

ALL ELECTIVE EXAMS

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

Please see the transcript of your results on the Elective examination. The transcript provides information with respect to your performance on the examination.

The following information is designed to help you in the interpretation of your reported results.

OVERALL RESULT – This overall reporting is based on how you performed on a combined basis on the objective format and case portions of the examination. Your performance is classified as a “Pass with distinction”, a “Pass”, a “Marginal pass” or a “Fail”.

If you achieved a either a “Pass with distinction”, a “Pass”, a “Marginal pass”, you have met the required standards of this elective module of the CPA Professional Education Program (PEP). Candidates who have successfully passed two (2) elective modules are eligible to proceed to Capstone 1 of the CPA PEP. If you received a FAIL, you are allowed to rewrite one future offering of the examination without repeating the module. You will be required to repeat the module prior to a third attempt at the module examination.

RESULTS BY EXAMINATION SECTION – In addition to your overall status, the transcript provides information with respect to your performance in each of the specific competency areas. The information in your results report is broken down into two distinct areas:

Performance on Objective Format Questions – this section provides information on the objective format questions that you answered as part of the examination. These questions were provided in electronic format on the examination day.

Performance on the Cases – this section provides information on the cases that you answered as part of the examination. These cases were provided on paper (hard) copy on the examination day.

The case results are further broken down by technical competency area assessed, by case. NOT all technical competency areas are assessed on each examination, and therefore you may not receive feedback on some technical competency areas.

Design of Assessment

The Elective blueprint for the Elective exams allows for the objective-format portion of the examination to be between 0-25% of the exam and the case portion therefore to be between 75-100%. The examination is designed to be completed within three hours (180 minutes), however, candidates are given four hours (240 minutes) to respond.

The Elective examination was weighted approximately 25% (30 minutes) for the objective-format portion. (See Elective OFQ weightings in the Elective Blueprints at: <https://www.cpacanada.ca/~media/Site/become-a-cpa/docs/Evaluations/Blueprint%20Elective%20Modules%20Jan2015-E.pdf>)

The case portion was 75% and consisted of two cases for a total of 150 minutes, where a minimum of 50% of the assessment tested competencies specifically in *The CPA Competency Map* listed for this Elective. The remainder of the case component assessed competencies described in the Core or Entry Columns of the Map.

Competency Performance

1-Technical competencies

Performance has been assessed in one of four levels:

1. Not competent
2. Reaching competent
3. Competent
4. Competent with distinction

For each of the cases, you are provided with *your performance* in each relevant technical competency area as indicated by the shading of the assessed level for each area. You are also provided with a breakdown of the *group performance*, which represents the percentage of candidates that attained each of the competency levels, for this particular examination.

Note: For the objective format questions *your performance* is reported for the total of all questions along with the *group performance*.

2-Enabling Skills

In addition, you are provided with feedback on the enabling skills that you demonstrated on each of the cases on the examination. These ‘skills’ are closely correlated with the enabling competencies as set out in the *CPA Competency Map*.

Elective assessments require candidates to identify the appropriate issues, to do a thorough analysis, considering more variables than at Core. Thorough analysis means appropriately using the case facts and using supporting technical rules, theories and techniques where logical to do so. At the Elective level, candidates are expected to suggest a suitable course of action, one that is consistent with their analysis.

The report describes whether you did or did not demonstrate each of the following enabling skills:

- Appropriately **assessed the situation** (i.e. identified the appropriate issue (s) for discussion).

“You did not” is given by the markers where any one of the significant issues is missed.

If the WRONG issue is identified e.g., inventory existence rather than valuation, this is considered an “IDENTIFICATION” issue; if the candidate goes off on a tangent e.g. has a discussion of the audit planning when it was NOT relevant to the role/required then that is a COMMUNICATION issue (see below). It may also be an IDENTIFICATION issue if the “tangent” is the only issue discussed and never sees the real issue.

