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Objectives

• Evaluate the current state of your program’s interview/recruitment process and identify areas for potential improvements.

• Describe innovations related to the presentation of program details to applicants, video interviews and interview scoring utilized by other programs.

• Identify next steps in implementing improvements in the interview/recruitment process for your program.
How was your match?
Background of the problem

So many people to interview, so little time....
The costs of interviewing

• Program
  • Actual financial costs
  • PD, coordinator, faculty, resident time
  • PD, coordinator, faculty, resident energy
  • Opportunity costs

• Medical student
  • Financial costs
  • Time
  • Energy
  • Opportunity costs
Students costs for travel and lodging are burdensome

Figure 7.
The majority of the 906 respondents strongly agreed (426) or agreed (291) that expenses related to travel were overly burdensome.

*Statement: I felt the expense of travel costs (flights, trains, buses, rental cars) associated with interviewing were overly burdensome.*

Figure 8.
The majority of the 906 respondents strongly agreed (303) or agreed (290) that the expenses related to lodging were overly burdensome.

*Statement: I felt the expense of lodging costs associated with interviewing was overly burdensome.*

Cost of Applying to Residency Questionnaire Report AAMC 2016
## How much do students spend?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>$3,422.71</td>
<td>$2,853.44</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$5,506.21</td>
<td>$4,113.03</td>
<td>$4,100.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Couples</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>$3,189.59</td>
<td>$2,131.98</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Spec</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>$3,379.15</td>
<td>$2,764.55</td>
<td>$2,600.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mult Spec</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$3,903.79</td>
<td>$3,688.37</td>
<td>$3,200.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prelims</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>$4,575.62</td>
<td>$3,459.51</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Medicine</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>$2,225</td>
<td>$1,392</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Table 2
Recruitment and Interview Day Characteristics of 270 US Internal Medicine Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Programs (n = 270)</th>
<th>University Based (n = 91)</th>
<th>Community Based University Affiliated (n = 142)</th>
<th>Community Based (n = 37)</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews extended per PGY1 position</td>
<td>13 (6)</td>
<td>12 (4)</td>
<td>14 (7)</td>
<td>13 (6)</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews conducted per PGY1 position</td>
<td>10 (4)</td>
<td>9 (3)</td>
<td>10 (5)</td>
<td>10 (5)</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews conducted by program director</td>
<td>57 (72)</td>
<td>55 (76)</td>
<td>61 (73)</td>
<td>45 (56)</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimated Recruitment Costs 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Component</th>
<th>All Programs (n = 270)</th>
<th>University Based (n = 91)</th>
<th>Community Based University Affiliated (n = 142)</th>
<th>Community Based (n = 37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median (IQR)</td>
<td>Median (IQR)</td>
<td>Median (IQR)</td>
<td>Median (IQR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program director effort*</td>
<td>$42,400 ($27,750-59,375)</td>
<td>$50,000 ($37,500-72,521)</td>
<td>$37,500 ($25,000-56,250)</td>
<td>$37,500 ($25,000-50,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate program director effort†</td>
<td>$52,022 ($23,376-89,291)</td>
<td>$86,703 ($57,820-140,253)</td>
<td>$38,781 ($19,273-60,692)</td>
<td>$28,910 ($18,700-63,602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief resident effort†</td>
<td>$12,206 ($4,346-25,450)</td>
<td>$25,425 ($12,226-42,383)</td>
<td>$8198 ($1380-15,282)</td>
<td>$5794 ($0-16,953)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative staff effort‡</td>
<td>$29,650 ($19,582-41,919)</td>
<td>$40,420 ($27,562-56,113)</td>
<td>$26,257 ($17,505-35,134)</td>
<td>$19,693 ($14,190-31,004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of medicine chair effort</td>
<td>$369 ($0-854)</td>
<td>$699 ($427-932)</td>
<td>$0 ($0-777)</td>
<td>$0 ($0-0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>$4850 ($2400-10,000)</td>
<td>$10,000 ($4850-24,000)</td>
<td>$4225 ($2000-5000)</td>
<td>$2000 ($900-4850)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$600 ($300-1000)</td>
<td>$1000 ($600-2000)</td>
<td>$600 ($250-1000)</td>
<td>$500 ($200-600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>$0 ($0-700)</td>
<td>$0 ($0-4500)</td>
<td>$0 ($0-1000)</td>
<td>$0 ($0-0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total estimated recruitment cost per program</td>
<td>$148,345 ($95,966-234,704)</td>
<td>$239,821 ($162,815-317,526)</td>
<td>$120,920 ($87,933-187,916)</td>
<td>$105,256 ($81,880-140,980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per PGY1 matriculate</td>
<td>$9899 ($6494-13,271)</td>
<td>$9639 ($5438-12,898)</td>
<td>$9809 ($6347-13,337)</td>
<td>$10,347 ($7382-13,293)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per NRMP matched position‡</td>
<td>$14,162 ($9741-22,605)</td>
<td>$11,058 ($7792-14,708)</td>
<td>$16,387 ($11,162-24,334)</td>
<td>$20,939 ($13,647-28,096)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Strategies to Respond to Application Inflation

