

Examination Panel Report for Under Manager – November 2011

APPLICATIONS

Number applied: 32	Number approved: 32
Overall comments:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was good attendance at the briefing session where candidates appeared to gain some benefit by the demonstration oral exam. • Oral candidates generally performed well on exam day. 	

WRITTEN EXAMINATION

Dates:	6 September 2011
Number of candidates:	29
Passed:	19 (= 65% success rate)
Total marks:	400
Highest mark:	309
Average mark:	244
Examination Papers - Part B -	
- Mining Legislation (UB1), Mine Ventilation (UB2) and Coal Mining Practice (UB3)	
Overall comments:	
<p>UB 1 Mining Legislation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Mining Legislation paper UB1 included scenario-based questions that required responses in accordance with the legislation. This was designed in order that candidates could demonstrate practical application of the legislation in the role of undermanager. This and the traditional type of questions may be used in the future. • For the Coal Mining Practice UB3 exam, poor marks were generally as a result of inadequate knowledge of subject matter, poor risk management (hence, application of the statutory framework), poor organisation and not enough consideration of whole of mine issues when focusing on the problem presented. Candidates must identify hazards and management controls for the situations presented. The use of tables assisted in better demonstrating an organised approach to risk management by some candidates. <p>Mine Ventilation UB2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The format of the Ventilation paper was changed for the September 	

Undermanager's exam seeking candidates to provide an explanation of their understanding of ventilation principles in relation to the details provided in the exam.

- The expectation is that the changed format provides an opportunity for a candidate's knowledge to be demonstrated whilst reducing the influence of merely good exam technique and standardised base assumptions.
- For those candidates with a good understanding of ventilating principles, the change in format resulted in answers being provided which highlighted the strengths of their knowledge base; a pleasing number of candidates demonstrated a very good knowledge base. These candidates scored well in the exam.
- A number of candidates struggled to demonstrate a good understanding of ventilation understanding under the changed format.
- In general the ratio of candidates who did well in this exam to the number who didn't do as well has remained similar to past exams.
- A number of candidates scored very well with Question 1 of the paper where they were asked to "Identify and list all relevant issues and critical factors that you believe must be incorporated in, or be addressed by, the ventilation management system" and how aspects were to be managed. However, 10 of the 28 candidates who sat the Ventilation paper achieved a mark of less than 60% for this question.
- It was disappointing that many candidates did not recognise the potential for gas from adjacent seams to contribute to the gas produced in the mine operation, a number of those candidates who did recognise the potential in question 1 failed to address the additional gas make when describing the management of the ventilation system.
- Fifteen of the 28 candidates who sat the ventilation paper demonstrated an appropriate understanding of calculating the potential gas make in this exam.

UB 3 Coal Mining Practice

- Poor marks were generally as a result of inadequate knowledge of subject matter, poor risk management (hence, application of the statutory framework), poor organisation and not enough consideration of whole of mine issues when focusing on the problem presented. Questions asked are scenarios that are applicable to underground coal mining. These scenarios should be used as case studies for detailed analysis as exam preparation.

ORAL EXAMINATION

Dates:	19, 20 October 2011
Number of candidates:	25
Passed:	20 (= 80% success rate)
Overall comments:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Candidates generally performed well and were organised in their approach to questions.• Adequate benchmarking was generally demonstrated. Candidates must be able to recall and discuss benchmarking visits and risk management associated with it.• A whole of mine approach is required	
Topics Examined	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Brattice ventilation use in clearing gas from a panel.• Whole of mine approach• Statutory framework• Benchmarking• Emergency preparedness and systems• Roof falls• Planned and unplanned practical events and approach to managing them	