

SAIOH PCC OCCUPATIONAL HYGIENIST WRITTEN ASSESSMENT – OCTOBER 2016

REFERENCE: PCC AP03 OCT. 2016 (OH)

REPORT FROM THE EXAMINER

Twelve (12) candidates attempted this written assessment. Three (3) candidates passed, one (1) candidate qualifies for a full remark (which he/she still failed) and eight (8) failed (now 9).

SECTION 1: Potential marks 20. 12 Candidates – none passed. (Highest mark was 13 out of 20).

- 1.1 Leak Test: only 5 candidates (out of 12) know what a leak test on an active HCS procedure meant.
- 1.2 Vibration and especially how to do it, do not feature high on most potential Occ. Hygienists competency scale. Only 2 of the 12 candidates know the answer(s). Also, candidates do not answer the questions asked, they just write down a lot of possible information (shotgun approach).
- 1.3 NOAEL, even though used a second time this year in a written assessment paper, only 5 of the 12 candidates know what is referred to and how it is derived.
- 1.4 To determine SEG's seems to be more difficult than it has to be. Usually one SEG per shift per / for each workplace. Only 4 out of 8 got this answers correct.
- 1.5 Classification and examples of Nano-particles still new to most OH's. Only 3 out of 12 had the correct answer.
- 1.6 Candidates do not understand the term "dose". Only 4 candidates out of 12 got this correct.
- 1.7 Candidates do not understand the principles of dilution ventilation. Only 3 out of 12 passed.
- 1.8 Only 3 candidates could correctly answer the question regarding an unknown HCS and what OEL(s) to use.
- 1.9 Effective use of BEI's to determine adequate control was not understood. Only 2 of the 12 candidates got this question correct.

SECTION 2: Potential marks 25. Only three of the candidates (out of 12) passed this section.

- 2.1 It seems strange to say, but most potential OH's cannot calculate the usual dust concentrations, TWA's and/or do the necessary evaluations. Only 4 of the 12 candidates passed.
- 2.2 Most of the candidates could not describe the proper Asbestos removal process, e.g. removing the friable asbestos while the production process is ongoing. Only 7 of the 12 candidates passed this question.

SECTION 3: Potential marks 15. Only 4 candidates (out of 12) passed this section.

- 3.1 The calculation of volume flow rate in a duct / pipe is relatively simple, however only 7 of the 12 candidates got it right.
- 3.2 Calculation and evaluation of noise levels against the NRR rating of HPD's are very common however, only 4 out of 12 were successful in answering this question.

SECTION 4: Potential marks 60. Of the 12 candidates, 6 passed this section.

- 4.1 Unfortunately, the candidates' ability to do Risk Assessments and to put the info/observations into report formats is poor. Possible a feature of the general use of "master" templates. Calculations of any sampling, again poor, leading to incorrect evaluations. Candidates do not

do the calculation adaption for oxides from the pure form. Only 4 out of 12 candidates obtained a pass-rate for this question.

- 4.2 Candidates in general, only have a superficial knowledge of the health effects associated with exposure to isocyanates. Appropriate and effective exposure controls are also not good. Only 4 out of the 7 candidates who attempted this question, passed.
- 4.3 Only 7 of the 12 candidates attempted the question on Legionella and only 5 were successful. Candidates did not understand the causing factors of Legionella and especially how to use this to control it in the short and long term. Quite a few also do not know the health effects caused by Legionella bacteria.
- 4.4 Only 6 candidates attempted this question but 4 of them passed. Some candidates have difficulty focussing on the hazards and how to address the resulting risks. Overall, the control recommendations for manual handling task were also poor.

In general, I found the paper too long.

D JANSEN VAN VUUREN
SAIOH PCC CHIEF EXAMINER
14.11.2016