Scrub Sink Notes

PRACTICE WORKBOOK

The Medical School Interview

MMI and Panel

Written by a surgical resident in Canada.

36	8	14
practice prompts	story bank worksheets	days of practice

Open the workbook

START HERE

How to use this workbook

Use this workbook to speak, collect evidence, and revise. All prompts are original teaching scenarios. Scenario models are constructed composites, not real applicant answers, actual interview content, or school endorsed responses. The personal section uses composite coaching models and blank learner-owned evidence. Never borrow a biography. This is education, not a guarantee of admission or medical or legal advice. Check the current format with the school.

Practise your answers aloud in your own natural voice.

How to use a station

1. Read the prompt and identify the task: discuss, converse, instruct, collaborate, or answer a personal question.
2. Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes before reading the model. Use a different practice clock only when you have agreed it in advance.
3. Mark what was audible, with one exact sentence or observed action as evidence. Do not give credit for an intention the listener could not hear.
4. Read the composite. Compare the reasoning and actions, not the wording.
5. Repair one behaviour and answer a changed version. Leave room for a different defensible decision.

Use the Five Moves throughout: read and restate; name who is affected; reason through options; decide; state the next step and what would change your mind. These are thinking moves, not a recital. In an acting station, perform the conversation instead of explaining the headings.

For fictional scenarios, keep the supplied role and facts. For personal questions, use your own true events, role, actions, and outcomes. Remove names and unnecessary identifying information without changing the substance. Do not disclose someone else's private experience to make your answer memorable. Get permission from anyone recorded and agree how recordings will be stored or deleted.

Go to the station index

Go to the fourteen day practice plan

Practice notes

NAVIGATION

Station index

Navigation and station inventory

There is one primary prompt per lecture: thirty six in total. Twenty eight have scenario or process composite answers; eight personal and panel exercises use composite coaching models so your evidence remains your own. The follow up in lecture 33 is an additional changed-fact exercise, not a second primary station. Every prompt has a marking guide. Scenario and process stations include two common mistakes. Personal exercises use coaching probes and revision prompts.

Part	Lecture numbers	Practice focus
A	01 to 04	**Baseline, observable evidence, format, Five Moves**
B	05 to 12	**Eight ethical themes**
C	13 to 21	**Acting, task collaboration, instructions, policy**
D	22 to 29	**True stories and personal questions**
E	30 to 33	**Assumptions, constraints, groups, changed facts**
F	34 to 36	**Planning, feedback, day and recovery**
G	Worksheets	**Fourteen days, circuit packets, ratings, system brief**

Marking convention

Use present, partial, or absent against each station's observable moves. These correspond to two, one, and zero on the shared self rating sheet. An unsafe miss is a separate reason to repair a response, not a secret deduction formula. The personal section's zero to two scale has the same practice purpose. No scale is a school rubric, pass mark, or admissions prediction. Do not sum unrelated stations and interpret the total as ability.

Eight story bank worksheet

Fourteen day plan

Self rating sheet

PART A · FOUNDATIONS

STATION 01

Welcome and How to Practise

Original prompt

> A student group can fund either quieter study space or longer tutoring hours. Members disagree. You are asked to recommend a fair way to decide. What would you do?

Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes.

Composite model

Composite answer box

This is a composite model answer. I would first ask what problem members need solved and what constraints the funding has. People who need quiet space and people who need tutoring may face different barriers. I would gather a small amount of relevant input, compare feasible options against agreed criteria, and explain the choice. If a modest trial of either option is possible, I would include a review date and a way to hear from people whose need remains unmet.

Observable marking guide

- Names the relevant needs before choosing criteria.
- Makes a feasible recommendation and review step.
- Recognises whose need remains unmet.

Misses to repair

- Invents funding or claims one preference is morally superior without reasons.

Two common mistakes

1. Listing values without choosing an action. One common mistake is saying fairness, inclusion, and communication without showing what those words would change. The model connects fairness to gathering relevant input and using shared criteria. Your version could make a different recommendation. It still needs a reason and a next step that someone could carry out.
2. Treating the model as a speech to memorise. Another mistake is collecting polished sentences instead of practising decisions. Write down one action from the model that you missed. Close it. Say that action in your own words. The course ends each lecture with one drill for exactly this reason. Reading answers can feel productive while leaving your speaking unchanged.

Variation

Both needs cannot be funded even as a trial. Make a transparent choice and record the unmet need.

Final drill

Before the next lecture, keep this first recording and label one thing you did well and one thing to change. Use observable descriptions. Say, I named the people affected, or, I gave three options but no recommendation. Do not label yourself a good or bad candidate. You will compare this recording with a fresh response near the end of the course.

My notes

One audible strength: _____
One missing action: _____
My revised decision: _____
What would change my mind: _____

PART A / STATION 02

What a Rater Can Observe

Original prompt

> A peer suggests removing a difficult survey response before presenting a student project. They say it is confusing and probably an error. You are on the project team. What would you do?

Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes.

My first attempt

My notes

One audible strength: _____
One missing action: _____
My revised decision: _____
What would change my mind: _____

Turn the page to review the composite answer

STATION 02 / ANSWER AND REVIEW

What a Rater Can Observe

Composite model

Composite answer box

This is a composite model answer. I would not remove a response just because it weakens our result. I would ask what makes my peer think it is an error and review the project's agreed handling of questionable data. The respondent, our team, and anyone relying on the presentation are affected. We need accuracy and a fair account of uncertainty. I would keep the original record and seek guidance from the project supervisor if the rule is unclear.

I would tell my peer that I understand wanting a clear presentation. We can explain an unusual response without hiding it. If we establish a genuine error using a consistent rule, we can describe that decision transparently. If the presentation is imminent, I would flag the uncertainty rather than quietly changing the data. New evidence of an error could change how we analyse it, but pressure for a cleaner result would not.

Observable marking guide

- Distinguishes a genuine data error from an inconvenient response.
- Asks for evidence and uses an agreed process.
- Keeps the record and explains a proportionate escalation.

Misses to repair

- Deletes a response for appearance or publicly accuses the peer before checking.

Two common mistakes

1. Guessing the hidden ideal opinion. A common mistake is treating every scenario as a puzzle with one secret preferred view. You may spend the time trying to sound like the person you imagine the school wants. Instead, make a defensible decision and show its limits. If another option could be reasonable, explain the condition under which you would take it. You can be decisive without pretending uncertainty does not exist.
2. Using polish as a substitute for evidence. Another mistake is grading yourself mainly on filler words or accent. If a listener understands you, focus first on substance. Did you answer, compare, and act? Speech habits can improve with practice, but removing every hesitation does not repair an unsupported conclusion. Change one behaviour at a time so you can tell whether the change helped.

Variation

The peer supplies evidence that a response was entered twice. Revise the handling of that error transparently.

Final drill

Before the next lecture, replay your baseline recording. Make four columns with the common dimensions we used. Under each, quote one sentence that provides evidence. Leave a blank where evidence is missing. Choose the most important blank and write one sentence that would fill it. Say the answer again once, keeping your natural voice and adding that missing action.

PART A / STATION 03

Adapt to the Interview Format

Original prompt

> A volunteer coordinator has changed your shift without asking. You cannot attend the new time. Discuss your approach, then imagine the coordinator is present and speak to them.

Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes.

My first attempt

My notes

One audible strength: _____
One missing action: _____
My revised decision: _____
What would change my mind: _____

Turn the page to review the composite answer

STATION 03 / ANSWER AND REVIEW

Adapt to the Interview Format

Composite model

Composite answer box: discussion

This is a composite model answer. I would check that I understood the change and explain my actual availability. The coordinator may be covering a staffing problem, while I have another commitment I cannot move. I would avoid promising a shift I cannot attend. I would ask whether my original shift or another feasible time would help and give a clear answer soon enough for the coordinator to arrange cover.

Composite answer box: direct conversation

I saw that my shift has moved, and I wanted to check what happened. I cannot attend the new time because of a commitment I cannot change. I can still do the original shift. Is there another time this week that would be useful? I understand that you need reliable cover. I would rather tell you clearly now than agree and cancel later.

If the coordinator says there is no alternative, I would acknowledge the difficulty without inventing availability. I might say, I hear that this leaves a gap. I cannot take that time, but I can send you my available times today. The answer has a boundary and a useful next step. It does not need to win an argument about who caused the scheduling problem.

Observable marking guide

- Changes from describing a plan to speaking directly to the coordinator.
- States actual availability without a false promise.
- Offers one feasible next step and listens for a reply.

Misses to repair

- Continues an analytical monologue during the direct conversation.

Two common mistakes

1. Narrating empathy to an actor. One mistake is saying, I would acknowledge your feelings, while the person waits for you to acknowledge them. Speak to them directly. Try, That sounds frustrating, or, What part is worrying you most? Then allow a reply. Do not use an empathetic opening as a launch pad for a long speech that leaves no room for the person's view.
2. Ignoring the written instructions. Another mistake is preparing so strongly for one format that you perform it everywhere. A request to rank options needs a ranking. A request to give instructions needs usable instructions. If the task has two parts, touch both. When the instruction is genuinely unclear, ask a focused clarification. Do not ask questions merely to delay making a decision.

Variation

The coordinator says no alternative shift exists. Maintain the honest limit and clarify what remains possible.

Final drill

Before the next lecture, use the shift scenario again. Record a thirty second discussion of your approach, then a thirty second direct conversation opening. Compare the verbs. The discussion may describe actions. The conversation should actually perform one. Write down which format you currently find harder and arrange one short practice in that format during the next week.

PART A / STATION 04

The Five Moves

Original prompt

> You organise a free practice workshop. One volunteer has missed two preparation tasks. A teammate wants to remove them immediately. The workshop is tomorrow. What would you do?

Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes.

My first attempt

My notes

One audible strength: _____
One missing action: _____
My revised decision: _____
What would change my mind: _____

Turn the page to review the composite answer

STATION 04 / ANSWER AND REVIEW

The Five Moves

Composite model

Composite answer box

This is a composite model answer. I need to protect tomorrow's workshop while responding fairly to a volunteer whose work is missing. The participants need a usable session, the team needs dependable preparation, and the volunteer deserves a chance to explain. I would check what is actually incomplete and contact the volunteer privately. I would ask whether something has prevented them from completing it and what they can realistically finish today.

Waiting without a backup could leave participants with a poor session. Removing the volunteer without a conversation could be unfair and lose a useful contribution. I would assign a small, time limited task if they can commit to it, while arranging a backup for anything essential. If they are unreachable or cannot do the work, I would reallocate it now. I would tell the team the practical plan without speculating about the volunteer's circumstances.

After the workshop, I would discuss expectations and whether the volunteer wants a different role. Evidence that the task was completed but not shared would change my judgement about reliability. An ongoing pattern without a workable plan might mean ending this responsibility. I would explain that decision directly and respectfully. Support does not require leaving an essential task uncovered, and accountability does not require public criticism.

Observable marking guide

- Restates the workshop decision and immediate deadline.
- Privately checks the missed work without assigning a motive.
- Protects essential tasks with a backup, then reviews the longer term role.

Misses to repair

- Leaves the workshop uncovered while waiting indefinitely or shames the volunteer publicly.

Two common mistakes

1. Turning the Five Moves into a recital. A common mistake is announcing each heading even during an acting conversation. The structure is there to help you think. With an actor, asking what happened may cover restating and gathering context at once. A brief offer may express your decision. Use language that fits the person and task rather than forcing them to listen to your preparation notes.
2. Treating every option as equally acceptable. Another mistake is offering balance without judgement. Some options expose people to avoidable harm or require dishonesty. Explain why you reject them, then compare the reasonable choices. Fairness to another perspective does not require endorsing it. Your listener needs to hear where you stand and why, including the limits of your confidence.

