

# Supplemental ERAS® 2022-2023 Application Cycle: Results of the Program Director Reaction Survey

## Overview

Program directors from the programs participating in the supplemental ERAS application for the 2022-2023 cycle were invited to complete a survey about their experiences from Nov. 17, 2022, to Dec. 16, 2022. The purpose of the survey was to collect feedback from program directors to better understand their experience with the supplemental ERAS application data within the Program Director’s Workstation (PDWS). The survey took about 15 minutes to complete.

Responses were analyzed in aggregate and by specialty. This report summarizes overall and select specialty-specific results from the program directors’ survey. Specialty-specific results are included in the supplemental appendices. Results with smaller sample sizes should be interpreted with caution. (Percentage values in tables may not total 100% due to rounding and cells with fewer than five observations. Results for Internal Medicine/Psychiatry and Public Health and General Preventive Medicine were not included due to small sample sizes.)

## Sample

Program directors from 985 programs responded (34% program response rate). Response rates by participating specialties varied (Table 1). Five percent of respondents indicated they did not use the supplemental ERAS application data, so results from these respondents were excluded from the analysis.

**Table 1. Survey Response Rate, Overall and by Specialty**

Specialty	Percentage (Number) of Programs That Responded	Number of Programs That Participated in the Supplemental ERAS® Application
Adult Neurology	27% (42)	155
Anesthesiology	46% (71)	154
Dermatology	29% (36)	123
Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology	30% (80)	271
Emergency Medicine	45% (117)	261
General Surgery	30% (86)	283
Internal Medicine - Categorical	30% (154)	512
Internal Medicine/Psychiatry	15% (2)	13
Neurological Surgery	21% (23)	110
Obstetrics and Gynecology	37% (100)	272

Specialty	Percentage (Number) of Programs That Responded	Number of Programs That Participated in the Supplemental ERAS® Application
Orthopedic Surgery	27% (49)	182
Pediatrics	40% (80)	200
Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation	42% (40)	95
Psychiatry	37% (95)	255
Public Health and General Preventive Medicine	38% (10)	26
<b>Overall percentage (total number) of respondents and number of programs that participated in the supplemental ERAS application</b>	<b>34% (985)</b>	<b>2,912</b>

## Findings

### Past Experiences

Emergency Medicine and Obstetrics and Gynecology did not participate in the Past Experiences or Geographic Preferences sections of the supplemental ERAS application, so directors of programs in those specialties were not presented with survey questions about those sections. Of the directors who responded from the other 13 specialties:

- Seventy percent used data from the meaningful and impactful experiences information of the supplemental ERAS application during their admissions process (Table 2).
- Nearly 70% found the type of information applicants provided about meaningful experiences and other impactful experiences was neither insufficient nor extraneous (Table 3).

**Table 2. Did you use the meaningful and impactful experiences information during the application review process?**

Choice	Percentage (n)
Yes	70% (537)
No	30% (230)
Total number	767

**Table 3. The type of information provided by the most meaningful and impactful experiences responses was:**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)</b>
<i>Lacking important information</i>	11% (51)
<i>Just about right</i>	69% (326)
<i>Included extraneous information</i>	21% (98)
<b>Total number</b>	<b>475</b>

#### Most Meaningful Experiences

- Respondents used or planned to use the meaningful experiences information through various stages of the application process: as part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview (94% of respondents), as a tiebreaker to help decide whom to interview (79% of respondents), as part of their preparation for the interview (87% of respondents), and as part of rank order list (ROL) discussions (71% of respondents) (Table 4).
- Seventy percent of respondents thought the meaningful experiences responses helped them get a better picture of each applicant (Table 5).
- Forty-three to 54% of respondents thought the meaningful experiences responses provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the Experience section of the MyERAS® application, Noteworthy Characteristics section of the Medical Student Performance Evaluation (MSPE), personal statement, or letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation (Table 6).
- Forty-nine percent of respondents found it was more efficient to use the meaningful experiences data than data from the Experience section of the MyERAS application (Table 7).

**Table 4. How important is the most meaningful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
528	6% (33)	94% (495)	9% (45)	45% (224)	32% (156)	14% (70)	46% (226)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
524	21% (112)	79% (412)	35% (144)	37% (154)	21% (88)	6% (26)	28% (114)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
526	13% (69)	87% (457)	13% (61)	37% (167)	35% (162)	15% (67)	50% (229)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
521	29% (152)	71% (369)	34% (125)	42% (155)	19% (71)	5% (18)	24% (89)
<i>Other</i>							
187	71% (133)	29% (54)	54% (29)	24% (13)	15% (8)	7% (4)	22% (12)

**Table 5. The most meaningful experiences responses helped me get a better picture of each applicant.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
518	4% (22)	96% (496)	4% (20)	7% (34)	19% (96)	60% (296)	10% (50)	70% (346)

