

## APPENDIX E - REGION IV OPERATING TEST JOB PERFORMANCE MEASURE QUALITY REVIEW MATRIX

JPM#	1. Dyn (D/S)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Attributes					4. Job Content Errors		5. U/E/S	6. Explanation (See below for instructions)
			IC Focus	Cues	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over- lap	Job- Link	Minutia		
S1	D	3								S	
S2	S	3								S	
S3	S	3								S	
S4	D	3								S	
S5	S	3								S	
S6	S	3								S	
C1	S	3								S	
P1	S	3								S	
P2	S	3								S	
P3	S	3								S	
B/U	S	2								S	
A1(B)	S	3								S	
A2(B)	S	3								S	
A3(RO)	S	3								S	
A3(SO)	S	2								S	
A4(RO)	S	3								S	
A4(SO)	S	3		✓						E	Use the word "dose" vice "overexposure" everywhere it appears to make this task more challenging. The applicant should be able to determine that it is an overexposure and take appropriate actions.
A5(SO)	S	3								S	

## CALLAWAY 7/02

### Instructions for Completing Matrix

This form is not contained in or required by NUREG-1021. Utilities are not required or encouraged to use it. The purpose of this form is to enhance regional consistency in reviewing operating tests. Additional information on these areas may be found in Examination Good Practices Appendix D. Check or mark any item(s) requiring comment and explain the issue in the space provided.

1. Determine whether the task is dynamic (D) or static (S). A dynamic task is one that involves continuous monitoring and response to varying parameters. A static task is basically an system reconfiguration or realignment.
2. Determine level of difficulty (LOD) using established 1-5 rating scale. Levels 1 and 5 represent inappropriate (low or high) discriminatory level for the license being tested.
3. Check the appropriate box when an attribute weakness is identified:
  - The initiating cue is not sufficiently clear to ensure the operator understands the task and how to begin.
  - The JPM does not contain sufficient cues that are objective (not leading).
  - All critical steps (elements) have not been properly identified.
  - Scope of the task is either too narrow (N) or too broad (B).
  - Excessive overlap with other part of operating test or written examination.
4. Check the appropriate box when a job content error is identified:
  - Topics not linked to job content (e.g., disguised task, not required in real job).
  - Task is trivial and without safety significance.
5. Based on the reviewer's judgment, is the JPM as written (U)nacceptable (requiring repair or replacement), in need of (E)ditorial enhancement, or (S)atisfactory?
6. Provide a brief description of problem in the explanation column. Provide conclusion on whether JPM SET criteria satisfied (i.e., number/distribution of safety functions, A.3 and A.4 integrated with parts B/C, Admin topics per section meet ES).

[illegible]

# CALLAWAY 7/02

## APPENDIX F - REGION IV OPERATING TEST QUESTION QUALITY REVIEW MATRIX

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Errors					4. Job Content Errors				5. U/E/S	6. Explanation (See below for instructions)	
			Stem Focus	Direct L/U	One Ans	Min Resp	Scope (TS?)	Job- Link	Minu- tia	SRO Only	Back- wards			
<p><b>Instructions for Completing Matrix</b></p> <p>This form is not contained in or required by NUREG-1021. Utilities are not required or encouraged to use it. The purpose of this form is to enhance regional consistency in reviewing operating tests. Additional information on these areas may be found in Examination Good Practices Appendix D. Check or mark any item(s) requiring comment and explain the issue in the space provided.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Classify level of knowledge (LOK) as either (F)undamental or (H)igher cognitive level.</li> <li>Determine level of difficulty (LOD) using established 1-5 rating scale. Levels 1 and 5 represent inappropriate (low or high) discriminatory level for the license being tested.</li> <li>Check the appropriate box when a psychometric error is identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stem lacks sufficient focus to solicit only the answers listed (e.g., unclear on intent, answer needed, or unnecessarily negatively phrased)</li> <li>Direct lookup (e.g., desired answer contained in obvious reference),</li> <li>Question does NOT solicit single demonstrably correct answer,</li> <li>Minimum response for passing credit NOT described in key,</li> <li>Scope of question outside guidance of NUREG (e.g., why not how, TS bases not system, emergency not emergency plan),</li> </ul> </li> <li>Check the appropriate box when a job content error is identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Topics not linked to job content (e.g., disguised task, not required in real job, invalid K/A).</li> <li>Recall of too specific knowledge,</li> <li>RO test items test at the SRO job level or vice versa,</li> <li>Reverse logic or application compared to job.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Based on the reviewer's judgment, is the question as written (U)nacceptable (requiring repair or replacement), in need of (E)ditorial enhancement, or (S)atisfactory?</li> <li>Provide a brief description of problem in the explanation column.</li> </ol>														

**APPENDIX N - REGION IV OPERATING TEST SCENARIO REVIEW MATRIX**

Scen Set	1 ES	2 TS	3 Crit	4 IC	5 Pred	6 TL	7 L/C	8 Eff	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation (See below for instructions)
1										The two scenarios (DS1 and DS2) in Set 1 as well as the backup scenario (DSB/U) satisfy requirements.

**Instructions for Completing Matrix**

This form is not contained in or required by NUREG-1021. Utilities are not required or encouraged to use it. The purpose of this form is to enhance regional consistency in reviewing operating test scenario sets. Additional information on these areas may be found in Examination Good Practices Appendix D. Check or mark any item(s) requiring comment and explain the issue in the space provided.

1. ES: ES-301 checklists 4, 5, & 6 satisfied.
2. TS: Set includes SRO TS actions for each SRO, with required actions explicitly detailed.
3. Crit: Each manipulation or evolution has explicit success criteria documented in Form ES-D-2.
4. IC: Out of service equipment and other initial conditions reasonably consistent between scenarios and not predictive of scenario events and actions.
5. Pred: Scenario sequence and other factors avoid predictability issues.
6. TL: Time line constructed, including event and process triggered conditions, such that scenario can run without routine examiner cuing.
7. L/C: Length and complexity for each scenario in the set is reasonable for the crew mix being examined, such that all applicants have reasonably similar exposure and events are needed for evaluation purposes.
8. Eff: Sequence of events is reasonably efficient for examination purposes, especially with respect to long delays or interactions.
9. Based on the reviewer's judgment, is the scenario set as written (U)nacceptable (requiring repair or replacement), in need of (E)ditorial enhancement, or (S)atisfactory?
10. Provide a brief description of problem in the explanation column