Variation

The volunteer reports an urgent personal crisis. Preserve coverage while adjusting support and avoiding intrusive questions.

Final drill

Before the next lecture, answer the workshop prompt using five lines of notes. Then change one fact: the volunteer tells you they have an urgent personal crisis. Answer again without demanding private details. Keep the workshop covered and adjust your support. Compare the two decisions. Circle the part that changed because of evidence, and underline the principle you kept.

PART B

Ethics

Ethics practice stations

All eight prompts are original teaching scenarios. Every model answer is a composite created for practice, not a real admission answer. Use each model to examine the choices, then practise answering in your own words. These exercises are not medical or legal advice. Apply the role and facts supplied; real duties depend on setting, supervision, policy, and jurisdiction.

Use the Five Moves: read and restate; name who is affected; reason through options; decide; give the next step and what would change your mind. For each station, answer aloud for two minutes before reading the model. Score only what you can hear in the recording. Do not award credit for a principle that never becomes an action.

Marking method

For each strong move, mark present, partial, or absent. Present means the answer names an observable action and connects it to the scenario. Partial means the idea is mentioned without a clear next step. Do not use the total to predict an admissions result. An unsafe miss identifies a reasoning problem to repair before repeating the station.

PART B / STATION 05

Autonomy and Capacity

Companion lecture 05: Autonomy and Capacity. Central skill: Separate disagreement from a concern about decision making.

Prompt

> You volunteer in a clinic. An adult declines a recommended test because missing another shift may cost their job. A relative calls the choice irrational and asks you to persuade the clinician to ignore the refusal. What would you do?

Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes.

My first attempt

Turn the page to review the composite answer

STATION 05 / ANSWER AND REVIEW

Autonomy and Capacity

MODEL ANSWER: composite

This is a composite model answer. I would first clarify what the adult understands about the test and why they wish to decline. I would speak respectfully and, if they agree, arrange a private conversation with the clinician. I would not treat a decision that worries the relative as proof that the adult cannot decide.

The adult may be balancing a health risk against a real threat to their livelihood. The relative may fear harm and feel powerless. The clinician needs accurate information, and the clinic must respect the limits of a volunteer's role. I would ask whether the adult would like help explaining the work concern to the team.

Options might include a different appointment, information about the urgency of the test, or a discussion of available supports. I would ask the clinician about those possibilities without promising they are available. I would also ask whether language, pain, confusion, or pressure from someone else is making the conversation harder.

My immediate choice would be to support an informed conversation and tell the relative I cannot arrange for the refusal to be ignored. If the adult appears unable to follow the discussion, or there is an immediate safety concern, I would promptly involve the responsible clinician. I would avoid debating a capacity label with the family.

My next step would be to help connect the adult with that clinician and confirm what assistance they actually want. New evidence of confusion, coercion, or serious immediate danger would change the urgency of my response. A continued refusal after a supported discussion would not, by itself, justify my overriding the person.

Observable strong moves

- States that refusal alone does not establish inability to decide.
- Asks what the adult understands and why work matters to their choice.
- Offers a supported, private conversation with the responsible clinician.
- Names a concrete trigger for more urgent help, such as new confusion or immediate danger.
- Makes the volunteer role explicit and avoids promising an alternative appointment.

Unsafe misses

- Overrules the adult or asks the relative to decide merely because the refusal seems irrational.
- Walks away after saying it is their choice, without offering clarification or support.
- Claims to make a formal capacity finding as a volunteer.

Two common mistakes

1. Calling disagreement incapacity. Replace the label with the specific concern that needs assessment.
2. Treating autonomy as permission to walk away. Offer information, support, and an appropriate clinical conversation.

Variation

The adult becomes suddenly confused during the discussion. Increase urgency and involve the responsible clinician promptly. Do not attempt to diagnose the cause.

Concrete drill

Record ninety seconds. Separate disagreement from decision making ability, offer one practical support without guaranteeing it, then record your revised next step for sudden confusion.

PART B / STATION 06

Confidentiality and Its Limits

Companion lecture 06: Confidentiality and Its Limits. Central skill: Respond usefully to concern while protecting private information.

Prompt

> At a youth mentoring programme, a participant tells you they are receiving counselling and asks you to keep it private. Their sibling later asks whether they attend counselling, saying, I need to know because they have seemed withdrawn. You are a volunteer mentor. What would you do?

Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes.

My first attempt

Turn the page to review the composite answer

STATION 06 / ANSWER AND REVIEW

Confidentiality and Its Limits

MODEL ANSWER: composite

This is a composite model answer. I would acknowledge the sibling's concern without confirming the counselling information. I might say, I can hear you are worried. I cannot share someone else's private conversations, but I can listen to what has concerned you and help connect you with the programme's appropriate support person.

I would ask what the sibling has noticed and whether they have a specific concern about immediate safety. The participant's privacy matters. The sibling may also have information that warrants action. I would avoid assuming that receiving counselling is itself a danger signal or that a family relationship gives automatic access to private information.

If there is no immediate danger, I would seek guidance from the designated supervisor under programme policy. I would consider speaking privately with the participant, explaining the concern, and asking what support or family involvement they want. I would not promise that every detail can remain secret regardless of what I learn.

My choice now is to keep the counselling disclosure private and respond to the concern through the programme's support process. If the sibling describes a credible immediate threat, I would seek urgent help through the appropriate local route and alert the responsible supervisor. I would share relevant information with people positioned to help. I would keep that disclosure focused on the safety concern.

My next step depends on the urgency of what I hear. I would document or relay factual observations as the programme requires, without adding a diagnosis. Specific evidence of danger would change my response. General curiosity or pressure from the sibling would not be enough for me to disclose the private conversation.

Observable strong moves

- Acknowledges the sibling without confirming counselling.
- Invites concrete observations and checks whether there is a specific immediate safety concern.
- Uses the designated supervisor and local programme process.
- Considers speaking privately with the participant and asking what support they want.
- Limits any justified sharing to the relevant people and information.

Unsafe misses

- Promises absolute secrecy regardless of danger.
- Discloses counselling because the requester is a sibling.
- Dismisses a specific urgent safety concern without seeking help.

Two common mistakes

1. Promising absolute secrecy. Explain honest limits before making a promise you may not be able to keep.
2. Sharing everything because someone is worried. Identify the purpose, recipient, and scope of any disclosure.

Variation

The sibling describes a credible threat of immediate harm. Seek urgent assistance through the appropriate local route and alert the responsible supervisor. Avoid circulating the entire private conversation.

Concrete drill

Record a thirty second reply that does not confirm or deny counselling. Add a specific immediate threat and record a second reply with faster safety action.

PART B / STATION 07

Consent as a Conversation

Companion lecture 07: Consent as a Conversation. Central skill: Check that agreement is informed and voluntary before proceeding.

Prompt

> You help organise a teaching session at a community clinic. A participant has agreed to a demonstration involving an examination. Before it starts, they whisper, Do I have to do this to keep getting appointments here? The clinician says the session is running late. What would you do?

Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes.

My first attempt

Turn the page to review the composite answer

STATION 07 / ANSWER AND REVIEW

Consent as a Conversation

MODEL ANSWER: composite

This is a composite model answer. I would pause the setup and respond to the participant respectfully. I would say, thank you for telling me. I want to make sure your question is answered before this begins. I would ask the responsible clinician to speak with them privately and clarify the relationship between this teaching activity and their care.

The participant may believe that declining could threaten access to appointments. The clinician and learners have a schedule, but their convenience does not resolve that concern. I would avoid telling the participant to carry on because they already agreed. I would also avoid giving detailed clinical explanations that I am not qualified to provide.

I would ask whether they would prefer to stop, have more time, or receive another explanation. I would make clear to the clinician that the question concerns possible pressure, using the participant's words with their knowledge when possible. A private conversation may make it easier for them to express a different preference.

My decision would be to keep the demonstration paused until the responsible clinician has addressed the uncertainty and confirmed how to proceed. I would ask the team to explain any consequences accurately, without using access to care as pressure. If the participant declines, I would support a respectful response and help the team find another teaching arrangement.

My next step would be to check that the participant has a chance to ask questions without the audience waiting over them. If I learn they freely want to continue after a clear explanation, the session may proceed through the proper process. Continued uncertainty, distress, or pressure would mean seeking further supervisory help.

Observable strong moves

- Names the participant's fear that declining might affect appointments.
- Pauses the teaching setup before continuing.
- Requests a private explanation from the responsible clinician.
- Uses an open question and gives the participant room to explain their understanding.
- Explains how uncertainty, a decision to decline, or a request to stop changes the next action.

Unsafe misses

- Treats the earlier agreement or signature as enough despite the new concern.
- Pushes the participant to continue because the clinician is running late.
- Invents a guarantee about care access or supplies clinical consent beyond the volunteer role.

Two common mistakes

1. Treating a signature as the whole answer. New uncertainty requires clarification before proceeding.
2. Reassuring beyond your authority. Obtain an accurate explanation and protect the opportunity to choose.

Variation

The examination has started and the participant asks to stop. State an immediate pause and involve the responsible clinician before discussing whether or how to continue.

Concrete drill

Record one minute with a respectful interruption and one open question. Then practise your first sentence when the participant asks to stop during the demonstration.

PART B / STATION 08

Truth Telling and Repair

Companion lecture 08: Truth Telling and Repair. Central skill: Own a known error and start practical repair.

Prompt

> As a hospital volunteer, you misread a notice and tell a visitor their appointment has been cancelled. They return upset after missing check in. Another volunteer suggests saying the visitor arrived late, because admitting the error could upset the supervisor. What would you do?

Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes.

My first attempt

Turn the page to review the composite answer

STATION 08 / ANSWER AND REVIEW

Truth Telling and Repair

MODEL ANSWER: composite

This is a composite model answer. I would tell the visitor that I gave them incorrect information and apologise directly. I would avoid blaming them or the notice. I would ask them to stay with the appropriate staff while I promptly explain what happened to my supervisor and the clinic team, within the volunteer process.

The visitor has lost time and may have practical or health concerns. The clinic needs an accurate account to decide what help is possible. My supervisor needs to understand the error, and the other volunteer may be acting from fear. Those pressures do not justify changing the facts or asking the visitor to accept blame.

I would say to the other volunteer that I cannot describe the visitor as simply late when my information contributed to the delay. I would not turn that conversation into an argument in front of the visitor. The priority is to connect the visitor with staff who can assess what happened and arrange an appropriate response.

My decision is to report my error promptly and help repair its effects. I would ask the clinic what the visitor should do next and offer practical assistance within my role. I would not promise they can be seen today, offer clinical reassurance, or independently negotiate a result that staff have not authorised.

My next step would be to confirm that a responsible staff member has received the concern and that the visitor knows who is helping. If I learn of an urgent health concern, I would alert clinical staff immediately. I would follow the local reporting process and later ask how volunteers can avoid misreading the same notice.

Observable strong moves

- Clearly says the volunteer gave incorrect information.
- Offers a direct apology without blaming the visitor.
- Tells the supervisor and clinic team promptly through the appropriate process.
- Helps obtain an accurate next step without guaranteeing a same day appointment.
- Checks the handover and distinguishes known effects from effects needing assessment.

Unsafe misses

- Agrees to describe the visitor as simply late.
- Alters an account or record to hide the error.
- Says no harm occurred or promises a replacement appointment without knowing.

Two common mistakes

1. Explaining before acknowledging. State the error and apologise before giving context.
2. Promising a result to earn forgiveness. Promise a concrete action you can perform.

