

Departmental Policy

ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT REAPPRAISAL

Classification Operations	Table of Contents Purpose 1
Approval Authority Associate Dean, UME	Scope 2
Implementation Authority Manager, Undergraduate Medical Education	Definitions 3
Effective Date October 30, 2014	Policy Statement 4
Latest Revision November 1, 2018	Special Situations 5
	Responsibilities 6
	Appendices 7
	Procedures 8
	Instructions/Forms 9
	Standards 10
	Parent Policy 11
	Related Policies 12
	Related Information 13
	References 14
	History 15

Purpose	1	Create an UME policy outlining the information on the student's rights to reappraisal of an academic assessment and how the right is carried out.
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. UME means the Undergraduate Medical Education program with the University of Calgary. b. MD - Medical 3 year program c. Approval Authority means the office or officer responsible for approving Undergraduate Medical Education policy and procedures d. Implementing Authority means the office and officer responsible for implementing Undergraduate Medical Education policies and procedures. e. Student Evaluation Committee (SEC) f. Student Academic Review Committee (SARC) g. ITER – In-training Evaluation Report
Policy Statement	4	Policy that outlines the student's right to reappraisal of an academic assessment and how that right is carried out.
Special Situations	5	
Responsibilities	6	UME will ensure adherence to this policy
Appendices	7	

Procedures

- 8 Students will have two opportunities to demonstrate satisfactory performance on summative evaluations. A student who is unsatisfactory on a summative evaluation is required to write a repeat summative evaluation or repeat OSCE. The repeat evaluation will follow the same due process as established for initial evaluations and the same reappraisal process is possible.

Sufficient time between evaluations should allow for necessary remedial work as determined by the appropriate course committee. **All students should be familiar with the policies for promotion outlined in the Terms of Reference of the Student Academic Review Committee.**

https://www.ucalgary.ca/mdprogram/about-us/ume-policies-guidelines-forms-terms-reference#quickset-field_collection_quicktabs_2

Students with unsatisfactory academic performance on multiple summative evaluations may be required to appear before the Student Academic Review Committee (SARC) according to the criteria outlined in the SARC terms of reference.

Instructions/Forms

- 9 The Office of the Associate Dean (UME) will monitor evaluations and offer assistance when academic difficulties are observed. A student who is unsatisfactory on a summative examination should meet with the Associate Dean or his/her representative to discuss remedial plans.

Requests for reappraisals may be directed to the following categories:

1. Written and OSCE Examinations (Item A and B below)
2. Preceptor Evaluation of Clinical Performance (ITER), Overall Examination Decisions, and/or Remedial Recommendations (Item C and D below)
3. Other forms of evaluation (Item E below)

A. Criteria for Reappraisal of Written Evaluations and OSCE Examinations

1. Requests for reappraisal will not be accepted if the student has received a "Satisfactory" overall evaluation for the relevant course or clerkship.
2. Requests for reappraisal will not be accepted for factors that have impacted all individuals taking the examination.
3. A student who is unsatisfactory on an evaluation may request reappraisal only if he/she has identified errors in the summation and calculation of their grade or procedural irregularities that may have adversely affected his/her assigned grade. All summative examinations are intended to reflect the course/clerkship objectives and the UME goals, objectives, and philosophy. At the time of the examination, students may submit comments regarding individual questions on the comment sheets provided. These comments should identify ambiguities or errors in the structure or content of an examination item. As part of the usual examination pre/post review process,

reappraisal requests can be directed against content of individual items. Content-specific questions will be directed to the Director of Student Evaluation and the Course Chair/Clerkship Director.

4. Failure to transcribe responses correctly onto the examination paper or optical score sheet is an unfortunate student error, but is not an acceptable criterion for examination reappraisal. If an optical score system is used to grade the paper, a manual review of the answer sheet may be requested in order to identify any potential errors that the optical system may have made in scoring the exam.
5. Illness during the examination is not grounds for reappraisal. Policy regarding deferral of examination due to illness is documented in the University of Calgary examination policies.

