STUDENT EVALUATIONS: DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE
(Formerly called the Student Evaluation Policy)
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Purpose

1 Create an UME policy outlining the information on the development and maintenance of student evaluations.

Scope

2 This policy applies to all medical students in the MD Program in Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary.

Definitions

3 In this policy:
   - UME means the MD program, Cumming School of Medicine with the University of Calgary.
   - MD - Medical 3 year program
   - Approval Authority means the office or officer responsible for approving Undergraduate Medical Education policy and procedures.
   - Implementing Authority means the office and officer responsible for implementing Undergraduate Medical Education policies and procedures.
   - Student Evaluation Committee (SEC)
   - Student Academic Review Committee (SARC)
   - Undergraduate Medical Education Committee (UMEC)
   - ITER – In-training Evaluation Report
   - Satisfactory means that the Faculty has determined that the student has met or exceeded the level of performance minimally acceptable for promotion. When a student receives a Satisfactory grade in the course concerned, the grade cannot be altered by any further changes made in the evaluation as a result of
subsequent appeals. A final grade of satisfactory is not eligible for appeal.

- Unsatisfactory means that the student has not met the minimum performance level for the evaluation. A student who is unsatisfactory may wish to review their result sheet with the examination key to aid in recognition of areas of deficiencies and assist in planning remedial studies or to identify an error in the marking. Should a student feel that an error has occurred in the marking of a question he/she may submit a Request for Re-Appraisal. Satisfactory with Performance Deficiency is used in occasional circumstances in the clerkship year in order to accurately record student performance for the following situations:
  - Failure of one component of a clerkship evaluation with subsequent completion of required remedial work and satisfactory performance on rewrite of that component.
  - Incomplete means that a student has not completed all mandatory components of a course or clerkship.

Overall rating of satisfactory performance in a clerkship rotation but with one or more specific areas of deficiency noted including professional and ethical behaviour.

- Canadian Resident Match Services – CaRMS
- Minimum Performance Level – MPL
- Exam Review Working Group - ERWG

Policy Statement

4 Student evaluations serve several purposes including:
  - assessment of student performance and achievement of curricular objectives
  - feedback to students and faculty regarding student learning needs
  - program evaluation including identification of strengths and weaknesses in the education program

1. Participants in UME Evaluations

All UME Program Evaluations are intended solely for medical students registered with the UME MD program. Observers are not normally permitted at any student examinations. As such, non-UME students will NOT be permitted to participate in UME examinations, unless express approval has been granted by SEC. All requests for external participants should be directed, in writing, to the chair of the SEC. With prior approval, observers may be approved if several conditions are met. Requests for non-UME students at UME exams must confirm the following:

a. The observer will not be a future candidate for the examination. The observer has a professional role relevant to student evaluation (e.g. new course/clerkship chair, responsible for new examination development, etc.)

b. The observer has a defined affiliation with the Cumming School of Medicine (e.g. current faculty, visiting professor, etc.)

c. Students will be notified of any observers a minimum of 1 week before the examination date.

d. Observers must not interfere in any way with the examination. No notes or recording of the material is permitted.

If these conditions are met, the request for observation should be submitted in
writing to either the Director of SEC or the Associate Dean, UME (or designate) a minimum of 3 weeks before the examination date. SEC will review all requests for observers at an evaluation, and make recommendations to the Associate Dean, UME. If approval is granted by the Associate Dean, the relevant course/clerkship chair must also grant approval and confirm logistics to accommodate the observer. Requests for observers at a UME evaluations may be denied if the request results in additional work for the UME Program Coordinators (i.e. if an extra track of students is added to an OSCE). Approval of requests for observers will also consider the risk of an increased burden on the e-Learning Team.

2. Frequency of Student Evaluations
   Each course and clerkship in the MD program must have a formal, certifying student evaluation. The schedule of certifying student evaluations is determined by the Office of the Associate Dean, UME. Generally, the certifying course evaluations are offered at the end of the individual courses. There are 2 offerings for rewrites & deferrals in each year of the MD Program.