Variation

The first supervisor dismisses the concern. Use the next appropriate support route while continuing to address the visitor's immediate needs. Report the facts without launching a public argument.

Concrete drill

Write three spoken sentences: state the error, apologise without an excuse, and name who you will contact now. Add a dismissive supervisor and practise the next escalation.

PART B / STATION 09

Fair Resource Allocation

Companion lecture 09: Fair Resource Allocation. Central skill: Use relevant criteria and a fair process for a scarce resource.

Prompt

> A community programme has one remaining transport seat for clinic visits. Two people request it. One is a regular donor whom the coordinator wants to reward. The other is new to the programme. You help with bookings, and neither person's urgency or alternative transport is known. What would you do?

Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes.

My first attempt

Turn the page to review the composite answer

STATION 09 / ANSWER AND REVIEW

Fair Resource Allocation

MODEL ANSWER: composite

This is a composite model answer. I would explain that both requests deserve consideration through the programme's allocation process. I would ask what the transport service is intended to prioritise and whether a policy already sets the criteria. I would not give the donor priority simply as a reward for contributions.

Both people may depend on the ride. Staff also need a workable process, and donors need confidence that support serves the programme's purpose. I would ask the appropriate coordinator to gather the minimum relevant information about need and alternatives. Any assessment of clinical urgency should come from a qualified source through an appropriate process.

I would explore whether another ride, a different time, or another suitable support is available, without promising it exists. If the requests remain tied under the relevant criteria, I would ask for a transparent tie breaking process consistent with programme policy. I would avoid changing criteria to favour the person whose story I prefer.

My decision now is to pause preferential booking long enough for the responsible coordinator to apply a fair process promptly. I would explain my concern respectfully and escalate through the programme's appropriate route if pressure to favour the donor continues. I would avoid making either person argue their worth against the other in public.

My next step would be to confirm who will decide and when both people will hear back. New information about relevant need or a workable alternative could change the outcome. I would explain the decision without revealing the other person's private details, offer the available review route, and seek help for the person left without a seat.

Observable strong moves

- Identifies the programme's purpose before selecting criteria.
- Rejects donor reward as an automatic priority.
- Seeks relevant information through the proper process and keeps clinical urgency assessment with a qualified source.
- Explores feasible alternatives without inventing resources.
- Names who decides, when people hear back, and how review works without disclosing the other person's details.

Unsafe misses

- Prioritises wealth, popularity, donations, or presumed social worth.
- Makes a clinical urgency judgment from the limited booking information.
- Leaves the decision unresolved indefinitely while gathering unnecessary information.

Two common mistakes

1. Rewarding social value. Explain why a difference is relevant to this resource's purpose.
2. Choosing a lottery before checking relevant differences. Use an appropriate tie breaking route only after applying the relevant criteria.

Variation

Both requests are equal under the programme's criteria. Explain a transparent tie breaking process consistent with policy and an action for the person who misses out.

Concrete drill

Record ninety seconds. Name the purpose, one needed fact, one irrelevant fact, and the review route. Then practise the genuine tie variation.

PART B / STATION 10

A Colleague in Trouble

Companion lecture 10: A Colleague in Trouble. Central skill: Take immediate safety action while supporting the colleague respectfully.

Prompt

> At a community volunteer event, another student is unsteady and smells of alcohol before a scheduled drive carrying participants. They say they barely slept and ask you to keep quiet because they need this reference. The vehicle is about to leave. What would you do?

Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes.

My first attempt

Turn the page to review the composite answer

STATION 10 / ANSWER AND REVIEW

A Colleague in Trouble

MODEL ANSWER: composite

This is a composite model answer. I would act immediately to prevent the drive from starting and alert the event supervisor. I would tell the student calmly that I am concerned they may not be safe to drive. I would describe the unsteadiness and the smell I noticed, without claiming to know why they are occurring.

The participants need safe transport. The student may need help themselves, and the organiser has responsibility for the event. I would ask the supervisor to arrange a safe alternative and assess what further assistance is appropriate. I would not agree to keep the concern secret because the student needs a reference.

If the student is willing, I would speak with them privately while the supervisor takes over the transport problem. I would ask whether they feel unwell and what help they need. I would avoid interrogating them about alcohol use or announcing my suspicions to other volunteers. Those conversations would not make the immediate drive safer.

My choice is to prioritise safety and make a factual report through the event's process. If the student attempts to drive despite the concern, I would use the appropriate urgent local safety route. I would avoid a physical struggle over the vehicle. If they appear acutely unwell, I would seek emergency assistance according to the situation.

My next step would be to confirm the supervisor has taken responsibility for the participants and the student. I would help arrange a safe way for the student to leave if directed. New signs of medical distress or an attempt to drive would increase urgency. Later, I would support a fair review and appropriate help without promising a particular disciplinary outcome.

Observable strong moves

- Acts to stop the departure and alerts the supervisor immediately.
- Describes unsteadiness and the smell as observations, without diagnosing intoxication.
- Seeks safe transport arrangements for participants and appropriate help for the student.
- Refuses secrecy while keeping the conversation private when feasible.
- Names an urgent response if the student attempts to drive or appears acutely unwell.

Unsafe misses

- Lets the vehicle leave to protect the student's reference.
- Delays urgent action until a private conversation proves the cause.
- Uses a public accusation or physical confrontation that could increase danger.

Two common mistakes

1. Protecting the reference before protecting people. State an immediate action that changes the situation.
2. Public accusation and punishment. Report observations and allow an appropriate assessment and fair process.

Variation

There is no smell of alcohol, only sudden unsteadiness. Keep the driving safety concern and seek appropriate help while remaining open about the cause.

Concrete drill

Record the first twenty seconds with the immediate action first. Add one private sentence containing care and a clear boundary. Repeat without the alcohol cue.

PART B / STATION 11

Boundaries and Gifts

Companion lecture 11: Boundaries and Gifts. Central skill: Set a respectful boundary without abandoning the person's access problem.

Prompt

> You volunteer at a clinic and often help a visitor understand forms. They offer you a valuable watch and ask for your personal phone number so you can arrange their future appointments. They say refusing would insult their family. What would you do?

Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes.

My first attempt

Turn the page to review the composite answer

STATION 11 / ANSWER AND REVIEW

Boundaries and Gifts

MODEL ANSWER: composite

This is a composite model answer. I would thank the visitor and recognise the kindness behind the offer. I would explain gently that I cannot accept the watch or arrange appointments through my personal number. I would keep the conversation respectful and private. I would not call their gift improper or suggest they were buying influence.

The visitor may feel grateful, face difficulty navigating the clinic, or worry that support will disappear. I also need to consider fair access for other visitors and the limits of my role. A valuable personal gift linked to private booking help could create expectations that I cannot meet and that the clinic has not authorised.

I would ask what makes arranging appointments difficult and offer to connect them with the clinic's appropriate contact. With their agreement, I could help explain the access problem to my supervisor. I would check the volunteer policy for handling the offer, including whether a card or message of thanks to the team would be a suitable alternative.

My decision is to decline the valuable watch and personal booking arrangement while continuing appropriate assistance. I would say that I appreciate the gesture and want to keep helping through the clinic. If they feel insulted, I would listen and explain the boundary calmly. Their disappointment would not make a private arrangement appropriate.

My next step would be to involve my supervisor for policy guidance and a sustainable way to address the appointment difficulty. If I learn there is an approved way for the family to thank the team, I can share that option. New information about cultural meaning might change my wording, but would not remove the concern about special access.

Observable strong moves

- Thanks the visitor and acknowledges the meaning of the offer.
- Identifies the valuable gift and private appointment access as linked concerns.
- Declines the watch and personal booking arrangement respectfully.
- Asks what makes booking difficult and offers a formal support route.
- Seeks local policy guidance and considers an approved way to thank the team.

Unsafe misses

- Accepts the valuable gift and offers special access to avoid offence.
- Promises personal availability that the volunteer role cannot sustain.
- Accuses the giver of bribery or generalises about the family's culture.

Two common mistakes

1. Accepting to avoid an awkward moment. Address the expectation respectfully before it grows.
2. Inventing a universal gift ban. Explain the specific concern and consult the applicable policy.

Variation

The gift becomes a handwritten card for the team with no request attached. Explain how value, recipient, and expectations have changed, then check the relevant policy.

Concrete drill

Record forty seconds with thanks, one clear boundary, and one formal support route. Avoid opening with bribery or inappropriate. Repeat using the card variation.

PART B / STATION 12

Social Media and Professionalism

Companion lecture 12: Social Media and Professionalism. Central skill: Recognise combined identification risks and limit further exposure.

Prompt

> A fellow clinic volunteer posts about an inspiring encounter. No name appears, but the post includes the clinic, the day, a rare personal circumstance, and a photograph with an appointment board in the background. They say the visitor agreed to the story. What would you do?

Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes.

My first attempt

Turn the page to review the composite answer

STATION 12 / ANSWER AND REVIEW

Social Media and Professionalism

MODEL ANSWER: composite

This is a composite model answer. I would contact the volunteer privately and ask them to take the post out of public view promptly because the combined details and background image may identify someone. I would avoid repeating the details in a public comment. I would also inform the appropriate clinic supervisor through the local privacy process.

The visitor's privacy and dignity are central. Other people on the appointment board may be affected too. The volunteer may have intended to celebrate the visitor, but that intention does not establish that the disclosure is acceptable. I would explain the specific concern. I would avoid assuming they intended harm.

I would not assume that the visitor's agreement covered the photograph, background information, audience, or every detail in the story. The supervisor can determine what policy applies, what facts need to be preserved, and who should assess any required response. I would not download, forward, or repost the image to a group to gather opinions.

My decision is to act promptly to reduce further exposure and report the concern factually. Taking the post down may help, but copies or shares may already exist. I would avoid promising the visitor that all traces can be erased. Contact with affected people and any formal response should follow the responsible team's process.

My next step would be to confirm that the supervisor has received the concern and that the volunteer understands why further sharing must stop. If identifiable information is visible or the post is spreading, urgency increases. Even if the background proves unreadable, I would still ask the team to review the combined story details and the permission claimed.

Observable strong moves

- Names at least two identification routes from the prompt, including the background image or combined details.
- Contacts the volunteer privately and seeks prompt removal from public view.
- Notifies the responsible supervisor through the local privacy process.
- Avoids reposting or forwarding the image to solicit opinions.
- Recognises that claimed permission and deletion do not settle the entire response.

Unsafe misses

- Approves the post because no name appears.
- Treats the visitor's agreement as permission to disclose everyone on the board.
- Repeats the details publicly or promises that deletion erases all exposure.

Two common mistakes

1. Treating no name as anonymous. Review the cluster of details, image, caption, and comments.
2. Treating deletion as a complete repair. Reduce exposure and support the responsible team's assessment and response.

Variation

The photograph is removed. Consider whether the clinic, day, and rare circumstance can still identify the visitor, and explain why review remains necessary.

Concrete drill

Record one minute with two risks, one immediate action, and the supervisor handover. Repeat without the photograph, then propose an original composite teaching post.

PART C

Acting, teamwork, instructions, and policy

Timing rule for this workbook

The two minute clock in the individual exercise instructions is for the first isolated attempt. When a station is used in a mock circuit, the agreed circuit clock replaces every individual timing instruction, including those on actor cards. The standard circuit packet below uses one minute to read, four minutes to respond, one minute for the follow up, and two minutes for written feedback. Brief both friends before starting. These are practice choices, not a school's format.