<https://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/current/g-6-2.html>

6. Online examinations may have occasional technical difficulties. These include slower than usual computer speeds, temporary logouts and computer failure. Minor technical difficulties are not grounds for reappraisal. If a student encounters a minor technical difficulty during an online examination they should make the UME Evaluation Team aware before the close of the exam and appropriate accommodations may be arranged.
7. For written examinations, if after the normal post examination review process a student believes there is still a key error or alternate correct answer for a question, they may request that the question be reviewed if the information on which they based their answer came from an accepted source from the course in the year in which they were taught. Accepted sources include evidence-based textbooks or online resources, journal articles, posted lecture notes, slides, or podcasts. Unaccepted source material includes student notes from a class that cannot be confirmed by an alternate and accepted source.
8. For OSCE examinations, reappraisal will not be heard for challenges about the score assigned by examiners on items. As part of the post-OSCE review, the performance of all examiners is assessed and, for all students who are unsatisfactory on the OSCE, a sensitivity analysis is performed in which their performance is adjusted for rater specificity (“hawk” vs “dove” effects) and the final student grade is changed if their score is at or above MPL on the sensitivity analysis.

B. Process for a Reappraisal of written evaluations and OSCE Examinations

1. All Requests for reappraisal must be directed in writing to the Chair of the Student Evaluation Committee within 10 business days of receipt of the relevant evaluation result and include:
 - a. The students UCID number.
 - b. The decision that the student is requesting reappraised.
 - c. All related documentation, including correspondence between the person that made the decision and the student.
 - d. The grounds for reappraisal and evidence supporting this.
 - e. The requested outcome of the reappraisal.
 - f. Whether the student would prefer not to be identified by name in written documents.
 - g. A statement that all of the evidence and documentation provided is true and accurate.
2. The Chair of the Student Evaluation Committee will review the request for reappraisal and provide the student with a decision on whether the reappraisal will be heard; this will occur within 10 working days of receipt of the request.
3. Acceptable requests will be heard by a Reappraisal Subcommittee consisting of the Chair of the Student Evaluation Committee, Director of Student Evaluation, and either the Course Chair/Clerkship Director or Evaluation Coordinator.
4. Materials considered by the Reappraisal Subcommittee may also include:
 - a. The original examination question and answer key.
 - b. A copy of the student's original response.
 - c. A written recommendation from the marker/question author for scoring of student response.
 - d. Computer logs of time spent during the exam and login and logout times.
 - e. Documentation of any minor technical difficulties during the exam and any corresponding accommodations made to deal with such technical difficulties.
5. The decision of the Reappraisal Subcommittee may result in a grade and or MPL that is higher, lower or unchanged when compared to the original grade.
6. In the event that there is considered to have been a process error, the

Reappraisal Subcommittee may require reassessment of the student. Normally this will be conducted at the next scheduled rewrite time (Years 1 and 2) or with the next clerkship offering of the examination (Year 3). If this is required and the student does not complete this reassessment, he/she will be considered “Unsatisfactory” for the examination.

7. Results for an individual Request for Reappraisal will only apply to the individual student being assessed. An exception to this is where a systematic problem is identified that may have adversely affected other students in the current academic year the Evaluation committee may apply changes to other students without the need for each of the students to file an appeal on the same grounds.
8. The Chair of the Student Evaluation Committee will notify the student, the Associate Dean of UME, the Assistant Dean of UME and the Course Chair/Clerkship Director of the outcome of the reappraisal with 10 business days. A copy of this letter will be placed in the student’s permanent file.

Decisions of this committee will be considered final unless appealed to the University Appeals Committee (appeals@ucalgary.ca).

The timeline for academic assessment reappraisal is shown in the accompanying figure. (Appendix A).