   Each course and clerkship in the MD program should have a formative evaluation administered approximately midway through the course. Courses or clerkships that are short in duration (less than 4 weeks) may not have sufficient time to provide structured formative evaluation, but should provide alternate means that will allow students to measure their progress in learning.

   Students must be notified at the beginning of the course regarding types and dates of all evaluation strategies to be used.

3. Types of Formal Student Evaluation
   Generally, UME evaluations can be categorized as either formative or summative (certifying).

   Formative
   The purpose of the formative evaluation is:

   - to provide students with a sampling of the question-format to be used on the summative evaluation and;
   - to allow students to monitor their learning progress.

   The formative evaluation should be similar in format and content to the final evaluation but will emphasize material covered up to the time of administration. It is expected that the same preparation steps including blueprinting and development/review of question bank will be used to prepare both formative and certifying examinations, thus similar steps will be taken for each examination to ensure the security of the examination database. Formative evaluations may be
samplings of certifying evaluations with briefer duration and/or demonstrations of examination question format. A blueprint will be provided to the students using questions on material covered up to the time of administration.

Formative evaluations are considered mandatory educational activities. Students who do not participate in formative evaluations will be reported to the Associate Dean, UME. Student conduct during formative evaluations must follow University of Calgary evaluation regulations as would apply during certifying evaluations.

**Summative (Certifying)**

Each course and clerkship in the MD program must have a formal, certifying student evaluation. This evaluation should be a fair and representative sampling of the course/clerkship learning objectives. Preparation steps described further in this document include blueprinting, development/review of question bank and standard setting are required. The certifying evaluation may have one or more components, but a single final grade is then compiled for each course. Regardless of overall grade, a course or clerkship chair should inform the Associate Dean, UME or delegate directly if a student has demonstrated significant unprofessional and/or unethical behaviour during the course or clerkship.

Summative evaluations are considered mandatory educational activities. Summative evaluations may be deferred as per usual policy for deferrals.

4. **Components of Student Evaluations**

Format of student evaluations is chosen to reflect appropriate assessment of learning objectives. In order to adequately sample the breadth of knowledge, skills and attitudes outlined in learning objectives, two or more evaluation components may be required for an individual course or clerkship. A clear description of evaluation methods must be provided to students at the beginning of the course or clerkship. All evaluation strategies used in UME should be approved by SEC.

Specific evaluation components should have reasonable demonstration of objectivity, reliability and validity. Marking will be done anonymously when possible.

- Multiple Choice Examinations
  - Multiple choice questions should be written in the “single best response” format. In general, the single response question tends to have better psychometrics than other formats. Most national examination bodies have moved to this question type or an extended matching format.
• Questions should aim to test “higher level objectives” such as application and problem solving rather than simple recall of factual material.
• Reliability of multiple choice examinations is dependent on several factors including test length and the quality of the individual questions. Locally prepared examinations should aim for a reliability coefficient of ≥ 0.7. This will generally require an examination length of 70-100 questions depending on the discrimination factor of individual questions.
• Validity of examinations requires appropriate sampling of course content as guided by the examination blueprint. High individual item discrimination is desirable; however, core items may have lower item discrimination.

Peripatetic Examinations
• The peripatetic examination questions must be included in the blueprint for the relevant course. The peripatetic component should be reflective of the allotted teaching time in the course, with a maximum of 20% contribution to the final grade.

Objectively Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCE)
• Reasonable reliability for well-constructed OSCE examinations can be achieved with approximately 9 stations. Longer evaluations may be required to adequately sample desired content area. OSCE examinations used as part of certifying evaluations should have 7-12 stations.
• In order to maximize reliability, preparation of OSCE examinations should include examiner and patient training, pilot testing of station questions and pre-testing of the scoring checklist.