Interactive stations: lectures 13 to 21

All prompts below are original. Every model is a composite for practice. They are not real interview content. Use the Five Moves throughout: read and restate; identify who is affected; reason through options; decide; state the next step and what would change your mind. In acting exercises, apply these moves through conversation rather than explaining them to the actor.

For every station, allow the applicant to read the prompt, then say, "Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes." Keep two minutes for the first attempt. Give feedback afterwards, then repeat once if useful. Do not interrupt with coaching. Feedback should identify an observable strength, a missed opportunity, and one change to practise. No score predicts an admissions result.

PART C / STATION 13

Difficult News Without Pretending to Be a Doctor

One skill: Give clear, compassionate information while staying within your role.

Original prompt

> You volunteer at a community arts centre. A participant arrives to collect a painting submitted to a display. The coordinator has confirmed that a storage leak destroyed it. You must tell the participant. No replacement or compensation has been approved. Speak with the participant.

Actor or facilitator instructions

One applicant and one actor. The actor plays the participant, not a clinician. Let the applicant give the news before replying. Then say, "I painted it with a parent who has died." If asked what you need, ask why the painting was not protected. Later ask whether the centre will pay. Do not invent another event or an immediate safety concern. If the applicant offers choices, prefer a later call with the coordinator. The facilitator keeps two minutes and does not coach during the response.

Marking guide

Look for a brief warning followed by the confirmed fact, a real pause, a response to the painting's meaning, honest limits on explanations and compensation, and an agreed contact step. The Five Moves should guide the conversation silently: understand the task, notice those affected, consider available help, choose a response, and adapt to the participant's preference. Do not reward an analytical speech delivered at the actor.

Concise composite model

Composite model: "I have upsetting news about your painting. A storage leak destroyed it. I am very sorry this happened while it was with the centre." Pause. "It sounds as though the painting held something you cannot replace. I do not know why the storage arrangements failed, and I cannot promise compensation. I can help you contact the coordinator. Would you prefer to speak now or arrange a later call?" Confirm the chosen contact step and what still needs an answer.

Two common mistakes

- Burying the known fact beneath vague reassurance.
- Promising money or an explanation outside your authority.

Followup variation: The participant wants the coordinator immediately. The actor accepts an offer to request the coordinator, while recognizing that immediate availability is not guaranteed.

One drill: Practise one clear fact, a genuine pause, and a response to the actor's concern. Ask the actor whether the news and next step were both clear.

PART C / STATION 14

Speaking with an Angry Person

One skill: Respond to the concern beneath anger while maintaining a workable boundary.

Original prompt

> At a volunteer tutoring centre, you manage the sign in desk. A parent arrives for a session that was moved without their knowledge. They have travelled twice this week and demand immediate teaching for their child. No tutor is available now. Speak with the parent.

Actor or facilitator instructions

One applicant and one actor. The actor plays the parent; no child actor is needed. Begin, "This is our second wasted trip. Find someone to teach my child now." When asked, say no change message reached you. After the applicant acknowledges the disruption, repeat the demand. Once, say, "You are useless." If the applicant sets a respectful boundary, lower your voice and explain that repeated travel disrupts work. Give a preferred contact method when asked. The facilitator keeps two minutes.

Marking guide

Look for a specific acknowledgment of the repeated trip, a focused question, attention to the child's situation and appropriate privacy, an honest statement that no tutor is available, and one useful choice. If insults occur, the applicant should describe the boundary steadily and continue offering help. The Five Moves should appear through listening, options, a decision, and a confirmed next step, not spoken analysis.

Concise composite model

Composite model: "You expected a session and have made a second trip. I am sorry for that disruption. What message did you receive?" After listening: "I cannot provide a tutor today because none is available. I can contact the coordinator about the next session and a reliable confirmation method." If insulted: "I want to help. I can continue while we speak without personal insults." Offer a call now or an agreed reply later. Confirm what is arranged and still pending.

Two common mistakes

- Telling the parent to calm down before hearing the problem.
- Promising a tutor or preferential slot that you cannot provide.

Followup variation: The parent says they must leave immediately. The actor accepts a brief confirmation of contact details and an explanation of the request being passed on.

One drill: The actor repeats the same demand twice. Each time, the applicant reflects the concern, maintains the practical limit, and offers one realistic choice.

PART C / STATION 15

The Friend Who Wants a Cover Story

One skill: Refuse a false account clearly while offering truthful support.

Original prompt

> A friend missed a required volunteer shift. They ask you to tell the coordinator that you saw them become ill that morning, although you did not see them. They say losing the position would damage their application. Speak with your friend.

Actor or facilitator instructions

One applicant and one actor. The actor plays the friend. Start by asking the applicant to say they saw you become ill that morning. If the applicant clarifies, confirm they did not see you. Say you overslept and panicked. Then ask, "Would you risk our friendship over one mistake?" If offered honest help, accept help drafting your own message. Do not add immediate danger or claim a real school has a specific rule. The facilitator keeps two minutes.

Marking guide

Look for clarification of what the friend requests, acknowledgment of pressure, a definite refusal to invent a witnessed event, and an honest alternative that leaves the explanation with the friend. The applicant should consider the coordinator and people relying on the shift without lecturing the actor. Changing information may change support, but does not justify a false statement. Look for an agreed next step.

Concise composite model

Composite model: "I hear that you are worried about losing the position. Are you asking me to say I saw you ill? I did not see you that morning, and I cannot give that account. I care about you. I can help you prepare an honest message acknowledging the missed shift and asking what to do next. I cannot promise the coordinator's response. You choose what personal context to share and send the message yourself."

Two common mistakes

- A tentative refusal that sounds open to negotiation.
- Promising absolute secrecy before understanding what might emerge.

Followup variation: The friend says the applicant actually saw them later that afternoon. The applicant may confirm only what they truly observed, without turning that observation into evidence of the morning.

One drill: Refuse once clearly and offer two truthful forms of help as the conversation continues. The actor repeats the boundary back to check whether it was unambiguous.

PART C / STATION 16

Solving a Task with a Partner

One skill: Build and verify a shared plan with a partner.

Original prompt

> With a partner, order four word cards from left to right: cedar, maple, pine, willow. You know cedar is first and pine is immediately before willow. Your partner holds another rule. Share the rules aloud, agree on the order, and check every rule.

Actor or facilitator instructions

Use four paper word cards, with one word per card: cedar, maple, pine, willow. No diagram is required. Give the applicant a private rule card reading, "Cedar is first. Pine is immediately before willow." Give the partner a private rule card reading, "Maple is not last." Both know they must use every card once in a left to right row. The partner shares the private rule when invited and may ask whether another card could go between pine and willow. The facilitator gives two minutes.

Marking guide

Look for an invitation to share rules, a joint restatement of the goal, reasoning that includes the partner's constraint, a concrete proposal, and a check of every rule. The Five Moves should support the task and partner participation. A correct order does not excuse ignoring the partner. A courteous discussion without a correct checked result is also incomplete.

Concise composite model

Composite model: "Let us share our rules first. Cedar is first, and pine immediately precedes willow. What do you have?" After hearing maple is not last: "The pine and willow pair cannot be second and third because maple would be last. I suggest cedar, maple, pine, willow. Does that fit your information? Let us check each rule and count each card once." Read the checked final order aloud.

Two common mistakes

- Narrating your own deductions without leaving room for input.
- Treating a partner's agreement as a substitute for checking the rules.

Followup variation: The facilitator adds, "Willow is last." This confirms the existing solution. The applicant should check it without needlessly moving the cards.

One drill: Run the task twice with roles exchanged. On the second attempt, nobody moves a card until both private rule cards have been read aloud.

Task answer key

The only valid order is cedar, maple, pine, willow. Cedar occupies position one. Pine and willow must be adjacent in that order. Putting them second and third forces maple into last place, violating the partner's rule. Therefore the pair occupies positions three and four, with maple second.

PART C / STATION 17

Giving Clear Instructions

One skill: Give precise instructions with shared reference points and observable checks.

Original prompt

> Your partner has five paper cards labelled sun, rain, wind, snow, cloud. Give verbal instructions to produce this left to right order: cloud, sun, wind, rain, snow. The partner may ask questions. Do not touch the cards. Finish by checking the full sequence aloud.

Actor or facilitator instructions

Prepare five paper cards labelled sun, rain, wind, snow, cloud, one of each. Shuffle them in front of the partner. Show only the applicant the target sequence: cloud, sun, wind, rain, snow. The applicant may speak and look but may not touch the cards. Use the partner's left and right throughout. The partner follows the actual wording, asks one genuine clarification question about a term such as "immediately," and reads the sequence when asked. The facilitator gives two minutes.

Marking guide

Look for checking the available cards, agreeing on direction, giving one manageable action at a time, welcoming clarification, and comparing the actual final row with the target. The Five Moves should guide preparation and checking. "Do you understand?" alone does not verify the product. Credit a clear repair if an instruction is misinterpreted.

Concise composite model

Composite model: "We will use your left and right. Do you have all five named cards? Place cloud at your far left. Put sun immediately to its right, with no card between them. Next put wind to the right of sun. Please read the row so far. Now add rain, then snow, each to the right of the last card. Read the full row from your left to your right." Compare the reply with the target and correct any discrepancy.

Two common mistakes

- Giving the entire sequence while the partner is still locating the first card.
- Blaming the listener instead of replacing an ambiguous instruction.

Followup variation: The partner begins facing the opposite direction. The applicant must establish whose left is being used before giving spatial instructions.

One drill: Shuffle the cards and guide a partner without touching them. After the final spoken check, rewrite the least clear instruction as a single concrete action.

Task answer key

From the partner's left to right, the completed row is cloud, sun, wind, rain, snow. Every card appears once. Small physical gaps are allowed. "Immediately" means that no other card sits between the two named cards.

PART C / STATION 18

Following and Checking Instructions

One skill: Clarify consequential ambiguity, act, and verify the completed task.

Original prompt

> A facilitator asks you to arrange four word cards in a row. Follow these instructions: put blue first, put green beside blue, put red after green, and put gold last. Clarify any wording that could produce different results. Then arrange the cards and read the final order aloud.

Actor or facilitator instructions

Use four paper word cards labelled blue, green, red, gold. The facilitator reads the prompt exactly and gives two minutes. Answer clarification questions using the key below. Do not deliberately mislead or introduce extra rules. The applicant arranges the row after obtaining the information needed. No diagram or hidden object is used. The reading direction needs clarification. Once direction is clear, the other constraints force the relative placements, so do not expect redundant placement questions. Discuss this distinction during feedback.

Marking guide

Look for a restatement that every card is used in one row, a question about reading direction, inference of the remaining positions from the complete constraints, and a rule by rule final check. The Five Moves support the task without requiring constant permission. Good questions resolve alternatives. Repeated requests for approval after clear instructions do not add accuracy.

Concise composite model

Composite model: "Should first to last mean my left to my right? Thank you. Blue is first, so green must be its neighbour in second place. Gold is last, leaving third place for red, which is after green. I will arrange that row, then check it." Place blue, green, red, gold. "From my left to right I have blue, green, red, gold. Blue is first, green is immediately to its right, red follows green, and gold is last. Does that match the intended instructions?"

Two common mistakes

- Silently guessing about a reference point that could change the result.
- Arguing about blame while leaving a correctable task error unresolved.

Followup variation: The facilitator changes the instruction to, "Use my left to my right," while sitting opposite. The applicant should establish the shared orientation before arranging cards.

One drill: Run the original task, then exchange roles. Identify one question that prevented a different plausible action and one question that would have added no useful information.

Task answer key

Use the applicant's left to right. First means the far left position. Green is immediately to the right of blue. Red is immediately to the right of green. Gold is farthest right. The correct order is blue, green, red, gold.