C. Criteria for reappraisal of preceptor evaluation of clinical performance (ITER), overall examination decisions, and/or remedial recommendations

In this situation, the Reappraisal Subcommittee has limited scope and will consider only whether the evaluation process was conducted fairly and/or if recommended remedial work is reasonable.

Requests for Reappraisal will not be accepted if the student has received a “Satisfactory” overall evaluation for the relevant course or clerkship.

D. Process for reappraisal of preceptor evaluation report of clinical performance (ITER), overall examination decisions, and/or remedial recommendations

1. Requests for reappraisal of ITER evaluations, overall evaluation decisions or remedial recommendations will only be considered by the Chair of the Student Evaluation Committee once the student has completed the

course or clerkship in question and potential remediation recommendations have been made by the Departmental Course/Clerkship Committee and/or Associate Dean UME.

2. All Requests for reappraisal must be directed in writing to the Chair of the Student Evaluation Committee within 10 business days of receipt of the relevant evaluation result and include:
 - a. The students UCID number.
 - b. The decision that the student is requesting reappraised.
 - c. All related documentation, including correspondence between the person that made the decision and the student.
 - d. The grounds for reappraisal and evidence supporting this.
 - e. The requested outcome of the reappraisal.
 - f. Whether the student would prefer not to have a student sit on the reappraisal subcommittee.
 - g. Whether the student would prefer a written or oral reappraisal and why.
 - h. Whether the student would prefer not to be identified by name in written documents.
 - i. A statement that all of the evidence and documentation provided is true and accurate.
3. The Chair of the Student Evaluation Committee will review the request for reappraisal and provide the student with a decision on whether the reappraisal will be heard within 10 working days of receipt of the request.
4. Within 5 business days of the decision to hear a reappraisal, the Chair of the Student Evaluation Committee will notify the student, Course Chair/Clerkship Director, Assistant Dean of UME, and Associate Dean of UME of the membership of the Reappraisal Subcommittee and the date, time, and location of the reappraisal.
5. The Reappraisal Subcommittee will consist of at least 3 faculty members of the Student Evaluation Committee (excluding, where applicable, the Clerkship Director and/or Evaluation Coordinator of the clerkship in question and the Director of Student Evaluations) and 2 student

representatives from the Student Evaluation Committee. If three members of the Student Evaluation Committee are unavailable then alternative faculty will be invited to join the Reappraisal Subcommittee (typically these faculty will be members of the Preclerkship Committee). The Associate Dean and/or Assistant Dean(s) may attend the reappraisal in the capacity of an observer. They will not vote or be allowed to ask questions or make comments during the reappraisal.

6. Within 5 business days of the notification of reappraisal, the student or Course Chair/Clerkship Director can submit a challenge requesting that a member of the Reappraisal Subcommittee not hear the reappraisal. Challenges can only be made on the grounds of perceived conflict of interest that may prevent a fair decision being made. Challenges should be made to the Chair of the Student Evaluation Committee. If the membership of the panel is changed then notification of this and the new membership will be given within 5 business days of the challenge.
7. At the time of notification of the decision to hear a reappraisal, the Course Chair/Clerkship Director will be asked to submit a written response (within 10 business days) to the Chair of the Student Evaluation Committee that includes:
 - a. All documents related to the decision.
 - b. A response to the student's grounds for reappraisal.
 - c. A response to the student's requested outcome of the reappraisal.
 - d. Whether they would prefer a written or oral reappraisal and why.

The written response from the Course Chair/Clerkship Director must be submitted at least 5 business days before the date of the reappraisal.

