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Objectives

• Discuss the importance of consistent applicant evaluation and its effect on improving diversity and reducing-bias in admissions.

• Complete optimal training of evaluators on holistic admissions, bias, and scoring.

• Describe effective interactions between evaluators and applicants, including prompting questions and providing feedback.

• Recognize the importance of consistent evaluation techniques on data collection and continuous admissions monitoring.
Historical Context: “Traditional Admissions”

- Metric-based Pre-Screen
- Faculty interviews
- Faculty discussion
- Acceptance
Challenging Biases

Only PA Faculty and/or PAs know how to pick good future PAs

Academic metrics and GRE consistently predict PA student success

Specific “paths” to PA are consistent with success, other paths less so

Perfect interview = excellent future student; mistakes in interview = poor future student

Biggest goal = identifying strong PA students
PAEA Diversity Statistics

**FIGURE 4. RACE**

- **White**
  - MSS: 86.8%
  - EOPS: 90.2%
- **Asian**
  - MSS: 11.5%
  - EOPS: 8.9%
- **Black or African American**
  - MSS: 3.7%
  - EOPS: 2.6%
- **American Indian or Alaskan Native**
  - MSS: 1.3%
  - EOPS: 1.0%
- **Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander**
  - MSS: 0.3%
  - EOPS: 0.0%

**Respondents (%)**
PAEA Diversity Statistics

2017 PAEA Student Report 2
Matriculating student response rate 42.1% of 9,626 1st year students
• 4.5% veterans (n=178)
• 68.2% of veterans had healthcare training in military
• 75.2% female, 24.8% male
• Age range 17-59
• Age mean 25.7
• Sexual orientation not inquired about

2018 PAEA Student Report 3
Matriculating student response rate 45.8% of 10,578 1st year students
• 3.9% veterans (n=176)
• 74% of veterans had healthcare training in the military
• 75.5% female, 24.5% male
• Age range 19-65
• Age mean 25.6
• Sexual orientation other than straight 5.7%
UNMC Self Reflection

In order to change the outcome, we needed to change the process.
Back to the Drawing Board: Holistic Admissions

- Non-Cognitive Variables & metrics
- Multiple-mini interviews, healthcare experience & metrics
- Applicants admitted based on rubric scores

Get to know the applicant 1st as a person before applying metrics

Use trained evaluators from many professions to interview

No faculty discussion about who to accept (except for “red flags”)
Evaluator Training Overview
8 Steps for Successful Evaluator Training

1. Recruitment
2. Engage in the mission
3. Bias Awareness Training
4. Buy In
5. Teach the rubric
6. Practice evaluating
7. Collect and give feedback
8. Retrain
UNMC Evaluator Training: Mission, Buy-In, Bias

- **Transparent** with evaluators about mission
- Introduced holistic admissions
- Discussed diversity & bias
  - Several examples so all participants can relate
- Introduced multiple mini-interviews
- Question & answer – huge buy in opportunity!
Holistic Admissions Practices

• Consider potential as a future provider in addition to potential as a future student
• Consider whole person
• Utilize experiences-attributes-metrics (E-A-M) model during each step of admissions (recruitment, application screening, interviews, selection)
• Promote student retention, diversity, and optimal learning environment
• Focus on organization’s mission and goals

Sources: Measuring Noncognitive Variables for Student Success & Retention by William Sedlacek; AAMC - www.aamc.org
Evaluator Training

Evaluators complete online course titled “Personal Skills for a Diverse Campus” prior to in-person training session on campus.