PART C / STATION 19

Policy When You Do Not Know the Facts

One skill: Make an actionable conditional recommendation when essential evidence is missing.

Original prompt

> A fictional community clinic proposes accepting routine appointment requests only through an online portal. Its stated goal is reducing administrative work. You have no data on patients, staffing, cost, or access. Discuss whether the clinic should proceed and what information would affect your recommendation.

Actor or facilitator instructions

One applicant and one facilitator. Read the prompt and give two minutes. Do not supply current health system facts or invent clinic data. If asked for missing information, reply, "That information is not provided. Explain how it would affect your decision." For feedback, distinguish statements supplied by the prompt from assumptions. The goal is a reasoned recommendation under uncertainty.

Marking guide

Look for an accurate restatement, identification of patients and staff affected, separation of the stated goal from proven benefit, comparison of practical options, a provisional recommendation, and a specific review trigger. The Five Moves should culminate in an action. Do not reward invented figures or universal claims about technology, cost, or patient preferences.

Concise composite model

Composite model: "I would distinguish adding a portal from removing all other channels. The claimed reduction in administrative work is not established. Patients, people helping them, and staff may face different consequences. I would provisionally test an optional portal with an accessible alternative, after agreeing on what to measure. I would ask about current request failures, workload, patient barriers, and support needs. If the test missed people or increased workload, I would revise or stop it before expansion."

Two common mistakes

- Presenting intended benefits as facts already demonstrated.
- Listing missing data without making any recommendation or next step.

Followup variation: The facilitator says the current process also has unresolved problems. The applicant should compare both options against the same criteria instead of treating existing practice as automatically satisfactory.

One drill: Record a response, list every factual statement, and mark its source. Rewrite unsupported statements as explicit assumptions, possibilities, or questions. Finish with an action and review trigger.

PART C / STATION 20

Arguing Both Sides Fairly

One skill: Represent both positions fairly before explaining a considered preference.

Original prompt

> A fictional training centre proposes assigning all limited practice room bookings by a random draw instead of first come, first served. Discuss the strongest argument for each approach. Recommend a process, including how you would respond to people who disagree.

Actor or facilitator instructions

One applicant and one facilitator. Read the prompt and give two minutes. Supply no demand statistics or claims about current booking practices. After the answer, ask the applicant to describe the strongest concern of someone who disagrees. The applicant should use the same comparison criteria for both approaches and should not invent the motives of their supporters.

Marking guide

Look for the shared allocation goal, people affected, a strong argument and real concern for each option, a provisional decision, and a process for hearing feedback and reviewing the result. The Five Moves should end in a recommendation. Equal respect for opposing arguments does not require an undecided conclusion.

Concise composite model

Composite model: "First come, first served offers a clear priority rule: earlier requests precede later ones. Immediate confirmation would depend on mechanics not described here. A draw within a defined window could separate allocation from speed. I would examine whether people can use either process and whether uncertainty makes rooms harder to use. Provisionally, I favour a draw with clear rules, prompt results, and a way to release unused slots. I would acknowledge the value of a clear priority rule, invite practical concerns, and review whether the test improves opportunity without making planning substantially harder."

Two common mistakes

- Portraying the opposing side as selfish instead of giving its strongest reason.
- Saying both sides have points without choosing or explaining a review condition.

Followup variation: The facilitator asks for a first come recommendation. The applicant should make its strongest legitimate case without pretending the original uncertainty has disappeared.

One drill: Record two answers with opposite recommendations. Check whether each gives the other side a fair argument, then state your considered preference and what would change it.

PART C / STATION 21

Preparing Your Health System Brief

One skill: Plan a scoped, source based health system brief without national stereotypes.

Original prompt

> Your discussion group asks you to prepare a Canada and United States comparison of how a hypothetical adult obtains a nonurgent appointment. Explain how you would build the brief. Do not assume that coverage, costs, or access rules apply uniformly. Include what you would verify and how you would use the result.

Actor or facilitator instructions

One applicant and one facilitator. Read the prompt and give two minutes. This is a preparation exercise; do not research during it or require factual claims about either country. If the applicant offers an unverified system assertion, ask what source and scope would be needed before including it. The facilitator assesses how the applicant would prepare and use the brief, not recall of current rules.

Marking guide

Look for a defined hypothetical adult, type of appointment and location in each country, identical comparison questions, a plan to verify relevant rules, separation of evidence and interpretation, and an update trigger. The Five Moves should connect the brief to a real pathway or decision. Do not reward a broad Canada versus United States slogan.

Concise composite model

Composite model: "I would define the same appointment type and a clearly described adult in a specific location in each country. I would ask how the person finds a service, requests an appointment, establishes applicable eligibility or coverage, checks possible payment, and finds alternatives. I would use responsible current sources, record scope and verification details, and flag uncertainty. The brief would separate verified information, interpretation, and unanswered questions. I would update it when circumstances, sources, or applicable rules changed."

Two common mistakes

- Treating a country label as enough to predict an individual pathway.
- Collecting interesting facts that do not answer the chosen question.

Followup variation: The hypothetical adult changes location or circumstances. The applicant should identify which fields need reverification rather than copying the earlier conclusion.

One drill: Create a one page template with no system facts: person, service, locations, comparison questions, source fields, limitations, interpretation, unresolved questions, and review trigger.

PART D

Personal and panel questions

Personal and panel practice

These are original practice prompts. They are not drawn from any school's interview. Coaching demonstrations show what truthful evidence must accomplish; they are not complete applicant responses and contain no biography to borrow. Use your own experiences, or leave an evidence field blank until you can supply one honestly.

Keep one overall method: **Five Moves: restate; who is affected; options; decide; next step and what would change your mind.** In personal answers, adapt the evidence: select a true event, describe your action, explain the consequence, reflect, and connect its relevance. Do not recite the method's labels in an interview. Let them organise your thinking.

For every station, read the prompt, say **"Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes."**, and record an answer. The practice time is a learning exercise, not a claim about a school's timing.

Self-marking scale

Score each of the five station criteria from zero to two: zero means missing or unsupported, one means present but unclear, and two means clear and supported. The maximum is ten. These are coaching criteria, not an admissions rubric or an estimate of selection likelihood. A truthful answer with a disappointing result can meet every criterion.

After marking, choose one change and answer again. Do not rewrite every sentence. Practise responding to the probe without making the story more impressive or more certain than the evidence permits.

PART D / STATION 22

Build Your Eight True Stories

> **Prompt, verbatim:** Describe a time you accepted responsibility when the outcome was uncertain. What did you do, and what did you learn?

Marking guide

1. Identifies a true event and the responsibility the learner actually held.
2. Explains the uncertainty and the people affected without unnecessary private detail.
3. Makes the learner's decision and action visible, including appropriate help.
4. Reports a consequence accurately, separating personal contribution from group work.
5. Gives a specific reflection and a future action relevant to responsibility.

Composite coaching model: answer planning, not a complete applicant response

Begin with [learner-owned event and responsibility]. Explain [uncertainty and who depended on the action]. Compare [options actually considered]. Describe [learner's action and reason], then [observed consequence and limits of attribution]. Close with [specific reflection and future change]. The fields need the learner's evidence; the structure supplies none.

Composite coaching sentence repair, not applicant evidence: Replace "I took responsibility" with "I checked [actual task], found [observed detail], and [action actually taken] because [reason]." Add [consequence actually observed]. Each field is learner-owned. Do not fill it with an imagined task or result.

Probes: What could you influence? Who helped? What would you change if the outcome had been different? What might another person present add?

Revision: One vague claim to replace: _____. One exact action to add: _____.

Practice notes

PART D / STATION 23

Why Medicine

> **Prompt, verbatim:** Why do you want to become a physician, and what experiences have helped you test that choice?

Marking guide

1. States a coherent, personal reason for the choice.
2. Connects the reason to truthful experience and accurately describes the learner's role.
3. Explains why the physician's combination of responsibilities is relevant, respecting other careers.
4. Discusses a difficulty or uncertainty that has genuinely informed the decision.
5. Identifies what remains to learn and how the learner would test that understanding.

Composite coaching model: analytical answer plan, not a complete applicant response

The selection question needs a supported explanation of a choice. Establish [learner-owned central reason]. Connect [true experience, action or observation] to [what the learner learned about the work]. Explain [why that combination of responsibilities matters], with [a fairly considered alternative]. Include [a genuine difficulty considered] and [an open question or next learning step]. Neither scientific interest nor a wish to help supplies the whole explanation without the learner's interpretation.

Composite coaching sentence repair, not applicant evidence: If a real conversation informed the choice, replace "I learned a lot" with "I asked [actual question], and the reply changed my understanding of [specific responsibility] by [truthful explanation]." Then explain [why that change matters to the learner's reasons for medicine]. If no such conversation happened, use a different true event.

Probes: Why this role rather than another role? What challenged your initial view? What part of the work have you not seen closely? What observation changed a question you were asking?

Revision: Reason: _____. Supporting evidence: _____. The connection between them: _____.

Practice notes

PART D / STATION 24

Why This School

> **Prompt, verbatim:** What draws you to this school's learning environment, and how would you contribute to it?

Marking guide

1. Uses a specific programme feature that the learner has checked against a current official source.
2. Explains why that feature matters to the learner's learning needs or values.
3. Supports the personal connection with true evidence rather than praise.
4. Describes a realistic contribution, with awareness of entering an existing community.
5. Distinguishes stated opportunities from guaranteed access and identifies a useful open question.

Composite coaching model: analytical answer plan, not a complete applicant response

Build a connection between [learner-verified feature and source] and [learner-owned educational reason]. Use [true experience] to show how that reason developed. Explain [a contribution supported by actual behaviour], including [how the learner would listen and learn first]. Close with [a genuine uncertainty about the learning experience]. The model supplies no school facts, claims of access, or applicant achievements.

Composite coaching sentence repair, not applicant evidence: Replace "This school suits how I learn" with "[Learner-verified feature] interests me because [true learning action and what it revealed]." If feedback changed the learner's approach, specify [actual feedback], [actual response], and [connection to the feature]. The demonstration supplies no school fact or biography.

Probes: Where did you verify that? Is participation guaranteed? Why does that feature matter to you? What would you want to understand before joining that activity?

Revision: Checked feature: _____. Source and date checked: _____. Personal evidence: _____. Remaining uncertainty: _____.

Practice notes

PART D / STATION 25

Strengths with Evidence

> **Prompt, verbatim:** What strength would you bring to a learning group? Describe an experience that helps us understand it.

Marking guide

1. States one strength as an observable working habit.
2. Selects an event that actually demonstrates that habit.
3. Specifies the learner's action and gives fair credit to others.
4. Reports a supportable consequence and recognises a limit of the strength.
5. Connects the habit to a learning group while allowing adjustment and feedback.

Composite coaching model: answer planning, not a complete applicant response

Name [learner-owned working habit]. Set out [true group task and learner's responsibility]. Show [specific action and why it helped], [other people's contributions], and [observed effect]. Explain [a circumstance in which the habit needs adjustment] and [how the learner would use feedback in a future group]. A flattering adjective is a claim; the learner-owned action provides evidence.

Composite coaching sentence repair, not applicant evidence: If the learner really asked which part was unclear, replace "I communicate well" with "I asked [actual question], heard [reply fairly summarised], and changed [actual explanation or next action]." Add [observed consequence]. If that question was never asked, use the learner's actual action instead.

Probes: What did you personally do? How might a teammate describe your contribution? When has this habit needed adjustment? What feedback helped you understand it?

Revision: Label: _____. Observable action: _____. Boundary or adjustment: _____.