8. The Reappraisal Subcommittee will have access to the student's clerkship documents from the specific department/rotation including all correspondence, Departmental Clerkship Committee meeting minutes, preceptor evaluation reports (ITERs), evaluations and examination results. Materials outside the course or clerkship being appealed will not be considered.
9. Normally, this meeting to hear the reappraisal will take place within 30 business days of the receipt of the request for reappraisal.
10. Both the student and the Course Chair/Clerkship Director can be accompanied by one advisor. Students are encouraged to bring their Faculty Advisor and the Course Chair/Clerkship Director is encouraged to bring the Director of Student Evaluations. As this is a Reappraisal

Subcommittee with limited scope (rather than an Appeals Committee), neither the student nor the Chair/Clerkship Director can bring legal counsel. A request for an additional witness from either party should be submitted in writing to the Chair of the Student Evaluation Committee at least 5 business days prior to the meeting. The Chair will determine if the witness is appropriate and relevant to the matter to be examined.

An advisor will not be allowed to participate in the meeting, beyond acting as an advisor to the student or Course Chair/Clerkship Director. More specifically, advisors will not be permitted to present to the Committee or question participants.

In the event that an advisor begins to address matters that the Chair rules inappropriate, the Chair may rule the speaker out of order and terminate their appearance before the Committee.

11. The Chair of the Student Evaluation Committee or designate will chair the reappraisal meeting. After providing introductions, an overview of the process, and confirming no conflict of interest, the chair will ask the student to present their case for reappraisal. The Reappraisal Subcommittee members will then have an opportunity to question the student. Next, the course Chair/Clerkship Director will have an opportunity to ask questions of the student – but these questions must be directed through the chair. If the student has a witness, this witness will then be called to provide information and respond to questions. After this, the chair will ask the Course Chair/Clerkship Director to present their case. The Reappraisal Subcommittee members will then have an opportunity to question the Course Chair/Clerkship Director. Next, the student will have an opportunity to ask questions of the Course Chair/Clerkship Director – but these questions must be directed through the chair. If the Course Chair/Clerkship Director has a witness, this witness will then be called to provide information and respond to questions. The chair will then ask the Course Chair/Clerkship Director to make a brief summary statement, followed by an invitation for the student to make a brief summary statement. The chair will then ask the student, Course Chair/Clerkship Director, and any advisors and witnesses to leave the room so that the Subcommittee can deliberate in private.
12. The Reappraisal Subcommittee will decide whether the reappraisal should be upheld or denied. Decision will be by secret ballot with the Chair only voting in case of a tie.

If the reappraisal identifies an apparent error in the assessment process, the Reappraisal Subcommittee may require reassessment of the student. This may necessitate completion of remedial work. If this is required and

the student does not complete this reassessment, he/she will be considered “Unsatisfactory”.

If the reappraisal concludes that the evaluation process was conducted fairly and/or the recommended remedial work is reasonable then the original result will stand and any applicable recommendation for remedial work will be required.

The Chair of the Student Evaluation Committee will notify the student, Associate Dean of UME, Assistant Dean of UME and the Course Chair/Clerkship Director of the outcome of the reappraisal with 10 business days. A copy of this letter will be placed in the student’s permanent file.

Decisions of this committee will be considered final unless appealed to the University Appeals Committee (appeals@ucalgary.ca).

The timeline for academic assessment reappraisal is shown in the accompanying figure. (Appendix A).

E. Reappraisal of all other UME Evaluations

This document outlines specific criteria for reappraisal/appeal of written examinations, OSCE examinations and preceptor evaluations. Other evaluation strategies may be also used in the Undergraduate Medical Education program as approved by the Student Evaluation Committee. Requests for reappraisal or appeal of other evaluation types must be submitted to Chair of the Student Evaluation Committee within 10 business days of receipt of the relevant evaluation result. The request will be handled according to the principles and processes outlined in the sections above. Any required modification to the reappraisal/appeal process due to the specific type of evaluation strategy discussed will be communicated to the student and the relevant course/clerkship chair in writing at least 5 business days prior to the reappraisal.

Standards
History

10

15 *Approved:* Dr. Sylvain Coderre, Associate Dean
UME Management

Effective: **October 30, 2014**

APPENDIX A

Maximum Timeline

