

Supplementary Guidance for Completing Team Evaluation Forms
to be read in conjunction with the
CACMS Accreditation Visit Report Writing Guide for 2025-2026 visits

Resolving uncertainty whether a requirement is met

The following steps are suggested when a team member is unsure whether a requirement is met. An example excerpt for Requirement 9.8 a is shown below in an element where the requirement was deemed explicit.

- Step 1- Re-read the element and re-evaluate. If the uncertainty is resolved, then check the appropriate 'Requirement met' or 'Requirement not met' box.
- Step 2 - If the uncertainty remains, contact the accreditation advisor, the team secretary or both to discuss concerns and seek guidance.

If the uncertainty is resolved after discussion, then the team member should check the appropriate 'Requirement met' or 'Requirement not met' box.

If the uncertainty remains after discussion, consult with the team secretary to determine whether more information needs to be requested from the school in advance of the accreditation visit. If more information is provided and satisfies the uncertainty, then check the appropriate 'Requirement met' or 'Requirement not met' box.

- Step 3 - If the uncertainty remains at the time of the first accreditation visit, discuss this with the entire team at its next meeting and update the entry accordingly.

If the uncertainty is resolved, then the team member/team secretary should check the appropriate 'Requirement met' or 'Requirement not met' box.

If the uncertainty is not resolved, then the requirement **must** be discussed with the school **during** the first accreditation visit.

- Step 4 - If the uncertainty remains after the first accreditation visit, the team should discuss and plan further data requests/approaches in preparation for the second accreditation visit. **All uncertainty MUST be resolved by the end of the second accreditation visit.**

In the example below, the challenge to the team member/team is to determine whether the data provided by the school or information gained during the visit satisfy the stated requirement in this peer review process.

9.8 FAIR AND TIMELY SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

A medical school has a policy and process in place for ensuring timely summative assessment of medical student achievement in each required learning experience. All summative assessments are available within six weeks after the end of each required learning experience.

Requirement 9.8-1

A medical school has a policy and process in place for ensuring timely summative assessment of medical student achievement in each required learning experience.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Requirement met	<input type="checkbox"/> Requirement not met	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsure
Evidence for the assessment of this requirement: Two school policies relating to summative assessment specify a six-week timeline for provision of final grades.		
Monitoring considerations (if applicable):		

Requirement 9.8-2

All summative assessments are available within six weeks after the end of a required learning experience.

<input type="checkbox"/> Requirement met	<input type="checkbox"/> Requirement not met	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unsure
Evidence for the assessment of this requirement: Data provided in Table 9.8-2 A show that all students in all required learning experiences, EXCEPT for the 8-week clerkship rotation in X, the 4-week rotation in Y and the 2-week rotation in Z receive final grades well before six weeks after the end of the required learning experience. In rotations X, Y and Z, 75%, 80% and 74% of students, respectively, receive final grades within 6-weeks, but as many as 9, 8 and 12 weeks elapsed in rotations X, Y and Z, respectively, before all students received final grades.		
Monitoring considerations (if applicable):		

Providing and refining evidence for the assessment of a requirement

A team member, in the first instance, collects information on how a requirement is, or is not met to:

1. establish a basis for the team member's opinion,
2. enable team members, and ultimately CACMS to arrive at the same view,
3. illuminate, if necessary, the basis for a clear and concise finding.

At an early stage

In the evaluation of evidence, the team member may wish to record more detailed information (such as DCI page numbers, DCI table numbers or specific quotations from the DCI or documents found in Core appendices) so that the information is readily accessible when the discussing the evidence with the team to reach a consensus opinion on a recommendation or element.

Using Requirement 9.8-1 as an example, an early iteration of the entry in the "Evidence for assessment of this requirement" box could state something such as:

"The school has one policy for summative assessment in pre-clerkship (*name of policy 1*) and another for clerkship (*name of policy 2*). Policy 1 specifies the timing for summative feedback in Section 3 on page four, and Policy 2 specifies this timing in Section 3, page 4."