Practice notes

PART D / STATION 26

A Weakness You Are Working On

> **Prompt, verbatim:** Describe a weakness you are actively working on. How have you recognised its effects and assessed your progress?

Marking guide

1. Identifies a real behavioural limitation without a global character judgment.
2. Explains its effect through a truthful event.
3. Describes a specific change already made and why it addresses the pattern.
4. Uses actual evidence to assess progress, distinguishing results from intentions.
5. Identifies remaining difficulty and a concrete next step while protecting privacy.

Composite coaching model: answer planning, not a complete applicant response

Define [learner-owned behavioural pattern]. Describe [true event and effect]. Explain [change already practised], [why it fits the pattern], and [evidence available so far]. Acknowledge [conditions under which the difficulty remains]. Name [next adjustment and how progress will be reviewed]. If improvement has not yet been demonstrated, the model must leave that evidence field open rather than invent success.

Composite coaching sentence repair, not applicant evidence: Replace "I am improving" with "I changed [actual practice] when [real trigger], and I have observed [evidence actually available]." If earlier clarification was the change, name [actual question] and [what followed]. Otherwise, use the learner's real strategy. Keep remaining uncertainty explicit.

Probes: How did you recognise the pattern? What did you actually change? What would suggest your strategy is not working? Which claim is a plan rather than a result?

Revision: Behaviour: _____. Action already taken: _____. Current evidence: _____. Next review: _____.

Practice notes

PART D / STATION 27

Failure and Conflict

> **Prompt, verbatim:** Tell us about a failure or a disagreement that did not resolve as you hoped. How did you respond, and what would you change?

Marking guide

1. Defines the actual disagreement and the shared task or competing needs.
2. Separates observable events from assumptions about motives.
3. Takes proportionate responsibility for the learner's own action and choices.
4. Explains a reasonable response, any repair, and what remains unresolved.
5. Gives a precise reflection or future change without claiming another person's forgiveness.

Composite coaching model: analytical answer plan, not a complete applicant response

A strong selection answer would establish [learner-owned true disagreement], [each person's apparent priorities], and [what the learner knew at the time]. It would compare [real options], explain [proportionate action within the learner's role], and report [actual outcome, including unresolved elements]. It would identify [learner's contribution to the problem or response] and [specific change]. Agreement alone would not prove a good process; the learner must show listening, accountability, and reassessment through evidence.

Composite coaching sentence repair, not applicant evidence: Replace "I learned to communicate better" with "I asked [actual question], and [reply fairly summarised] led me to [actual next action]." If no question was asked, describe [actual response] instead. Add [one specific future change]. Do not invent a conversation, agreement, or reconciliation.

Probes: What might the other person say? What did you assume? When would you have sought guidance? What practical repair remained after an apology?

Revision: Observable detail: _____. Interpretation to qualify: _____. Specific change: _____.

Practice notes

PART D / STATION 28

Explaining a Gap or Poor Grade

> **Prompt, verbatim:** A period in your record appears less strong than the rest. How would you explain it, and what evidence helps you assess your readiness now?

Marking guide

1. Identifies the actual period and result accurately and consistently with the application.
2. Gives proportionate context while preserving the learner's chosen privacy boundary.
3. Describes an action linked to the problem rather than a general promise to work harder.
4. Uses actual evidence of current readiness and acknowledges its limits.
5. Separates completed actions, current practice, and future plans, with a sensible next step.

Composite coaching model: answer planning, not a complete applicant response

State [learner-owned period and result]. Give [accurate context at the chosen level of disclosure]. Explain [specific action already taken and its reason]. Assess [actual later evidence or current evidence], including [what cannot yet be concluded]. Finish with [next step and when further help would be sought]. No grade, diagnosis, gap, improvement, or personal circumstance is supplied by the model.

If the prompt does not fit the learner's record, do not invent a gap or grade. Practise organising a genuine setback separately and label it as an alternative exercise.

Composite coaching sentence repair, not applicant evidence: Replace "I worked harder" with "I changed [actual study action], and the evidence available afterward is [actual observation or result]." If no later result exists, state that limit. Add [how and when the change will be reviewed]. Do not supply a grade or an improvement that has not occurred.

Probes: What exactly changed? What evidence is available now? What remains difficult? What would you do if the earlier pattern returned?

Revision: Record: _____. Context: _____. Action: _____. Evidence and limits: _____. Next step: _____.

Practice notes

PART D / STATION 29

Questions to Ask the Panel

> **Prompt, verbatim:** You have time for one question to the panel. What would you ask, and why is that information useful to you?

Marking guide

1. Identifies a genuine uncertainty the learner wants to resolve.
2. Checks that the answer is not already available in supplied programme information.
3. Asks one clear, neutral question suited to the panel's role and time.
4. Avoids unsupported assumptions, private information requests, and a self-promotional speech.
5. Explains how the answer could refine understanding and prepares to listen before following up.

Composite coaching model: question design, not a complete applicant response

A possible nonbiographical demonstration is: **"How do learners usually find out whether they are making progress before a formal assessment?"** It asks about a process without asserting a school fact. Use it only if it reflects [learner-owned uncertainty], fits [listener's role], and is not answered by [programme material already checked]. A follow up should respond to what the panel actually says.

Probes: Why is that useful to you? Who could answer best? What if the discussion already answered it? What would you ask after listening to the reply?

Revision: Question under twenty five words: _____. Best listener: _____. Uncertainty resolved: _____.

Practice notes

PART D · WORKSHEET

Eight story bank worksheet

Blank fields are intentional. Choose true events from your own life. A modest event is acceptable. One event may support several themes; repeat its event reference rather than inventing another experience. Do not force a story into a question it cannot answer.

Responsibility

Event reference and brief context: _____

Your actual role and who was affected: _____

Your action and options considered: _____

Consequence you can support: _____

Reflection and future change: _____

Relevant questions and privacy boundary: _____

Teamwork

Event reference and brief context: _____

Your actual role and who was affected: _____

Your action and others' contributions: _____

Consequence you can support: _____

Reflection and future change: _____

Relevant questions and privacy boundary: _____

PART D · WORKSHEET

Eight story bank worksheet

Service

Event reference and brief context: _____

Whose need you understood and your actual role: _____

Your action and how you checked the need: _____

Consequence you can support: _____

Reflection and future change: _____

Relevant questions and privacy boundary: _____

Learning from failure

Event reference and brief context: _____

Intended result and actual result: _____

Your contribution and response: _____

Consequence and repair you can support: _____

Reflection and future change: _____

Relevant questions and privacy boundary: _____

PART D · WORKSHEET

Eight story bank worksheet

Conflict

Event reference and brief context: _____

Shared task and differing views: _____

Your action and interpretation to qualify: _____

Actual outcome and unresolved elements: _____

Reflection and future change: _____

Relevant questions and privacy boundary: _____

Adaptation

Event reference and brief context: _____

What changed and who was affected: _____

Your old approach and revised action: _____

Consequence you can support: _____

Reflection and future change: _____

Relevant questions and privacy boundary: _____

PART D · WORKSHEET

Eight story bank worksheet

Ethical choice

Event reference and brief context: _____

Competing responsibilities and affected people: _____

Options, limits of your role, and chosen action: _____

Consequence you can support: _____

Reflection and what would change your mind: _____

Relevant questions and privacy boundary: _____

Meaningful curiosity

Event reference and brief context: _____

Question you pursued and why it mattered: _____

Your actual inquiry or learning action: _____

What you learned and what remains unknown: _____

Reflection and next question: _____

Relevant questions and privacy boundary: _____

PART D · WORKSHEET

Theme to question mapping matrix

These are possible connections, not instructions to make an event fit. A school-fit answer additionally needs verified programme information. A panel question may need no personal story at all. Question 22 supports building the entire bank.

Theme	Potential personal question connections	Evidence needed before using the connection
Responsibility	22, 25, 27, 28	The learner's actual obligation, decision, and follow through
Teamwork	22, 24, 25, 27	The learner's action and fair credit to others
Service	22, 23, 24, 25	A real need, appropriate role, and observed consequence
Learning from failure	22, 26, 27, 28	A real shortfall, response, and specific reflection
Conflict	22, 25, 26, 27	Differing views, observable behaviour, and proportionate responsibility
Adaptation	22, 24, 25, 26, 28	A changed circumstance and an actual change in approach
Ethical choice	22, 23, 25, 27	Competing responsibilities and a decision within the learner's role
Meaningful curiosity	22, 23, 24, 25, 29	An actual question pursued or a current genuine uncertainty

My event references that serve several themes: _____.
Question that needs a different event: _____.
Question for which no biography is needed: _____.

PART D · WORKSHEET

Truth and privacy audit

Before polishing an answer, check each statement:

[ ] The event happened to me, and I have not borrowed a model's biography.
[ ] I have described my actual role and separated observation from participation.
[ ] I have distinguished my contribution from the group's result.
[ ] Outcomes, feedback, dates, and quantities are supported by what I know.
[ ] Other people's feelings and motives are qualified when I cannot know them.
[ ] Names and identifying details unnecessary to the answer are removed.
[ ] I have not disclosed another person's private story to create emotional impact.
[ ] My chosen level of personal disclosure is truthful and comfortable for me.
[ ] A plan is labelled as a plan; early progress is not described as complete change.
[ ] School details have a checked source, with access conditions kept clear.
[ ] The account is consistent with my application and can survive an honest follow up.

One statement to verify: _____.
One detail to remove or generalise: _____.
One uncertainty to state explicitly: _____.
One concrete improvement for the next recording: _____.

PART E · MIXED PRACTICE AND FOLLOW UPS

STATION 30

Ask Before You Assume

Original prompt

> Your group is choosing a student speaker. One member requests a remote presentation instead of attending in person. Another says this shows less commitment and should disqualify them. You help organise the selection. What would you do?

Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes.

My first attempt

My notes

One audible strength: _____
One missing action: _____
My revised decision: _____
What would change my mind: _____

Turn the page to review the composite answer

STATION 30 / ANSWER AND REVIEW

Ask Before You Assume

Composite model

Composite answer box

This is a composite model answer. I would separate the speaker's suitability from the assumption that attending remotely shows less commitment. I would ask what the speaking role requires and whether a remote presentation can meet those requirements. The applicant, other candidates, the audience, and the organisers all need a fair and workable process. I would also ask the person privately what arrangement would let them participate, without requiring personal details they do not need to share.

Keeping the current arrangement may be simplest for organisers, but convenience alone does not establish that the adjustment is unreasonable. A remote option might work if the audience can hear, see, and ask questions. It might need a different arrangement if the essential task genuinely requires physical presence. I would compare the request with the purpose of the role and seek guidance from whoever is responsible for the selection process and its applicable requirements.

My default would be to keep the person in consideration while checking a feasible adjustment. I would not let a teammate's assumption become an unofficial selection criterion. I would explain the process to the group without sharing the person's circumstances. If a specific essential task cannot be completed remotely, that would change the options we consider. We should establish that limitation rather than simply calling the person less committed.

Observable marking guide

- Separates the remote request from a judgement about commitment.
- Checks essential role requirements and workable adjustments.
- Keeps the person under consideration while using the responsible process.

Misses to repair

- Demands a private diagnosis or promises an arrangement before checking feasibility.

Two common mistakes

1. Diagnosing an unseen personal circumstance. One mistake is inventing a sympathetic explanation and defending it as though it is true. You do not need to decide that the person has a disability or a caring responsibility to treat them fairly. Respect begins with avoiding an unsupported judgement, not with finding a sufficiently moving story. Let the person control what they disclose.
2. Asking questions that cannot change your decision. Another mistake is producing a long list of questions to appear thorough. If every answer leads to exactly the same action, the questions may only delay it. Choose one question that tests an essential uncertainty. Explain what you would do while waiting, especially when a deadline is close.

