

CHIEF EXAMINERS REPORT

Subject:	<u>Certificate of Professional Competence – Road Haulage</u>
Stage/Scheme:	<u>05608 (Unit 4)</u>
Series and/or year of examination:	<u>September 2011</u>

The quality of answers varied dramatically even though this was a very straightforward paper. The marks awarded ranged from 4 to 87. The majorities of candidates were well prepared and were able to show their knowledge as it related to the scenario. However, a disappointingly high number of candidates who scored full marks for questions 3 and 4 did not do very well on either question 1 or 2, or in some cases both. This may be an indication that centres correctly anticipated the routes to be used for the scheduling and costing questions allowing the candidates to memorise the answers to questions 3 and 4 before coming into the examination room – they clearly had not done the same for the “O” licensing and maintenance questions as when left to their own devices the same candidates appeared to struggle. This is a disadvantage of pre-releasing the scenario.

Unfortunately, a minority of candidates still enter the examination either not having studied or not being able to cope with level 3 questions. Some were unable to demonstrate even a basic knowledge of a particular subject and were unable to direct their answers to the question and/or simply wrote all they knew about a particular subject without any reference to the question or the scenario.

A small number of candidates still fail to realise that in a level 3 examination

questions must be answered in sentences with explanations and application of knowledge and it is not acceptable to simply write a series of notes, bullet points or lists.

Question 1

This question involved application of the rules in parts a) and b) and knowledge of the criteria in part c).

Part a) required candidates to recognise that, as the new main operating centre was to be in a different traffic area, an application for a new licence to cover the North-West Traffic Area was required and that all applications are initially dealt with by the CLO in Leeds. A number of candidates failed to score marks because they only said “fill in GV79” or similar without further explanation and did not even say what they would do with the form after they had filled it in.

Part b) required candidates to recognise that as the new secondary operating centre was in the same traffic area as the existing centre that an application for a major change to the existing licence was required. As in part a) a number of candidates only said “fill in GV81”.

Part (c) required candidates to identify and explain four of the criteria. Despite this being fundamental and basic knowledge a disappointingly high number of candidates are unable to identify and describe the basic requirements to obtain an “O” licence. Again too many candidates simply did not read the question and gave answers relating to undertakings and fitness despite the fact that the question instructed them not to.

Question 2

This question was the least well answered in Section A. Again, as in question 1 part c), a disappointingly high number of candidates appeared unprepared for a question on a fundamental part of the syllabus and were unable to discuss the

advantages of in-house maintenance or relate this issue to the scenario. Another issue with this question was the failure of approximately half the candidates to write their answer in the form of a memorandum thereby losing one mark before they started addressing the issues.

Question 3

A majority of candidates scored the maximum twelve marks which strongly suggests that centres anticipated this question. There were two correct answers – either a single forty five minute break at Glasgow or taking fifteen minutes at Glasgow followed by a thirty minute break after driving for another hour. A number of candidates wrote an illegal schedule by only taking a thirty minute break at Glasgow and no others or by taking a thirty minute break there followed by a fifteen minute break en route. A couple of candidates failed to score any marks because they drew up a schedule for route 2.

Question 4

A majority of candidates also scored the maximum eleven marks for this question. The most common errors were to cost the vehicle only, incorrect calculation of the total distance travelled, use of the wrong figures, simple arithmetical errors or using the wrong vehicle.

Question 5

Part (a) i) was answered in a mediocre fashion with most candidates obtaining one or two marks and few obtaining all three. Part (a) ii) and iii) were well answered with a lot of candidates obtaining full marks.

Part (b) was very poorly answered with many candidates not scoring any marks at all.

Question 6

Part a) was generally well answered but some candidates simply wrote one word

lists. Quite a few candidates misread the question and wrote a list of incentives to attract the best candidates.

Part b) was generally well answered with a majority of candidates obtaining all seven marks.

Question 7

This question was hinted at in the scenario and candidates had obviously learnt the rules applicable to the transportation of sheep and in particular the difference between short and long journey authorizations. Accordingly most candidates scored very well.

Question 8

Part (a) was very well answered again, probably due to the fact that this question was hinted at in the scenario.

Part (b) was very well answered as well.

CONCLUSION

The paper was generally well answered and did not present any difficulties to those candidates who had prepared thoroughly. The main reason for candidates failing to obtain good marks appear to be the usual ones of failing to read the questions properly, simply writing lists without further application or explanation and inadequate preparation.

This paper is consistent with level 3.

Pass rate: 65%