### Increases in Applicants; Recruitment Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q22. During the past three years, has your program experienced an increase in the number of applicants?</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q23. For your categorical and other 3-year applicants, have you adjusted your recruitment in any way(s) to accommodate the increase in applicants over the past three years?</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For 215 respondents who reported "yes" to Q22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q24a-j. How have you adjusted your recruitment to accommodate the increase in applicants over the past three years?</th>
<th>Frequency of cases</th>
<th>Percent of responses</th>
<th>Percent of cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Invite more applicants in total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have more interview days</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have more applicants per day</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Conduct web-based interviews (Skype, FaceTime, etc.)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conduct phone interviews</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Turn away applicants who don’t have an obvious tie to my program’s region</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Turn away applicants who appear “overqualified” for my program</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Raised our standards for whom we invite</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Other (please specify)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>295.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For 137 of 139 respondents who reported "yes" to Q23. Multiple responses allowed; percentages will exceed 100.

2017 Spring Survey of Residency Program Directors
Scheduling the interviews

- Interview broker - Yale
- Thalamus - Hopkins
- ERAS/PDWS - UA COM-P
Thalamus - Hopkins

PROS:
• Easy to use and company are responsive to questions and requests
• Can create tracks with caps per day for different types of candidates (e.g. primary care, scientist, categorical, our own students)
• Can send attachments in the email invitations
• Creates waitlist options and automatically updates them
• Allows applicants real-time interaction with scheduling
• Affordable
• An applicant can track all interviews together for all programs using it
Thalamus - Hopkins

CONS:
• Cannot assign interviewers to the applicants using the platform
• Cannot upload all of ERAS application into the platform
• Inflexible with scoring sheet formats
• Because of above it is not “self contained” and we still use ERAS and our own version of DropBox to manage the process.
ERAS Interview Invitation:

- Our process is different
- Step-by-step instructions:
  - Invited applicant website (link)
  - Video overview of our interview process (link)
  - Supplemental information form
  - Scheduling through ERAS
    - Interview drop-down menu → select “invitations”
  - Applicant Visit Days
UA COM-P Scheduling in ERAS/PDWS

Interviews: RSVP Event
Visit Days: Private Event
UA COM-P Scheduling in ERAS/PDWS

• Visit Day Scheduling:
  • Attending a visit day is not mandatory
  • “Private Event” in ERAS Scheduler
  • Virtually unlimited capacity
  • Flexible scheduling across recruitment season

Hello,

As described in the welcome email from Dr. O’Malley and in our recruitment website, we really hope that you are able to come to visit us for an in-person opportunity to tell you more about our University of Arizona College of Medicine – Phoenix Internal Medicine Residency Program.

The applicant visit days are from approximately 4:00pm – 8:00pm, with around three per month for the next few months. The visit will allow you to meet with residents, tour Banner-University Medical Center Phoenix, and to develop a better sense of our strong academics, supportive culture and family feeling.

1. Sign up for one of the following dates below by replying to this message. You may select the one that best fits your schedule; you may come visit either before or after your Interview day.
2. Schedule your travel. We will send out details on lodging, airport, and ground transportation in the near future.
3. The week before your visit, you will receive email confirmation and additional information regarding parking, directions, and details of the evening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 17</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 8</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 20</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 29</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 6</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 12</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 20</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 31</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we stated previously, our goal is to make your visit useful and meaningful, and to allow flexibility in the scheduling. However, we understand that it might not be feasible, and your inability to come will not impact where we rank you. Please reply to this message even if you are unable to attend a visit day.