Instructions/Forms

9 Preceptor Evaluations
• Preceptor evaluations should include global rating of satisfactory/unsatisfactory performance and an anchored rating scale for specific desired competencies.
• Adequate space for comments should be available.
• Preceptor evaluations must be completed by an attending physician.
• Rotations that involve several preceptors should have a mechanism in place to compile input from all supervising attending physicians and residents.
• Courses are encouraged to use a format for preceptor evaluation that includes “standardized In-training Evaluation Report (ITER)” ratings that are similar across courses.

Online Formative Evaluations

The delivery of formative evaluations using an electronic medium (the Student Self Evaluation System – SSES) was introduced in 2008. The Online Formative Evaluation Policy describes the use of this system. Fundamental principles of exam development and maintenance must be followed, regardless of the format of delivery.
Other Evaluation Methods

Other methods of student evaluation may be used as components of a course or clerkship evaluation. These may include measurement of student participation, completion of specified assignments, clinical reasoning questions, online certifying examinations, small group iRATs (individual rapid assessment tool) and gRATs (group rapid assessment tool), logbook completion for clinical clerkship, etc. All evaluation strategies used in UME should be approved by SEC.

Reporting of Student Grades

Students should receive timely feedback regarding their performance on both the formative and certifying evaluations. Normally, formative evaluation results will be made available within 5 working days and summative evaluation results will be distributed within 14 working days of the examination date.

Examination results will be distributed to each student via email to the student’s @ucalgary.ca address. Grades will be emailed only to @ucalgary address. Paper copies of grades are not distributed to students. The emailed result will include the overall score and the examination minimum performance level. For final overall preclerkship course results students will also receive the class mean and median mark, as well as the number of items on the exam. The number of items that were deleted during the post examination review may be obtained from the course or class evaluation representative. These results also indicate areas of strengths and weaknesses in each of the identifiable clinical presentations.

Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Grading System

Students will not be declared satisfactory overall based upon a result in only portions of an evaluation; the student must be declared Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory in the complete evaluation.

- **Results from year 1 and 2** will be reported as either “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory”.
- **Results from year 3** will be reported as “Satisfactory”, “Unsatisfactory”, or “Satisfactory with Performance Deficiency”.

The Medical School Transcript

- A satisfactorily completed rotation will appear on the medical school transcript as a credit.
- A rotation signed off as “Satisfactory with Performance Deficiencies” will
appear as a credit on a student’s medical school transcript with a notation stating the “Satisfactory with Performance Deficiencies” rating on that particular rotation.

- A failure on a mandatory rotation with a required repeat of the complete rotation will appear on the student’s medical school transcript as an F grade. The repeated rotation will be noted on the transcript and subsequently show as a credit upon successful completion, however, with a different medicine course number.

The Purposes of Identifying Students with Performance Deficiencies are:

- Ensure student is informed of poor performance
- To provide indication to UME Administration regarding weak student performance. This allows UME to provide monitoring and intervention to these students during their clerkship training.
- To allow opportunity for identification of problematic professional and/or ethical behaviour or of other weak skills that may not result in unsatisfactory overall rotation evaluation, but that must be corrected.
- To ensure fair reporting of student performance in transcript records.

Recording of Results

- **Formative Evaluations**: Individual student results will be included in the student’s permanent file, but will not be used to calculate final course mark and/or reported in the Medical Student Performance Record (MSPR).
- **Certifying Evaluations**: Individual student grades and class standings are not reported on student transcripts or provided as part of Canadian Resident Match Service (CaRMS) applications.

Preparation of Student Evaluations

1. **Blueprinting**: A blueprint or table of specifications is required for each course and clerkship evaluation in the Undergraduate Medical Curriculum. The blueprint will be consistent with the Clinical Presentation Curriculum philosophy and thus should be organized by clinical presentations and reflect tasks to be evaluated. The “basic” blueprint should be distributed to the course chair, evaluation coordinator, students and teachers at the beginning of the course or clerkship. The “expanded” blueprint that includes the specific diagnoses/diseases to be tested should be available to the course chair and evaluation coordinator. Distribution of this version to students and teachers is encouraged.

