answer sheets copied before grading	JS	ML	✓			
2. Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented	JS	ML	✓			
3. Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations)	JS	ML	✓			
4. Grading for all borderline cases (80 ±2% overall and 70 or 80, as applicable, ±4% on the SRO-only) reviewed in detail	JS	ML	✓			
5. All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified	JS	ML	✓			
6. Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants	JS	ML	✓			
Printed Name/Signature		Date				
a. Grader	Gerald Gauding / Gerald Gauding		12/18/06			
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	Marios Kafantaris / Marios Kafantaris		12/17/06			
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)	J. DANONHO / J. Danonho		1/10/07			
d. NRC Supervisor (*)	MARVIN SYKES / Marvin Sykes		1/11/07			
(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.						