We look forward to getting to know you better during this process. If you have any questions or issues with scheduling, please feel free to contact me.

Arletta Espinosa
Internal Medicine Residency Program Office Supervisor
University of Arizona College of Medicine – Phoenix
Arletta.espinosa@bannerhealth.com
602-839-3644
Delivering information to applicants
Yale Flipped Interview Day Project

• Does your interview day effectively reflect and represent the culture of your program?
Yale Flipped Interview Day Project

• Our Goals:
  • Provide information about our training program
  • Eliminate informational power point presentations
  • Introduce interactive activities to our interview day

• Our Process
  • Create a 30-minute video presentation with program information
  • Link emailed to applicants 1 week prior to interview day
  • Develop small group activities that reflect our educational culture
Yale Flipped Interview Day Project

• Pick the Winner

• Jigsaw Puzzle

• Debrief
Yale Flipped Interview Day Project

• Pick the Winner
  • What factors do you feel are essential to a high-quality Primary Care Residency experience?
  • Each applicant generates 4 answers
  • Share those 4 in groups of 5 applicants
  • Generate 5 winners
  • Share with large group
Yale Flipped Interview Day Project

- Jigsaw Puzzle
  - Created puzzle pieces to reinforce aspects of our program
  - Each applicant has a 1 different piece in a group of 5
  - Teach their group about their piece
  - Current resident is present for coaching and content
Yale Flipped Interview Day Project

• Structured Debrief
  • Faculty organize Pick the Winner comments into themes
  • Speak briefly to the large group about themes
Yale Flipped Interview Day Project

The Small Group Activities Effectively Introduced Me To The Educational Culture Of The Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Number of Responders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT AGREE</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISAGREE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yale Flipped Interview Day Project

The Small Group Activities Effectively Introduced Me To The Educational Culture Of The Program

- **Strongly Agree**: 38
- **Agree**: 34
- **Somewhat Agree**: 15
- **Neutral**: 3
- **Somewhat Disagree**: 0
- **Disagree**: 0
- **Strongly Disagree**: 0

Number of Responders
Yale Flipped Interview Day Project

The Small Group Activities Were An Effective Way To Learn Details About The Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Number of Responders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMewhat AGREE</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMewhat DISAGREE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yale Flipped Interview Day Project

The Small Group Activities Added Unwanted Stress To My Interview Experience

- STRONGLY AGREE: 2
- AGREE: 2
- SOMEWHAT AGREE: 5
- NEUTRAL: 6
- SOMEWHAT DISAGREE: 6
- DISAGREE: 28
- STRONGLY DISAGREE: 41

Number of Responders

[Bar chart showing the distribution of responses]
Yale Flipped Interview Day Project

• “Overall one of the best and most interactive interview days. Kept me constantly engaged and the day flew by. I would definitely keep the interactive experiences in the morning particularly the writing of 4 important things to us.”

• “Loved the flipped classroom! Gave me a good idea of the culture here and also made the interview day more interesting!”
Congratulations on being selected for an interview at the University of Arizona College of Medicine–Phoenix Internal Medicine Residency Program!

You have been selected from a pool of over 2,000 applicants as a competitive applicant that we think would fit well here. We are excited to meet you during this process.

For our "Remote" Interview Day and separate Applicant Visit Day, this website will be a special supplemental resource for more detailed information about our program.
Invited Applicant Website

Contents:

• Overview of interview & visit process
• Welcome, program overview
• Curriculum
  • Conferences
  • Research & Quality Improvement
  • Board Prep
• Resident Schedules, Clinical Sites
• Career & Personal Development
  • Mentoring
  • Career & Fellowship Prep
  • Wellness
  • Retreats, Resident Events
• Scholarly Activity
• Resident Life
• Benefits, Salary, Contract
• Residents as Teachers Prep
• Graduate Testimonials
Invited Applicant Website

Benefits:

• Applicants can review at their own pace
• Can return to it as needed over time
• Built in time for review as part of their remote interview day
• Can add new information, program updates over time
Interviews
Video interviews background

• Call for action “Video conference interviews may be one of the most impactful ways to improve and modernize the residency application process.”

• Pilots with initial interview via Skype as an introduction to the program and an opportunity to ask any critical questions with a follow up visit

• Recorded standardized video interview pilot for EM 2016 → expanded 2017-2018.