Content tested in a given evaluation may include any material previously covered in the UME curriculum, provided that this is reflected in the blueprint.
As with all components of the UME program, evaluation content and format should reflect non-prejudicial language and attitudes.

Parallel format examinations are acceptable if each version follows the same blueprint, resulting in similar sampling.

2. **Exam Construction:** Each course or clerkship committee is responsible for preparing formative and summative (certifying) student evaluations. Development and testing of new items on formative examinations is strongly encouraged to replenish and expand the question bank. The examination blueprint should be used to guide item development and selection to ensure congruency with educational objectives including weighting of content. Due to the high-stakes of the certifying examinations (original and re-writes), all items used should be congruent with course learning objectives, accurate and of sound technical quality to maximize the psychometric rigor of these examinations. Once constructed, every examination must undergo a pre-administration review.

**Process of Pre-Examination Review for Pre-Clerkship formative and summative written examinations**

Each course committee (including evaluation representative(s) and course chair) will prepare a draft of the written examination (both formative and summative). All examinations must be reviewed by the Exam Review Working Group (ERWG) for final approval. The ERWG minimally consists of:

- One SEC representative familiar with psychometric analysis
- One or two course representatives (normally course chair and/or evaluation representative)
- The UME Program Coordinator. The role of the Program Coordinator is to record the recommendations of the ERWG in the master exam bank.

The ERWG will ensure reliability and validity of exams through a review for:

- item ambiguity and technical quality
- accuracy of examination key
- congruency with learning objectives and exam blueprint
- approval of overall MPL and standard setting procedures

**Establishing the Minimum Performance Level (MPL)**

The MPL is an estimation or calculation of the likelihood that the weakest group of students in the class will be able to correctly answer a question. The MPL is not a reflection of what the class “should know”, but rather, a reflection of what the weakest students in the class “will know”. Standard setting (MPL assignment) for written formative and summative examinations should be done using a Modified Nedelsky
A minimum of 3 faculty should participate in the standard setting of each item. Critical steps in the standard setting process include:

Each faculty judge assigns a probability value (from 0-100%) that reflects minimally competent candidates’ ability to eliminate each of the distracter options.

- These probabilities are averaged and compared to past student performance statistics. The probabilities are used to calculate the MPL for each item.
- The overall exam MPL is calculated by summing the item MPL’s.

Prior to exam administration, the initial MPL is predicted by the ERWG, and is informed by a review of item psychometrics from previous years. While any content that is included on an examination is recognized as important material, items that examine fundamental, life-or-death, core knowledge may be assigned an MPL of 1.0 (i.e. you would predict that 100% of the weakest group of students will answer this question correctly). It should be understood that MPLs of 1.0 do not contribute to overall psychometric strength of an examination. Questions with MPLs of less than 0.3 are discouraged, as MPLs at this level are suggestive of guessing, and therefore do not contribute to the overall psychometric strength of an exam. Generally, in the absence of prior psychometric results (i.e. for new questions), the MPL should be set between 0.5 – 0.6. Although there is no pre-defined expectation related to MPL settings, calculated total MPLs in the UME program generally range from 60 – 65%. Overall exam MPLs that fall outside of this range will be scrutinized closely by SEC and may require final approval by the Associate Dean of the UME. Assistance with standard setting is available from Psychometric experts within the Cumming School of Medicine.

Recommendations will be collated by the ERWG chair or designate and incorporated into the final draft of the examination to be sent to the printers. A meeting may be called at the discretion of the ERWG chair if significant revisions are required.

**Process of Post-Examination Review for Pre-Clerkship formative and summative written examinations**

Formative and summative results are reported to students only after analysis of the psychometrics according to SEC criteria. Decisions regarding adjustments will be made by the consensus of an Exam Review Working Group (ERWG). Each member of the ERWG will be asked to sign a confidentiality agreement that acknowledges the sensitivity of the material being discussed. The ERWG is comprised of:

- One SEC representative familiar with psychometric analysis
- One or two course representatives (normally course chair and/or evaluation representative)
- One or two student representatives (course rep +/- year examination rep). (see role below)

---

1 The Modified Nedelsky method estimates the probability that minimally competent candidates can answer the questions correctly. It combines opinion of expert panel with statistics of past student performance.
The UME Program Coordinator. The role of the Program Coordinator is to record the recommendations of the ERGW in the master exam bank.