- Appropriately **analyzed** the issues (debated the issue(s) using case facts and technically appropriate theory (e.g. Tax Act) used to support the analyses).

Where the issues in the case are appropriately analyzed “you did” is given as feedback by the markers. *Candidates are given “you did not” if standards / theory are not discussed or if the incorrect standards are applied ON MORE THAN ONE assessment opportunity.*

- **Integrated** case facts in your analysis (used the case facts provided appropriately to support analyses).

Where the issues use case facts or supporting theories, calculations, and where the discussions are consistent between the qualitative and quantitative analysis, etc. “you did” is given as feedback. *Candidates are given “you did not” if case facts are not used in the discussion to support position ON MORE THAN ONE assessment opportunity. If the candidate simply states the theory and/or concludes immediately, then the response is considered to be missing a key component -- analysis. Candidates that do not use the appropriate tools, or are inconsistent between their quantitative qualitative analysis, more than once, are given “you did not” as feedback.*

- **Concluded** the discussion appropriately (concluded the debate, conclusion flowed logically from analysis).

Where the issues in the case are appropriately concluded upon “you did” is given as feedback. *Candidates are given you did not” if conclusions are missing OR if they are inconsistent with the analysis ON MORE THAN ONE assessment opportunity. Where candidates jump to a conclusion without any supporting analysis, there is no “logical flow” and therefore the response is considered to not have an appropriate conclusion, even where there is a concluding statement or recommendation.*

- Clearly **communicated** within your response (language was clear, used a level of language that was appropriate for the audience, played the appropriate role).

Communication is generally assumed to be “you did”, unless there is strong evidence of a weakness in the clarity of communication. *“You did not” is awarded if either the communication is unclear OR if the wrong role is played OR the level of language is inappropriate for the person the report is addressed to. For language to be “unclear”, it has to be significant enough that the marker repeatedly had difficulty understanding the points being made and therefore hesitated giving Reaching Competent or Competent on MORE THAN ONE Assessment Opportunity.*

Setting the passing standard

In determining which candidates pass, each candidate is judged in relation to pre-established expectations of what an entry-level CPA is able to perform after having taken the Elective. Before the opening of the marking centre, the evaluation guides for the cases are reviewed and applied to randomly selected candidate responses to test the pre-established passing profile, and adjustments are made.

In setting the passing profile, the following factors are considered:

- The level of difficulty of the examination.
- The design and application of the marking guide on the case portion.
- Comments from markers regarding any marking difficulties encountered or any time constraints noted on the case portion.
- Possible ambiguity of wording.

Subsequent appeal of results

Appeals of examination results are permitted for overall assessments of “Fail” only. Candidates may only apply for review of their examination results as a whole.

All responses have been marked once. After the results were recorded, the case portion was remarked for candidates in a set range of the passing standard. Differences between the first and second marking were arbitrated by a third marker, ensuring fairness in marking for the candidate responses around the passing standard.

The following procedures are applied to an appealed result:

- **Objective Format Portion:** Where the objective format questions include a written element (e.g., short answer or fill in the blank) the written responses are reviewed. The objective format questions are verified against the right answers.
- **Case Portion:** Competency-based assessment is applied. A change to the assessment is made only if one or more of the following errors occurred:
 - The markers misapplied the marking guidelines; or
 - The markers failed to consider a relevant section of the candidate’s response (e.g. the markers missed a relevant discussion, etc.); or
 - The markers exhibited poor application of judgment.

Candidates appealing their examination results must forward their request to the Board of Examiners through their provincial body within three business days from results release. Appeals requests will be handled:

- For CPA West candidates, through the My CPA portal.
- For Ontario candidates, refer to the Module 0 discussion board on D2L for instructions.
- For Quebec candidates, email : examens@cpaquebec.ca
- For Caribbean candidates, email: KScarlett@cpacanada.ca
- For CPA Atlantic, email: programs@cpaatlantic.ca

If an appeal is successful, the fee will be refunded.

Appeals results will be available before the next module offerings (see your regional website for details).