- Engagement with diversity
- Inclusive communication (impact, terminology, identity terms, microaggressions)
- The influence of unconscious bias
- Myths and stereotypes about merit and fit
Evaluator Training

Evaluators completed an in-person training session:
• 3 hours
• On campus- Kearney and Omaha
• Led by faculty facilitator
• Introduction addressing background of MMI, outcomes studies, unconscious bias
Halo Effect and Interviewer Bias

- **Halo effect** - A tendency to respond positively or negatively to particular people.
- Halo effect can be positive or negative.
- We all have biases.
- Examples: Athletes, veterans, geographic region, college vs. university, religion, pets, weight/height.
- Be aware of your potential biases.
- As MMI stations are situations or tasks, personal information shared by applicant will be minimal.
Combatting Bias in Scoring

• Re-read attributes to be assessed before and after each interview
• Score based on the rubric
• Regulate emotional response (with 8 stations, good and weak applicants will make themselves known)
• Don’t stress if you have a potential conflict of interest, just mark it down
• “When in doubt, move to the middle” – William Sedlacek
Evaluator Training

• Attendees practiced scoring video scenarios in pairs
  • Discussion in pairs following video regarding justification for scoring
  • Discussion as a group regarding any changes or other perspectives to scoring
• Attendees practiced scoring video scenarios individually
  • Discussion in group regarding justifications for scoring
  • Discussion as a group what different perspectives may influence evaluator’s scoring
• Process enhances more consistent scoring and moves scoring “average” toward a norm for evaluators.
Evaluator Recruitment

Consider the following for evaluators in the student admissions interview process:

- Active & past preceptors- MD, DO, PA, NP
- Alumni
- Current PA faculty members
- Other allied health profession faculty members (IPE)
- Non-preceptor health providers in community
- Guest lecturers
Evaluator Incentives

Alumni - part of selection of next generation
Gifts of Appreciation:
- Apparel items specific to professional program
- Thermal Mugs, promotional ware
Funding Sources

Diversity funding available at many institutions

Nebraska Inclusive Excellence Development Grant
• Development of E-module for evaluator training that can be completed interactively without requirement for on-site attendance.

APPROVED
Practice Scoring: Creating Training Videos

• Use actual cases
• Standardized patients and PA students
• Disclaimers
• Media Release Form
• Ensure audio and video quality
• Consider ADA accommodations
  • CC
  • Voice-over if needed
Practice Scoring: Example – Blood Draw

Applicant Door Note:

You are seeing a patient at a follow-up appointment to review bloodwork that you personally drew at yesterday’s visit. This morning, you were informed by the lab that you mislabeled the blood you drew, and therefore the lab results are not available. The patient was very hesitant about the blood-draw yesterday because of his fear of needles. You will need to inform the patient the blood needs to be redrawn. The patient is in the room waiting for his visit to discuss the results.
Evaluator Instructions: Example – Blood Draw

Evaluator: You will be evaluating the student as they interact with the standardized patient. The SP will become visibly annoyed or angered when the student delivers the news that the blood needs to be re-drawn. Please be prepared to assess the applicant’s integrity, humility, professionalism, empathy, and ability to accept feedback.

Prompting questions (asked by SP, if needed):
• Why did this error happen?
• What will you do to make sure it doesn’t happen again?
• Is there a chance this could happen again?
• If I want to make a complaint, who can I speak to?
Example – Blood Draw

Focus of Station:
Medical knowledge should NOT be assessed as part of this station.
Below are some characteristics of effective station navigation that the applicant might display.
1. Displays integrity by reporting a mistake was made and that the mistake is his/her fault.
2. Avoids blaming someone else for the error.
3. Displays remorse for the mistake and apologizes to the patient for the error.
4. Accepts feedback gracefully and professionally.
5. Avoids minimizing the patient’s fear of needles, blood, blood draws, etc.
Collect & Give Feedback

- Applicant Feedback
- Evaluator Feedback
- Scoring Data Analysis
Evaluator Feedback

• Provide evaluators with a piece of paper requesting station feedback and/or suggestions

“Should it indicate on the prompt whether it’s absolutely necessary for the blood to be redrawn or if other methods are available for testing?”

“On the door note, consider not saying you can leave the room – it isn’t necessary to stay all 8 minutes.”

“The door note indicated the SP was a male. Consider making it gender neutral so it doesn’t catch the applicant off guard if the SP is a female.”
The Last Step: Retrain

• Any returning evaluators (including faculty!) must complete refresher training annually
• Individual feedback given based on scoring patterns as need
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