**Student representatives and student review of exams**

The role of the student representatives on this subcommittee is to assist in ensuring that the exam content has been reflected through the teaching or learning objectives. The student representatives are also needed to collect and summarize comments raised by students regarding exam items. The student members of the subcommittee do not have the authority to represent specific student concerns or advocate for specific adjustments to final grades. Any changes resulting from this review, will apply to all students sitting the examination and evaluation scores re-calculated and all decisions are considered final. Student representatives may report back to the class confidential details related to an evaluation only with express written consent of the Chair of the SEC.

Following administration of the summative (certifying) examination, and prior to the distribution of student grades, the evaluation key and performance statistics on exam question are made available to the students for five days according to the UME Examinations Administration Policies and Practices. This is a privilege for students within the UME program which relies on the integrity of students to maintain examination bank security. Students may make constructive comments regarding individual items which are collated, then circulated to the Exam Review Working Group. Such comments should relate to any ambiguity of the question, lack of corresponding learning objective or inaccuracy of keyed responses. Student comments judged to be inappropriate or unprofessional will be deleted prior to distribution.

The student review of written examinations is a mutually beneficial process for both students and the MD program. It serves the following purposes:

- Improvement of question bank for upcoming years
- Course feedback (QI)
- Validity check
- Transparency of process
- Student learning reinforced

**Formative Examination ERWG review**

Following administration of the formative examination, post-administration adjustments to the examination for the current year will be based upon analysis of the psychometrics according to SEC criteria. Any changes resulting from the ERWG review, will apply to all students sitting the examination and evaluation scores re-calculated. Normally, final student marks will be distributed within 5 working days (and no later than 14 days) of the examination date.
Certifying Examination ERWG review

Following administration of the certifying examination, post-administration adjustments to the examination for the current year will be based upon analysis of the psychometrics according to SEC criteria. Decisions regarding adjustments will be made by the consensus of the ERWG. Any changes resulting from this review, will apply to all students sitting the examination and evaluation scores re-calculated and all decisions are considered final. Grades are released to the students at the conclusion of the ERWG review, and normally within 14-days of the exam date.

Establishing the post-administration MPL

Prior to exam administration, the initial MPL is predicted by the ERWG, and is informed by a review of item psychometrics from previous years. The final MPL is determined by the ERWG during the post-exam review. MPL determination is based solely upon item psychometrics. The overall examination MPL and student scores will be rounded up or down to the nearest whole number according to accepted mathematical rules. Subsequent pass/fail decisions are final, regardless of student score proximity to MPL.

Release of Post-examination review information

Following Pre-clerkship post-examination reviews the following information may be disseminated to students who have written that exam:

Number of questions deleted from the exam. Number of questions in which more than one correct answer was accepted for the exam. Other information as decided by the Examination Review Working Group for that exam.

This information will be released to students through the e-learning team which will identify the students who should receive the information by the ID numbers of the students they have on file that have completed that exam.

Release of formative and summative marks

Students should receive timely feedback regarding their performance on both the formative and certifying evaluations. Normally, formative evaluation results will be made available within 5 working days and summative evaluation results will be distributed within 14 working days of the examination date except during the rewrite/deferral period in which case results may be delayed until after the rewrite/deferrals are complete. In some cases (i.e. the Medical Skills OSCE), it is occasionally in the best interest of the students to delay the release of final marks beyond the 14-day period. Generally, marks will be released to students as soon as possible. Students writing deferred exams will only have access to their marks on evaluations in that course if they would normally have access to those marks if they had not deferred the exam.
Ongoing improvement of the exam bank

A full ERWG meeting may be scheduled within 3 weeks of administration of the certifying examination. Examination psychometrics and copies of the student comments with related examination questions and key will be circulated to all faculty members of the Exam Review Working Group (ERW group). Student representatives to ERW will have the opportunity to review comments and items within the UME office under the supervision of a UME Program Coordinator. Student feedback will be used at this meeting to make improvements to the question bank for upcoming years, to assist in interpretation of student responses and to guide future modifications to course content and delivery. No further changes to the current year examination will be based upon student comments. Both formative and summative examinations will be discussed at the meeting.