Variation

No reliable remote equipment is available. Explore a feasible alternative without treating the constraint as a character finding.

Final drill

Before the next lecture, write three judgements you might make under pressure, such as unreliable, difficult, or uninterested. Replace each with a concrete observed behaviour. Choose one and write a question that could change your response. Answer the speaker prompt again using only the observation and that question. Keep one clear provisional decision.

PART E / STATION 31

Choose a Workable Partial Solution

Original prompt

> Your student team can run one free application workshop. Some applicants need essay feedback. Others need basic information about the application process. You have one room and three volunteers for an afternoon. Recommend a plan.

Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes.

My first attempt

My notes

One audible strength: _____
One missing action: _____
My revised decision: _____
What would change my mind: _____

Turn the page to review the composite answer

STATION 31 / ANSWER AND REVIEW

Choose a Workable Partial Solution

Composite model

Composite answer box

This is a composite model answer. I would aim to give every attendee a useful starting point while being honest about how much individual feedback three volunteers can provide. Applicants with little process information and applicants with draft essays have different needs. Volunteers need a manageable task. I would ask attendees about their priorities before the event if possible and check what the volunteers are comfortable supporting.

A whole afternoon of individual essay reviews would leave many people waiting and might miss basic questions. A general talk alone could leave people without actionable feedback. I would start with a short shared orientation using current official application information that the team has checked. Then I would offer small group discussion and brief individual feedback slots within our capacity. I would make the limits clear before people arrive.

I would avoid presenting volunteer advice as an admissions decision or a guarantee. For questions we cannot answer, I would direct people to the relevant official source. I would collect anonymous feedback about unmet needs and bring a realistic proposal for another session to the organising group. If most attendees already understood the process, I would shorten the orientation. If volunteers lacked experience with essays, I would focus on clarity and questions rather than judging admissions prospects.

Observable marking guide

- Offers a workable plan with one room, three volunteers, and one afternoon.
- States the limits of individual feedback in advance.
- Names unmet need and a responsible follow up without promising resources.

Misses to repair

- Invents extra staff or implies the workshop can predict admission.

Two common mistakes

1. Solving the prompt with imaginary resources. One mistake is adding another day or hiring experts when the prompt gives you neither. It is reasonable to suggest seeking help. It is different to make your immediate solution depend on help that has not agreed to come. Give a workable plan under the stated conditions before describing an expansion.
2. Hiding the people the plan cannot fully help. Another mistake is presenting efficiency as though it proves fairness. Ask who might still struggle with your plan. They may need a different communication channel, a clearer explanation, or a later referral. Naming that gap shows judgement if you also explain what you can do about it.

Variation

Most attendees already understand the process. Reallocate the shared orientation time only within actual capacity.

Final drill

Before the next lecture, answer the workshop prompt in ninety seconds. Include one sentence beginning, With the resources given, I would. Include another beginning, This would still leave. End with an action assigned to a real role. Listen for any promise that needs money, expertise, or time you have silently invented, and replace it with an honest condition.

PART E / STATION 32

Make a Group Discussion Move Forward

Original prompt

> Your group must choose one improvement for a shared study room: better lighting, quieter seating, or longer opening hours. Agree on a recommendation and one reason to review it later. You have no budget figures.

Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes.

My first attempt

My notes

One audible strength: _____
One missing action: _____
My revised decision: _____
What would change my mind: _____

Turn the page to review the composite answer

STATION 32 / ANSWER AND REVIEW

Make a Group Discussion Move Forward

Composite model

Composite answer box

This is a composite model group exchange. I might open by saying, Could we agree on what problem is most important before choosing an improvement? I would suggest access, usability, and feasibility as provisional criteria, then invite another view. If a participant favours longer hours, I would ask what need they are trying to meet. I would avoid treating missing budget information as permission to invent a cost ranking.

If someone says quieter seating matters most, I might say, We have two different needs here: access outside current hours and a usable space during them. Does anyone have a reason to prioritise one now? If a quieter participant offers a concern about lighting, I would let them finish and ask how that concern affects the room's use. I would then summarise the actual points made, without claiming everyone agrees.

If the group identifies noise as the main current barrier, we could recommend a modest quiet seating trial, subject to feasibility. We would still record the unmet need for longer hours and ask the responsible organiser about it. Before closing, I would check, Are we agreed on that provisional recommendation, or is there a concern we have not addressed? We would review it if user feedback shows the main barrier is access rather than noise.

Observable marking guide

- Proposes relevant criteria and invites a different view.
- Summarises the actual disagreement accurately.
- Checks a shared recommendation and a reason to review it.

Misses to repair

- Dominates the decision, invents costs, or puts a quieter person on display.

Two common mistakes

1. Inviting someone only to interrupt them. One mistake is saying we have not heard from you, then correcting the person before they finish. An invitation is meaningful when you make room for the answer. If they decline, respect it. You can return to the task without putting a quieter person on display or demanding they speak to complete your picture of inclusive teamwork.
2. Agreeing so quickly that concerns disappear. Another mistake is avoiding disagreement to appear pleasant. A group can reach a weak decision because nobody names the unanswered question. Offer one specific concern and one practical way forward. Once the group addresses it and chooses a reasonable plan, help execute the plan rather than continuing to campaign for your preference.

Variation

The group has twenty seconds left and two options remain. Offer a provisional decision with a clear review condition.

Facilitator card

Use one applicant and two partners. Assign one partner longer hours and the other better lighting as initial preferences. Each explains a reason and can change their view. Do not invent budget figures. Discuss for six minutes in the isolated group drill. In a mock circuit, use the agreed circuit clock instead. The observer checks progress and shared criteria, not agreement with quiet seating.

Final drill

Before the next lecture, run this discussion with two friends for six minutes. Ask one friend to hold a different preference. Aim to make one useful proposal, one accurate summary, and one genuine check for unresolved concerns. Ask your friends whether each action helped the group. Do not count how many seconds you spoke as the measure of success.

PART E / STATION 33

Change Your Answer When a Fact Changes

Original prompt

> You supervise a student newsletter. An article criticises a campus service. The service manager asks you to remove it, saying it contains a factual error. The issue goes out tonight. What would you do?

Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes.

My first attempt

My notes

One audible strength: _____
One missing action: _____
My revised decision: _____
What would change my mind: _____

Turn the page to review the composite answer

STATION 33 / ANSWER AND REVIEW

Change Your Answer When a Fact Changes

Composite model

Composite answer box: first decision

This is a composite model answer. I would separate criticism the manager dislikes from a specific factual error. Readers need reliable information, the writer deserves a fair process, and the service should have a chance to identify the claimed error. I would ask the manager to point to the exact statement and supporting evidence. I would contact the writer and check our editorial process before making a change.

I would not delete the article simply to avoid criticism. I would also not publish a disputed factual statement without a reasonable effort to check it. If we cannot resolve a significant accuracy concern before tonight, I would consider holding that portion or the article and explain the reason transparently. Once checked, I would publish a correction or the supported account as appropriate. The decision would rest on evidence and editorial responsibility, not on who has more influence.

Changed fact

Now the writer confirms that one sentence is wrong. The manager also asks you to remove the rest of the criticism, which the writer says is supported. Pause again and answer aloud for one minute. Decide which part of your answer changes. Do not treat the manager's valid concern about one sentence as proof that every other request is justified.

Composite answer box: revised decision

The confirmed error changes my immediate action. I would correct that sentence with the writer and follow our process for making the correction clear. It does not by itself justify removing supported criticism. I would check the remaining claims fairly and give the manager a chance to respond through the appropriate editorial process. If the deadline prevents an adequate check, I would explain any delay. I would keep the reasons for each change clear to the editorial team.

Observable marking guide

- Checks the specific claimed error using evidence and the editorial process.
- Balances accuracy with a fair hearing for supported criticism.
- Revises the confirmed error without automatically removing every challenged point.

Misses to repair

- Defends a known error for consistency or removes criticism merely because a manager dislikes it.

Two common mistakes

1. Defending the original answer at any cost. One mistake is treating every challenge as an attack to repel. You may repeat your first recommendation even after its main assumption is false. Practise saying what the new information changes. If nothing changes, explain why the fact does not affect your reasoning. The listener needs to hear that you considered it, not that you ignored it.
2. Reversing everything to please the interviewer. Another mistake is abandoning a sound principle as soon as someone questions it. The manager can be correct about an error and still make an unjustified request about criticism. Change the part the evidence affects. Keep the part you can still defend. That is more precise than either automatic agreement or automatic resistance.

Variation

The manager is offended despite a correction. Keep respectful communication while explaining why supported criticism is treated separately.

Final drill

Before the next lecture, ask a friend to choose a station you have already practised and change one important fact after your answer. Give yourself one minute to respond. Start by naming the change, then state the revised action and one reason. Ask your friend whether they could identify what changed and what stayed consistent without needing your original speech repeated.

PART F · PLANNING, FEEDBACK, AND THE DAY

STATION 34

Your Fourteen Day Practice Plan

Original prompt

> You have fourteen days, limited practice time, and a habit of delaying aloud answers until you feel prepared. How would you use this plan if you miss day four?

Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes.

Composite model

Composite answer box

This is a composite model answer. I would keep the day seven circuit because it gives me feedback on several behaviours. I would use a short session on day five to practise one confidentiality answer, then keep the acting exercise with my friend. I would shorten passive review rather than remove all aloud practice. On day eight, I would check whether privacy reasoning is still a gap and repair it if needed. Missing one day would change the workload, not erase the whole plan.

Observable marking guide

- Preserves an aloud attempt, feedback, and a fresh test after missing a day.
- Keeps the planned circuit where feasible.
- Reduces passive review before abandoning all active practice.

Misses to repair

- Doubles every remaining session without considering feasibility or rest.

Two common mistakes

1. Catching up only by watching faster. One mistake is treating unfinished viewing as the main debt. A short answer with feedback may be more useful than another uninterrupted hour of listening. Keep the output for the day visible so you know what the work was meant to change.
2. Repeating only your most comfortable station. Another mistake is collecting easy successes on familiar prompts. Use the first circuit to choose the next practice target. Change a fact or question when you revisit a prompt so you have to reason again.

Variation

Only seven days remain. Keep baseline, feedback, a changed prompt, and rehearsal; reduce repetitions.

Final drill

Before the next lecture, write down when you will record your baseline, practise the Five Moves, and compare two ethical options. Give each session a finish condition you can observe. If your interview is sooner, compress the plan by keeping the baseline, feedback, changed prompts, and rehearsal. Reduce the number of repetitions before removing those four parts.

My notes

One audible strength: _____
One missing action: _____
My revised decision: _____
What would change my mind: _____

PART F / STATION 35

Run a Mock Circuit with Two Friends

Original prompt

> After a mock station, a friend says your answer was good but lacked confidence. You want feedback you can use before the next circuit. What would you ask them to observe?

Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes.

Composite model

Composite answer box

This is a composite model answer. I would ask which sentence or behaviour made the answer seem uncertain. Did I avoid a recommendation, change my position without a reason, speak too quietly to understand, or simply pause before answering? I would ask for one example of something I did effectively as well. Then I would choose one behaviour to practise, such as stating a recommendation before describing a contingency, and ask the friend to observe it on a fresh prompt.

Observable marking guide

- Asks for a sentence or behaviour behind the confidence impression.
- Chooses one observable target.
- Plans to test it on a fresh prompt rather than predict an admission result.

Misses to repair

- Treats a local rating as pass or fail or asks friends to coach during the response.

