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ADMISSIONS RENEWAL
OBJECTIVES OF LECTURE

- Describe medical school admissions evidence relevant to admissions renewal.
- Develop a strategy for implementing medical school admissions renewal.
- Develop training and engagement strategies for admission raters including faculty, residents and MD students.
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ADMISSIONS RENEWAL

- Canadian and U of T admission contexts
- Multiple independent sampling (MIS) applied within admissions context
  - Multiple Mini Interview (MMI) model
- Admissions recruitment and resourcing goals
- Modified Personal Interview (MPI)
  - Evaluation to date
  - Future directions
CANADIAN CONTEXT

All 17 Canadian MD schools ≈ admissions interviews
• McMaster MD school developed MMI in 2004 & 13/17 schools use MMI
• 3 Francophone MD schools employ one Quebec provincial MMI
• *U of T is ¼ schools not using MMI*

MMI ≈ Canadian success story
• MMI combines multiple independent sampling & structured/standardized interviews
• MMI ≈ interview process with applicants cycling thru 10 brief interviews of 8 minutes duration
• Acceptable and feasible
• Reliability is moderate/high with prediction thru to licensing examination
CANADIAN CONTEXT

Future of Medical Education in Canada (FMEC) (2010)
  • Association of Faculties of Medicine of Canada (AFMC)
  • FMEC recommendation: Enhancing Admission Processes
    • Non-academic & academic competencies to both be valued
    • AFMC ≈ National collaboration

AFMC 2014 Admissions Symposium ≈ national policy
  • National admissions MMI ?
U OF T CONTEXT

Admissions Personal Interview

• 2 interviewers (faculty & MD student) per interview with limited training
• Absent standardization & open file
• Each interview is 40-60 minutes
• Each interviewer assesses max 5 applicants
• 290 interviewers & 580 applicants
• Admissions final ranking ≈ 80% file & 20% interview

History

• Long tradition (25 years)
• Adopted for recruitment goal of placing a welcoming institutional face
• Successful recruitment – admissions yield rose from mid-60% to current highs 75%-80%
• Admissions statistics ≈ reputation & prestige markers
U OF T CONTEXT

• Admissions status quo cannot continue…
  • FMEC’s call to enhance admissions value of non-academic intrinsic competencies alongside academics
  • National collaboration re: MMI
    • MMI not attuned to U of T recruitment goal
    • MMI ➔ reputational risk for U of T
      • Interview brevity to decrease resource demand (5 minutes)
      • Impersonal interview approach, including closed file interview format
      • Large scale organizational demands (large crowds of applicants & interviewers, hall monitors & timing)
      • Disruption of campus recruitment activities
BACKGROUND MATERIALS

MMI & Recruitment
- apply multiple independent sampling to admissions personal interview
- admissions interview structure
  - Clare Kreiter

FMEC Enhancements
- U of T Council of Health Sciences Education
  - Caring and conscientiousness
  - Foundational competencies of all health care professionals
- CanMEDS Roles
- AMS Phoenix “Call to Caring” Project
  - Instill caring, compassion & empathy alongside technical expertise
MODIFIED PERSONAL INTERVIEW (MPI)

- The philosophy
- The basic model
- The evaluation path to date
THE PHILOSOPHY

• Assessment of non-academic intrinsic competencies
  • Evaluate pre-selected intrinsic competencies independent of academic transcripts/MCAT scores

• Standardization and fairness
  • Applicant should get multiple independent chances at showing their abilities
    • Multiple independent sampling, relative raking and semi-structured format
    • Enhanced rater training

• Active recruitment of great applicants via warm and personalized process
  • Reputation maintained/enhanced
  • Admissions yield maintained/enhanced

• Process should be reliable, predictive of future performance
U OF T BASIC MODEL - FMEC

- **U of T Medicine Admissions Adaptation**: explicitly assess **Caring and Conscientiousness** as entry-level competency at admissions interview

  - Explicit selection for humanistic and caring skills alongside academic excellence ➔ collaboration, ethical decision-making, self-reflection & values
  - MPI question writing/review/training ➔ Faculty, MD students & AMS Phoenix Project “**A Call to Caring**” colleagues
  - Competency prioritization & reorganization
    - Caring and Conscientiousness global competency rating across MPI circuit
    - Final Admissions rank ordering – 50/50 for admissions file review and interview
MPI ➔ “Getting to know applicants” & recruitment priority

• Interviewers are ambassadors for U of T Meds
• Emphasis upon behavioural interviewing questions ➔ conversation, not interrogation ➔ semi-structured interview format
• Faculty, residents, MD students interviewers ➔ applicants’ multiple sampling of medical education experiences

MPI ➔ embedded within campus recruitment activities

• Michener Institute – MMI site
ADMISSIONS MPI BASIC MODEL

Interviewers: Faculty, Residents and 4th Year Medical Students

Interviewer #1: Collaboration
Interviewer #2: Values
Interviewer #3: Ethical decision making
Interviewer #4: Self reflection

Global Competency: Caring and Conscientiousness
Michener Institute
Begin the MPI with interviewer and applicant introductions

1) I’d like to start the interview with a question about your team/group experience. Throughout medical school, you will need to communicate with diverse groups of people - patients, other students and professionals.

Please describe a team/group experience you have had and what you learned from that experience.

Follow-up questions

Can you tell me a bit more about the role you played in this team/group? What particular attributes do you feel you, personally, contributed to the team/group dynamics?

How do you think this experience will help you in medical school working with other students and one day with other professionals and patients from diverse backgrounds?
I have some additional questions regarding your overall experience and thoughts regarding team-work.