Exam psychometrics are observed longitudinally. Extraordinary meetings of the ERWG may be convened by the SEC Chair in the event that unusual trends are identified in any exam psychometrics. Unusually high (greater than 10% of the class) and low (0% of the class) failure rates will trigger a review. In the event that problematic or flawed items are identified by a review of psychometrics, then the ERW may recommend “parallel form changes” to the exam i.e. the flawed item is removed and replaced with a new item that covers the same principle or content. In the case of the clerkship exams, it is more appropriate to make a mid-year parallel change than to keep a flawed item on an exam. Mid-year parallel changes will NOT lead to a re-grading of students that have already completed the exam. If the ERW is unable to address problematic trends in exam psychometrics, further consultation with psychometric experts within the Cumming School of Medicine may be required, and final recommendations made by the Associate Dean, UME.

Process of Pre-Examination Review for Clerkship formative and summative written examinations

Written examinations used in the clinical clerkship will follow similar steps of preparation and review as described above with the following modifications due to the logistic limitations of repeated clerkship rotations.

- Each clerkship committee (including evaluation representative(s) and clerkship chair) will prepare a draft of the written examination (both formative and certifying) to be submitted for review and final approval to Exam Review Working Group (ERWG) annually prior to the beginning of each clerkship year. An annual review of the written examination will be scheduled to complete the steps described above for “pre-administration review”.
- Students in year 3 may make comments regarding individual questions at the end of their examination. The examination key is not made available to third year students. The comments will be collected and compiled separately from the student response.
sheets.

- At minimum, annual review of student performance, item statistics and student feedback will be conducted as described above for “post-administration review”. The primary purpose of this review is to improve the question bank for upcoming years. Student marks are not adjusted following this annual review.

Subcommittee Reporting

The ERWG chair will report quarterly to the SEC regarding outcome of certifying evaluation reviews. This report will include discussion of any problematic issues in the process and specific number of satisfactory/unsatisfactory students, number of items deleted from examination, and number of items modified for current examination.

Outcome of student evaluations

Individual student evaluation results are confidential. Individual results are recorded on the student’s permanent file and may be released to the student and to the Associate Dean, UME and to members of faculty committees responsible for student evaluation, promotion and/or appeals. The student’s faculty advisor may receive copies of the student’s examination results if provided directly by the student.

Group evaluation results may be released to the Clerkship Director and Evaluation Coordinator for the relevant course and to faculty responsible for program evaluation in the MD Program.

Consequences of an Unsatisfactory Performance

Students will have two opportunities to demonstrate satisfactory performance on certifying evaluations. A student who is unsatisfactory on a certifying evaluation, with or without a completed Request for Reappraisal to the SEC, is required to write a repeat certifying evaluation or repeat OSCE. Notification of the time and place for this repeat evaluation will be provided by UME following the release of the results of the final certifying evaluation. The repeat evaluation will follow the same due process as established for initial evaluations and the same Reappraisal process is possible.

In courses where peripatetic exams are incorporated into the overall grade, the peripatetic exam will be rewritten only if the student failed their original peripatetic exam in that course. If the student was satisfactory on the original peripatetic exam that mark will be used to calculate the students final rewrite grade. The MCQ will always be a component of the rewrite.

Sufficient time between evaluations should allow for necessary remedial work as determined by the appropriate course committee. Students with unsatisfactory performance on certifying evaluations shall appear before SARC according to the criteria outlined in the SARC terms of reference.