**Table 6. The most meaningful experiences provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagree % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
481	3% (16)	97% (465)	7% (33)	16% (76)	23% (105)	45% (210)	9% (41)	54% (251)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
481	4% (18)	96% (463)	6% (29)	17% (78)	24% (112)	42% (196)	10% (48)	53% (244)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
481	3% (16)	97% (465)	6% (29)	20% (93)	31% (144)	35% (165)	7% (34)	43% (199)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
481	4% (17)	96% (464)	6% (28)	18% (82)	23% (105)	41% (189)	13% (60)	54% (249)

**Table 7. It was more efficient to use information from the most meaningful experiences than the information from the ...**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagree % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
476	3% (14)	97% (462)	9% (40)	19% (86)	24% (109)	35% (164)	14% (63)	49% (227)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
477	4% (19)	96% (458)	10% (44)	24% (108)	29% (134)	29% (131)	9% (41)	38% (172)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
478	3% (15)	97% (463)	13% (59)	29% (136)	31% (143)	21% (96)	6% (29)	27% (125)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
476	4% (17)	96% (459)	12% (56)	25% (114)	28% (127)	25% (113)	11% (49)	35% (162)

### Other Impactful Experiences

- Respondents used or planned to use the other impactful experiences information through various stages of the application process: as part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview (90% of respondents), as a tiebreaker to help decide whom to interview (76% of respondents), as part of their preparation for the interview (82% of respondents), and as part of rank order list (ROL) discussions (69% of respondents) (Table 8).
- Seventy percent of respondents thought the other impactful experiences responses helped put the main ERAS application in context (Table 9).
- Forty-two to 55% of respondents thought the other impactful experiences essay provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the Experience section of the MyERAS application, Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE, personal statement, or letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation (Table 10).

**Table 8. How important is the other impactful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
526	10% (52)	90% (474)	13% (61)	48% (229)	29% (136)	10% (48)	39% (184)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
519	24% (126)	76% (393)	36% (143)	40% (158)	19% (76)	4% (16)	23% (92)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
520	18% (95)	82% (425)	16% (70)	43% (181)	31% (130)	10% (44)	41% (174)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
518	31% (160)	69% (358)	39% (138)	41% (147)	17% (60)	4% (13)	20% (73)
<i>Other</i>							
208	69% (143)	31% (65)	57% (37)	23% (15)	15% (10)	5% (3)	20% (13)

**Table 9. The other impactful experiences essay helped put the main ERAS application in context.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
511	6% (31)	94% (480)	4% (17)	8% (36)	29% (140)	49% (233)	11% (54)	60% (287)

**Table 10. The other impactful experiences essay provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
474	5% (25)	95% (449)	6% (26)	14% (64)	25% (112)	41% (186)	14% (61)	55% (247)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
474	6% (28)	94% (446)	6% (27)	14% (64)	28% (126)	40% (179)	11% (50)	51% (229)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
473	5% (26)	95% (447)	7% (32)	18% (79)	33% (149)	33% (149)	9% (38)	42% (187)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
470	6% (27)	94% (443)	7% (30)	15% (67)	28% (124)	37% (164)	13% (58)	50% (222)

#### Key Characteristics and Primary Focus Areas

- More than 80% of respondents used the key characteristics and primary focus areas (Table 11).
- Twenty-four to 33% of respondents found it was more efficient to use the key characteristics and primary focus areas than to use the Experience section of the MyERAS application, Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE, personal statement, or letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation (Table 12).

**Table 11. Responses to the Experiences Questions**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>The key characteristics helped me get a better picture of each applicant.</i>								
515	16% (82)	84% (433)	7% (30)	11% (47)	36% (154)	42% (184)	4% (18)	47% (202)
<i>The primary focus area helped me better understand applicant's alignment to my program's mission.</i>								
512	19% (96)	81% (416)	8% (33)	14% (57)	40% (166)	34% (142)	4% (18)	38% (160)

**Table 12. It was more efficient to use the experience types, key characteristics, and primary focus areas to better understand applicant qualities than the information from the ...**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
473	14% (64)	86% (409)	12% (48)	22% (92)	33% (133)	25% (103)	8% (33)	33% (136)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
474	14% (67)	86% (407)	12% (49)	25% (101)	36% (145)	20% (83)	7% (29)	28% (112)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
472	14% (65)	86% (407)	13% (53)	29% (119)	34% (137)	18% (75)	6% (23)	24% (98)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
472	14% (65)	86% (407)	12% (50)	26% (107)	35% (144)	19% (76)	7% (30)	26% (106)



## Geographic Preferences

Emergency Medicine and Obstetrics and Gynecology did not participate in the Geographic Preferences sections of the supplemental ERAS application and were not presented with survey questions about this section. Of the directors who responded from the other 13 specialties:

- Most respondents (82%) used the Geographic Preferences section during their admissions process (Table 13) and reported that it helped them identify applicants whom they would have otherwise overlooked (Table 14).
- Sixty-three percent of respondents found their program’s geographic division as designated by the U.S. Census accurately represented the location of their program (Table 14).
- Respondents used geographic preferences information during various stages of the application process: as a screening tool before a more thorough application review (86% of respondents), to send interview invitations to every applicant who selected their region (58% of respondents), to include in a composite filter to conduct holistic review (74% of respondents), as part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview (94% of respondents), as a tiebreaker to help decide whom to interview (88% of respondents), to prepare for the interview (70% of respondents) (Table 15).
- Sixty-eight percent of respondents answered that they plan to use geographic preferences information during rank order list (ROL) discussion. Geographic preferences are not intended to be used during ROL discussion. The AAMC is updating communications about the appropriate use of geographic preferences information and sending them to programs throughout the remaining cycle.
- Forty-seven percent of respondents thought applicants who selected their region were more likely to accept interview invitations (Table 16).