Later stage

Once a team consensus is achieved, often the evidence recorded on the Team Evaluation Form can be streamlined.

In this example where the requirement is met, the final iteration of the evidence for Requirement 9.8-1 might merely state something to the effect of:

“Two school policies relating to summative assessment specify a six-week timeline for provision of final grades.”

Typically, in cases where a requirement is not met or monitoring will be recommended, more specific information needs to be retained in the “Evidence for assessment of this requirement” box. An example:

“No mention is made of a specified timeline for provision of final grades in any of the policies/guidelines related to summative assessment.”

Generally, the importation of data tables and lengthy excerpts of documents into the “Evidence for assessment of this requirement” box is discouraged. Readers of the accreditation report can only be referred to tables or documents that are included in the core appendix or a supplemental appendix. If a desired table or document is not in the core appendix, discuss with the team secretary whether its addition as a supplemental appendix is warranted. The addition of supplemental appendices other than the visit schedule is not common.

Refining a preliminary finding (for Elements rated as SM or U)

When an element addresses one or more requirements that are unmet and one or more other requirements that have monitoring considerations, the finding should address the unmet requirement(s).

Example of a finding for Element 9.8 with a citation history and an overall element rating of U

This element was cited at the time of or since the last full accreditation visit yes no

OVERALL ELEMENT RATING

- Satisfactory
- Satisfactory with a need for monitoring
- Unsatisfactory

Early iteration of finding

FINDING (only if rated SM or U)

Data provided in Table 9.8-2 A show that all students in all required learning experiences, EXCEPT for the 8-week clerkship rotation in X, the 4-week rotation in Y and the 2-week rotation in Z receive final grades well before six weeks after the end of the required learning experience. In rotations X, Y and Z, 75 %, 80% and 74% of students, respectively, receive final grades within 6-weeks, but as many as 9, 8 and 12 weeks elapsed in rotations X, Y and Z, respectively, before all students received final grades. Data that shows how soon after the end of the required learning experience students receive final grades is needed. This element was found to be unsatisfactory at the last full visit, resolved to SM two years later and has remained at S since then.

Later iteration of finding

FINDING (only if rated SM or U)

In rotations X, Y and Z, 25%, 20% and 26% of students received final grades later than six weeks after the end of the respective required learning experience. Data are needed to show that by six weeks after the end of each required learning experience of clerkship, final grades are received by students. This element was found to be unsatisfactory at the time of the previous full accreditation visit.

Note: A U finding needs to include:

1. Clear statement(s) identifying the unmet requirement(s).
2. Clear statement(s) outlining the information/data/documents needed that in future would allow the CACMS to award an S.
3. If applicable, a brief statement mentioning a citation history.

Example of a finding for Element 9.8 with a citation history and an overall element rating of SM

This element was cited at the time of or since the last full accreditation visit yes no

OVERALL ELEMENT RATING

- Satisfactory
- Satisfactory with a need for monitoring
- Unsatisfactory

Early iteration

FINDING (only if rated SM or U)

The school implemented a new system of final grade reporting and follow-up in the fall semester. Before then, as many as 25% of students in some clerkship rotations did not receive final grades within six weeks of the end of their required clinical learning experiences. Under the new system, 100% of students, except for one instance where a preceptor was in hospital, received grades within four weeks of the end of the required learning experiences, but only seven months' worth of confirmatory data were available by the end of the second accreditation visit. Data showing a full year's worth of on-time reporting of final grades is needed to determine that the new system can be sustained. This element was found to be unsatisfactory at the last full visit, resolved to SM two years later and has remained at S since then.

Later iteration

FINDING (only if rated SM or U)

Since the implementation of a new system seven months before the visit, students are receiving final grades within six weeks. Monitoring is required to ensure that the system can be sustained for an entire year. This element was found to be unsatisfactory at the last full visit.

Note: An SM finding needs to include:

1. Clear statement that demonstrates that the element is satisfactory.
2. Clear statement of monitoring considerations to be addressed.
3. If applicable, a brief statement mentioning a citation history.