Consequences of an Unsatisfactory Performance in the Pre-clerkship and Clerkship of
the Curriculum

These are outlined in the SARC terms of reference


All students should be familiar with the policies for promotion outlined in the Terms of Reference of the Student Academic Review Committee.

EXAM RE-WRITE SCHEDULE

Specific dates for all evaluations can be found in the timetable for each year. The re-write period may NOT be deferred for travel, electives or any other plans that the student scheduled prior to an unsatisfactory exam result.

The First Year rewrites and deferred examinations have 2 scheduled offerings. First offering is scheduled on the last day of spring break before Year 2 begins. Course during this offering include, Course 1, Course 2, Course 3 Deferrals only, Medical Skills and Population Health. Second offering is scheduled for the first 2-days of the Year 2 Summer Elective period in Week 3 for Course 3 rewrites only. Students who rewrite will usually know their final mark for this repeat evaluation within 5 days of writing.

The Second Year rewrites and deferred examinations have 2 scheduled offerings. First offering is scheduled in Week 1 of Course 5 (August) for Course 4 rewrites & deferred exams only. The second offering is the last day of Year 2 before Clerkship begins for Course 5, Course 6, Course 7, Medical Skills and Applied Evidence Based Medicine (AEBM). Students who rewrite will know their final mark within 5 days of writing. As the clerkship year begins immediately after second year finishes, the timing of rewrites is critical.

The Clerkship Re-write and Deferral Examinations are scheduled pre-CaRMS in mid-October and the last week in April allowing for remedial and make-up time.

If a student is scheduled for an elective out of town and will incur a financial penalty by returning for the rewrite they may be allowed to write the exam immediately upon return, usually within the first 3 days, dependent on approval of the Assistant Dean of Clerkship or their designate.

Students with unsatisfactory performance on certifying evaluations may be required to appear before SARC as outlined in the SARC Terms of Reference.

A student who obtains an unsatisfactory rating on an evaluation is expected to meet with the Associate Dean, UME or delegate within 2 weeks of receipt of the relevant examination result. During pre-clerkship, the student is expected to organize a remedial program in consultation with the UME office to correct this deficiency prior to writing a
repeat evaluation. This may involve use of independent study time. Failure to complete a prescribed remedial program is regarded as equivalent to failing the repeat examination. During the clerkship year, in the case of unsatisfactory performance, a period of remedial learning may be required prior to the rewrite examination. The relevant Clerkship Director and/or Evaluation Coordinator will be responsible for arranging the appropriate remedial learning.

**Exam Security and Invigilation**

The questions and answers of all evaluations are secure. The copying of any formative or summative evaluation material by students is strictly forbidden, as is the possession of any evaluation material outside of the examination room. Students who discover any suspicious evaluation materials are expected to report the matter immediately to the Associate Dean, UME or delegate. Invigilators that identify unusual or irregular behaviour during examinations are expected to submit a written report to their manager, who in turn should inform the Director of the SEC and the Associate Dean.

Each member of the ERWG will be asked to sign a confidentiality agreement that acknowledges the sensitivity of the material being discussed.

**Other policies not described in this document**

Policies regarding student appeal are outlined in the UME Student Evaluations: Reappraisals and Appeals policy and the Medical Student Appeals Committee (MSAC) terms of reference. Policies regarding academic conduct including student conduct during examinations are described in the University of Calgary calendar. Students may defer certifying evaluation according to University of Calgary policy. Deferral of formative examination should follow the same process as for certifying evaluations. Deferred formative examination should be written within one week of the originally scheduled date. If the examination cannot be written within 2 weeks of the originally scheduled date, the student must meet with the Course Chair and Associate Dean to discuss the need to defer the course. Policies regarding academic accommodations for students with disabilities are outlined by the University of Calgary Student Accessibility Center.

**Standards** Refer to the SEC Policy document

**History**

*Approved:* Dr. Sylvain Coderre, Associate Dean  
UME Management  
Student Evaluation Committee, UMEC June 5 2015

*Effective:* January 22 2015