Two common mistakes

1. Coaching during the timed response. One mistake is rescuing the applicant halfway through by suggesting the missing point. That changes the task and hides what they can do independently. Save coaching for the debrief unless someone needs to stop. A follow up should test the answer, not complete it for them.
2. Turning a practice total into an admission prediction. Another mistake is announcing that a number means pass or fail. These are local practice anchors without school validation. Use them to track behaviours over time. A higher total on a memorised prompt may mean less than a clearer decision on a genuinely new one.

Variation

The observer and applicant disagree. Seek evidence, acknowledge uncertainty, and test the behaviour again.

Final drill

Before the next lecture, arrange one circuit and send your friends the role instructions from the workbook. Choose the four prompts and agree on the practice clock. Complete one blank rating sheet yourself so you understand the anchors. End the circuit by choosing one behaviour to revisit the next day, then thank your friends for the specific evidence they collected.

My notes

One audible strength: _____
One missing action: _____
My revised decision: _____
What would change my mind: _____

PART F / STATION 36

The Interview Day and the Reset

Original prompt

> You leave a station convinced that you missed an important point. The next task begins soon. What would you do with the remaining transition time?

Pause here and answer aloud for two minutes.

Composite model

Composite answer box

This is a composite model answer. I would acknowledge that I am disappointed and stop trying to calculate the score. I would use the permitted transition time to reset physically and identify the next instruction. If I had made a procedural error that needed immediate reporting, I would follow the school's process. Otherwise, I would leave analysis of the completed answer until afterwards and give the next task my attention. My feeling about the station is not reliable evidence of its final assessment.

Observable marking guide

- Acknowledges disappointment without assuming a score.
- Uses a brief physical reset and returns to the next instruction.
- Follows the stated process for any genuine procedural issue.

Misses to repair

- Replays the last answer throughout transition or carries its content into an unrelated station.

Two common mistakes

1. Carrying the last station into the next one. One mistake is using transition time to argue with an answer you cannot change. Acknowledge the thought and return to the next instruction. The purpose of the reset is to make attention available, not to prove that the last station went well.
2. Changing every habit on the final evening. Another mistake is replacing your natural speaking style with borrowed phrases at the last moment. Keep the structure and routines you have practised. Make practical checks, stop when you planned, and allow room for rest rather than another circuit of familiar speeches.

Variation

A connection failure interrupted the station. Report facts through the school process and avoid inferring its scoring effect.

Final drill

Before you finish the course, set a short timer and practise the doorway or virtual transition in your real setup. Say one sentence that brings you back to the next task. Then replay your first baseline recording and one fresh response. Identify a clearer action, a better question, and one next practice target. Keep the evidence of progress specific, and take your own truthful voice into the interview.

My notes

One audible strength: _____
One missing action: _____
My revised decision: _____
What would change my mind: _____

PART G · PRACTICE TOOLS

Fourteen day plan

Practice outputs are the finish condition. Adapt the duration to your circumstances and actual school instructions. A short repair and a fresh test can be useful on a busy day. Do not double every remaining session after a missed day.

Day	Work	Concrete output
1	Answer lecture 01 without restarting.	Baseline recording; one strength and one missing action.
2	Use the Five Moves on lecture 04.	Five lines of notes and a fresh aloud answer.
3	Autonomy and allocation, lectures 05 and 09.	Two option comparisons, two decisions, two conditions for revision.
4	Confidentiality and consent, lectures 06 and 07.	A private reply, a permission check, and a safety contingency.
5	Difficult news and anger, lectures 13 and 14.	Two conversations with a friend; one missed cue recorded.
6	Partner work and instructions, lectures 16 to 18.	A reproducible completed task and one clarified instruction.
7	First four station circuit below.	Applicant and observer evidence sheets completed independently.
8	Repair the weakest observed behaviour.	One before and after comparison on a fresh prompt.
9	Complete the eight story bank in Part D.	Eight theme cards with true evidence; shared events marked.
10	Why medicine, school fit, and weakness, lectures 23, 24, 26.	Three recordings and a one page evidence map; school facts checked.
11	Prepare a health system brief, lectures 19 to 21.	A short balanced answer with facts separated from questions.
12	Changed facts, lecture 33 and two earlier prompts.	Three one minute revisions naming the change and its effect.
13	Second circuit with different prompts.	Like for like behavioural comparison and one remaining target.
14	Rehearse route or virtual channel, reset, and current instructions.	Practical checklist, unresolved procedural questions, planned stopping point.

Missed day repair: What is the next important output? _____. What passive review can be reduced? _____. Which fresh prompt will test the repaired behaviour? _____.

PART G · PRACTICE TOOLS

Mock circuit setup with two friends

Print or share only the role material each person needs. Keep model answers out of the applicant's view. Use invented scenario names only when needed; personal evidence remains true. Obtain recording consent and agree storage and deletion. Make stopping possible without explanation if anyone is uncomfortable.

Person	Role	Material
Learner	Applicant	Prompt card only, blank notes if permitted in this practice.
Friend one	Facilitator, actor, or task partner	Prompt, actor cues or task key, one selected follow up.
Friend two	Observer and timer	Prompt, marking guide, blank evidence sheet, timing signal.

The standard practice clock per station is one minute to read, four minutes to respond, one minute for a follow up, and two minutes for independent written ratings. It replaces the two minute individual exercise clock. Four stations take thirty two minutes, plus briefing and debrief. Change the timings transparently if useful after checking the school's current format. Do not coach during responses. If an acting conversation naturally resolves, the facilitator may use the follow up; do not invent repeated crises to fill silence.

PART G · PRACTICE TOOLS

Mock circuit packets

First circuit packet: day seven

Order	Prompt from this workbook	Facilitator task	Follow up
1	06: Confidentiality and Its Limits	Read prompt; stay within supplied facts.	The sibling reports a credible immediate threat. What changes now?
2	14: Speaking with an Angry Person	Play the parent using the actor card; do not promise a tutor exists.	The parent refuses a later call. What can you honestly offer?
3	16: Solving a Task with a Partner	Set out the specified cards; use the answer key; be a cooperative partner.	Which constraint did your final check verify?
4	23: Why Medicine	Ask the personal prompt; use learner-owned evidence only.	What responsibility of medicine do you still need to understand better?

Second circuit packet: day thirteen

Order	Prompt from this workbook	Facilitator task	Follow up
1	12: Social Media and Professionalism	Read prompt; do not share actual images or private material.	The poster says the person gave permission. What still needs checking?
2	20: Arguing Both Sides Fairly	Keep booking details unspecified unless the applicant labels an assumption.	Which fact would change your recommendation?
3	32: Make a Group Discussion Move Forward	Both friends join as participants with different starting preferences; agree a separate timer signal.	What would make you review the chosen improvement?
4	27: Failure and Conflict	Choose one of the two personal angles in the prompt; no demand for intimate disclosure.	What remained unresolved, and what did you personally change?

For the three-person group station, the observer participates and completes evidence notes immediately afterwards; this limits simultaneous observation. Record only with everyone's permission, or run that station again with a different observer if a concern remains. Do not pretend participation produced independent observation. Compare evidence within similar tasks rather than adding totals across these different circuits.

PART G · PRACTICE TOOLS

Self rating guide

Zero means absent or counterproductive. One means attempted but incomplete or inconsistent. Two means clear and relevant when required. Use N A only with an explanation that the behaviour did not fit this task. A pause or an accent alone is not a deficit. Quote a sentence or describe an action for every rating. Applicant rates first, before hearing feedback.

Behaviour	Zero	One	Two
Addresses the task	Misses the question or wrong interaction.	Addresses part of it.	Answers the requested task and any required parts.
Listens and communicates	Ignores replies or cannot be followed.	Some clear language or listening with missed cues.	Understandable, concise, and responsive to the person or follow up.
Reasons with relevant options	Assumes key facts or gives unsupported choice.	Mentions options without meaningful comparison.	Compares feasible options using relevant interests and constraints.
Respects people and privacy	Dismisses concerns or discloses unnecessary private details.	Respectful intent but weak action or overbroad sharing.	Specific acknowledgement, fair language, and relevant privacy boundaries.
Acts within role and safety	Exceeds role, promises unavailable help, or ignores urgent concern.	Notices limits but leaves the response vague.	Takes proportionate action and seeks the appropriate help when needed.
Makes a next step and adapts	No next action or ignores a changed fact.	Next step or revision is incomplete.	Gives a feasible next action and revises with evidence, or explains what would change it.

PART G · PRACTICE TOOLS

Self rating sheet

Use the rating guide on the previous page. Record the sentence or action that supports each rating.

Name or private reference: _____.
Date: _____.
Lecture or prompt reference: _____.
Format: _____.
Fresh or previously practised: _____.
Changed fact: _____.

Behaviour	Applicant: 0, 1, 2, N A	Observer: 0, 1, 2, N A	Exact sentence or action
Addresses the task	_____	_____	_____
Listens and communicates	_____	_____	_____
Reasons with relevant options	_____	_____	_____
Respects people and privacy	_____	_____	_____
Acts within role and safety	_____	_____	_____
Makes a next step and adapts	_____	_____	_____

One strength with evidence: _____. One missed cue or unsafe assumption: _____. One priority behaviour: _____. Specific repair: _____. Fresh prompt to test it: _____. Result of that fresh test: _____.

Do not calculate a pass mark or admissions probability. If you compare practice sessions, compare the same behaviour on sufficiently similar tasks and note prompt familiarity. If a serious reasoning concern appears, repair it even if other ratings are strong.

Practice notes

PART G · PRACTICE TOOLS

Health system brief worksheet

Choose the country and context relevant to your own application. Do not assume that Canada or the United States has one uniform access pathway for every service and setting. Prepare questions about what varies rather than memorising an unsupported national generalisation. Check current facts with appropriate official sources when available. No external research was performed to create this workbook.

Issue and decision question: _____. Country and relevant regional or organisational setting: _____. Who is affected and how: _____. What problem needs evidence before proposing a change: _____.

Evidence item	Current official source and access date	What it supports	Limits or uncertainty
How people enter the relevant service	_____	_____	_____
Who funds or pays for the relevant service	_____	_____	_____
Who delivers and makes decisions	_____	_____	_____
A barrier experienced by a specific group	_____	_____	_____
A feasible proposed response and its tradeoff	_____	_____	_____

Strongest case for option one: _____. Strongest case for option two: _____. My recommendation under the stated conditions: _____. Implementation responsibility: _____. Possible unintended effect: _____. What I would monitor: _____. Fact that would change my mind: _____.

If a fact remains unverified, label it as a question and practise an answer that does not depend on pretending to know it. Separate a value judgement from a factual prediction. Statistics are optional evidence when accurate and relevant, not a substitute for reasoning.

Practice notes

PART G · PRACTICE TOOLS

School fit and interview day

School fit evidence register

School or programme reference for my own use: _____. Current official source and access date: _____. Specific opportunity actually available to applicants or students like me: _____. Any conditions on access: _____. My true experience or learning preference that makes this relevant: _____. What I still need to ask: _____.

Day checklist

[ ] I have checked the school's current format and instructions.
[ ] I know the start arrangements, identification needs, and permitted materials.
[ ] I have checked the route or rehearsed the intended virtual setup.
[ ] I know the stated route for procedural or connection problems.
[ ] I have a brief transition reset I have practised.
[ ] I will answer the present task rather than score the last one.
[ ] I will keep interview material confidential as required by the school.
[ ] I have a planned stopping point for preparation and space for rest.

My reset sentence: _____. My practical uncertainty to resolve through the school: _____. My one remaining practice target: _____.

Practice notes