2) From your experience, how does caring factor into teamwork? Can you share an example of how caring about team members was linked positively or negatively to a team’s functioning?

3) Tell me about how being a conscientious team member was demonstrated in a past team interaction? Please describe the effect of your conscientious behavior upon other team members and the team’s functioning.

4) How do you think competition interferes or enhances team function? Can you give me an example from your past team experiences to illustrate your point? If you experienced competitive urges yourself how did you manage them or if others did so how did you manage their competitive urges?
MPI SAMPLE COLLABORATION QUESTIONS

Please feel free as the interviewer to ask your own questions to further elaborate upon the applicant’s answers to the above questions.

At the 11-minute point of the interview, please begin to bring the interview to an end as the door will open at 12 minutes signaling the interview’s end. Also, remember to ask applicants if they have questions regarding the U of T medical school experience and to share your own medical education experiences as a medical student, resident and faculty member as you wish and feel comfortable in doing.
U OF T BASIC MODEL – RATER TRAINING
U OF T BASIC MODEL – RATER TRAINING

160 MPI interviewers with 95% completed online training
EVALUATION PATH TO DATE

MPI analysis
• G theory & D study

Applicant feedback
• applicant online forum & blog

Admissions yield
MPI QUESTIONS

• What is the reliability of the average interview score across 4 interviews? (inter-station reliability)

• What is the reliability of the ratings given within an interview? (inter-item reliability)

• Are there meaningful differences between interview stations? Days? Circuits?
G-STUDY RESULTS

- Inter-station reliability across 4 stations: 0.55
- Inter-item reliability within a single station: 0.94
Inter-interview reliability

@ 4 stations: 0.55
@ 5 stations: 0.60
@ 6 stations: 0.64
@ 7 stations: 0.67
@ 8 stations: 0.70
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MPI STATIONS

• All MPI stations had moderate item-total correlations (0.30-0.33)

• Self-Reflection MPI station (student or resident rater only) was not significantly different in terms of score or impact on reliability

• No significant differences between MPI Stations across Days
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RATERS

• No differences between Residents and Faculty on Collaboration & Values MPIs

• Residents significantly more hawkish than Faculty on Ethics MPI but effect is small (Cohen’s d=0.27).

• No differences between Students & Residents on Self Reflection MPI
OPTIMIZING MPI RELIABILITY

- Adding MPI stations → Increases resources and may jeopardize “Getting to know applicants” & recruitment priority
- Review & renew MPI questions
- Changing MPI rating scale → Moving from 7 point to 9 point scaling
- Revisit rater training → Emphasis on global judgement
- Addressing rater level factors → Load, fatigue, drift
[...] the new MPI format was surprisingly pleasant. All my interviewers were really nice and friendly.

The general consensus from the people I talked to who were interviewing with me on Jan 25th was that the way they asked the questions was weird for many of the stations and that the process lacked a bit of refinement (you could tell it was the first interview day).

This is NOT an MMI. Nor is it a classic panel interview - though I suspect it is more similar to the traditional personal/panel interview in that you will be asked to discuss things that you have done in the past. MMIs mostly focus on new scenarios which you may have had no experience with.

[...] two minute gap between each station [...] I didn't like the wait, either. Felt the urge to read something on the door as if it were an MMI.

I absolutely loved the MPI format, as others have said. I did find the 2 minutes were a bit long (1 minute would have been more than enough time), I ended up quietly chatting with the student guide that was there a few times, having a brief chance to talk to someone who wasn't evaluating me helped reduce the tension a bit.
BeMo Admissions Blog

Ultimate Guide to Modified Personal Interview (MPI)

Modified Personal Interview (MPI) at the University of Toronto

Introduction

Since this is the first year the new Modified Personal Interviews (MPIs) are being introduced by the University of Toronto's medical school, there seems to be a lot of confusion about what these interviews encompass. Therefore, this blog will strictly focus on the MPI and how it differs from the traditional Personal Interview (PI) and the Multiple Mini Interview (MMI). After reading this blog you will be familiarized with:

1. The history and logic/rationale behind the MPI
2. The set up and organization of the MPI
3. The types of questions you will encounter on the MPI

History, Background, & Rationale

The Modified Personal Interview (MPI) was designed as a response to the constant criticism that the Personal Interview (PI) receives for its limitations (poor reliability and validity) in identifying the right medical school candidate. Furthermore, the MPI was introduced as a counter-measure by
ADMISSIONS YIELD

- Overall yield is maintained
- UTM campus yield is enhanced

Explanatory hypothesis

- Overall yield – U of T reputational ceiling effect
- UTM campus yield – elastic & impacted by U of T reputation
  - MPI @ Michener Institute – single site – concentrates U of T brand message
  - Academy based – multiple sites – dilutes U of T brand message
FUTURE DIRECTIONS & PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Psychometrics

Prestige

2013 and 2014 UTM Campus Yield

2014 UTM Yield
2013 UTM Yield

Number of Interviews
Reliability

MPI
THE PHILOSOPHY – HOW DID WE DO?

• Assessment of non-academic intrinsic competencies
  • Evaluate pre-selected intrinsic competencies independent of academic transcripts/MCAT scores ✔

• Standardization and fairness
  • Applicant should get multiple independent chances at showing their abilities
    • Multiple independent sampling, relative ranking and semi-structured format ✔
    • Enhanced rater training ✔

• Active recruitment of great applicants via warm and personalized process
  • Reputation maintained/enhanced ✔
  • Admissions yield maintained/enhanced ✔

• Process should be reliable, predictive of future performance ±/−
QUESTIONS

Thank you ~