Sample video interview
Role of the Supplemental Information Form at UA COM-P in making the interview time most useful

- NOT a screening tool – helps interview time to be more high yield
- Routine questions addressed in advance of interview
  - Future career plans
  - Ties to AZ/Phoenix
  - Rotation here?
- Allows interview to be focused:
  - Needs of the program
  - Get to know applicant in more detail
  - Interests of the applicant
  - Form asks re: specific interests or questions they’d like to explore during their interviews
Virtual Interview Day: 4 Components

1. Program overview (independent review of invited applicant website)
2. PD interview (video)
3. APD interview (video)
4. Faculty interview (phone)
Description of video interviews at Johns Hopkins

• Motivation: Too many resources with little standardization

• ZOOM platform
• 15 minute slots with 10 minute interviews
• PD did all interviews (~400)
• 2 standardized questions plus 1 personalized question
• Really enjoyed the process and feedback from applicants was same
Visit day
Interview Day Snapshot 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Recruitment and Interview Day Characteristics of 270 US Internal Medicine Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Programs (n = 270)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview day components, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour</td>
<td>264 (98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>249 (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program director overview/slideshow</td>
<td>228 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>189 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning report</td>
<td>187 (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeting by Chair of Medicine</td>
<td>142 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon conference</td>
<td>137 (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner the night before interview</td>
<td>112 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending rounds</td>
<td>53 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient care rounds with residents</td>
<td>25 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty panel interview</td>
<td>24 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants interviewed as a group</td>
<td>7 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>30 (11%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PGY1 = post-graduate year 1; USMG = US medical graduate.

*Resident discussion panel, chief resident presentation, city tour, simulation center tour, meeting with fellowship directors.
Hopkins interview day: 8am to 3pm

• Morning Intro by PD
• Rounds or Interview
• Interview or Rounds
• Small talks on features of program by APDs
• Lunch with housestaff (NEW)
• Tour
• Resident-led presentation on Baltimore
• Q/A and closing
• Optional physician scientist recruitment sessions
Interview and file scoring
Hopkins Scoring and Reducing Bias

• Motivation: We found little anecdotal correlation between rank position and performance

• Therefore, we introduced Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales (BARS)
BARS fit correlated more strongly with Ranking than the 4 academic factors
Results

• *Fit* factors correlated more strongly with Ranking than the four academic factors
• Leadership was uncorrelated with Ranking
• There was no evidence of evaluation bias with respect to interviewer and applicant gender, race, and interviewer seniority.
• The 4 academic factors explained 11.8% and the 2 *fit* factors explained an additional 41% of the variation in Ranking.
• We have gone on to show the trainees selected by BARS also do better in 19 of 22 milestones at end of year.
UA COM-P Standard Questions & Formsite

Formsite for standardized file scoring:
UA COM-P Standard Questions & Formsite

Formsite for standardized file scoring:

• Total File Score is entered into Custom Scores box
• Comments / free text sections are copied & pasted directly into the Notes tab of ERAS
# UA COM-P Standard Questions & Formsite

## UA COM-P Internal Medicine Residency APP INTERVIEW FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring:** 1 = no insight/duelless, 2 = superficial/canned answer, 3 = some awareness but still off, 4 = good enough, match 5 = Perfect response

### QUESTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Score 1-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity:</strong> Tell me about a time when you had to adapt to diverse individuals by accepting/understanding their perspective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation:</strong> What kinds of challenges have you faced? Give an example of how you handled them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous Improvement:</strong> What was the most useful feedback you ever received?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication:</strong> Have you ever had an experience in which you had to speak up for someone or something?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Topics:</strong> Discussion on items from file not described above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Interview:</strong> Please note general rapport, ease of applicant, verbal and non-verbal communication style, or any other notable impressions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revision Date: 10/29/2017
Wrap-Up

• Residency recruitment has a high cost for all involved:
  • Medical Students
  • Program (PD, APDs, Coordinator, Faculty, Residents)
  • Financial, time, energy, opportunity costs

• Technology can be leveraged in multiple ways and in multiple aspects of
  the recruitment process in order to help alleviate some of these costs
  • Interview invitations/scheduling
  • Delivering information to applicants
  • Interviews / visit day
  • Interview and/or file scoring