**Table 13. Did you use geographic preference information during the application review process?**

Choice	Percentage (n)
Yes	82% (582)
No	18% (128)
Total number	710

**Table 14. Responses to Geographic Preferences Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>Geographic preference information helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
568	6% (35)	15% (87)	20% (112)	45% (254)	14% (80)	59% (334)
<i>My program's geographic division as designated by the U.S. Census accurately represents the location of my program.</i>						
563	7% (42)	12% (68)	18% (101)	47% (262)	16% (90)	63% (352)

**Table 15. How important was the geographic preference information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
575	14% (79)	86% (496)	11% (57)	35% (173)	28% (140)	25% (126)	54% (266)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant that selected my region</i>							
575	42% (240)	58% (335)	50% (167)	30% (99)	14% (47)	7% (22)	21% (69)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
571	26% (147)	74% (424)	20% (85)	36% (154)	28% (117)	16% (68)	44% (185)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide whom to interview</i>							
574	6% (37)	94% (537)	6% (31)	42% (224)	31% (169)	21% (113)	53% (282)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
571	12% (71)	88% (500)	13% (66)	36% (179)	33% (166)	18% (89)	51% (255)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
572	30% (174)	70% (398)	38% (151)	36% (143)	21% (85)	5% (19)	26% (104)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
570	32% (183)	68% (387)	32% (122)	41% (160)	22% (84)	5% (21)	27% (105)
<i>Other</i>							
176	77% (135)	23% (41)	49% (20)	20% (8)	20% (8)	12% (5)	32% (13)

**Table 16. In general, applicants who stated a preference for my region were more likely to accept interview invitations.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
565	4% (23)	8% (46)	41% (232)	35% (199)	12% (65)	47% (264)

#### Interpreting a Blank or No Geographic Preference

- More than 75% of respondents interpreted a “No geographic preference” response as the applicant was willing to go anywhere; 45% of respondents thought the applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography. More than 20% of respondents thought the applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response, or they did not draw any conclusions (Table 17).
- More than 40% of respondents interpreted a blank geographic preference as the applicant was willing to go anywhere or that the applicant was less interested in their program’s region. More than 25% of respondents thought the applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response, the applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography or did not draw any conclusions (Table 18).

**Table 17. How did you interpret a “No geographic preference” response? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>% (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program’s region</i>	9% (53)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	4% (23)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	78% (449)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	45% (255)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	23% (130)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	21% (123)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	15% (86)
<i>Other</i>	1% (7)
<b>Total number</b>	<b>573<sup>1</sup></b>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table 18. How did you interpret a blank geographic preference? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>% (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program’s region</i>	40% (227)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	16% (93)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	43% (249)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	27% (156)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	28% (162)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	26% (152)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	9% (53)
<i>Other</i>	2% (13)
<b>Total number</b>	<b>574<sup>1</sup></b>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

## Program Signals

- Eighty-two percent of respondents used program signals data during their application review process (Table 19).
- Respondents used program signals during various stages of the application process: as a screening tool before a more thorough application review (88% of respondents), to send interview invitations to every applicant who signaled their program (61% of respondents), to include in a composite filter to conduct holistic review (78% of respondents), as part of a holistic application review to decide who to interview (91% of respondents), as a tiebreaker to help decide whom to interview (86% of respondents), and during the interview to learn more about why an applicant signaled their program (64% of respondents) (Table 20).
- Sixty-three percent of respondents answered that they plan to use program signals information during rank order list (ROL) discussion. Program signals are not intended to be used during ROL discussion. The AAMC is updating and sending communications to programs throughout the remaining cycle on appropriate use of program signals information.
- Seventy-five percent of respondents agreed that program signals “helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked” (Table 21).
- Fifty percent of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed about whether applicants who signaled their program were better aligned than those who did not (Table 21). The survey was administered during the middle of the interview season when there would be more uncertainty.
- Respondents were asked whether the number of program signals available to applicants in their specialty were sufficient. Forty-five to 73% of respondents whose specialties allotted three to eight signals thought the number of signals was sufficient (Table 22).

### Interpreting Signals

- More than 50% of respondents interpreted a blank value for the program signal as the applicant being less interested in their program (Table 23).
- For Obstetrics and Gynecology programs, more than 70% of respondents interpreted Gold signals as more valuable than Silver signals (Table 24).
- For programs that used both geographic preferences and program signals, more than 50% of respondents gave more weight to program signals than to geographic preferences (Table 25).

**Table 19. Did you use program signals during the application review process?**

Choice	Percentage (n)
Yes	90% (830)
No	10% (89)
Total number	919

**Table 20. How important were program signals at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Not Important % (n)	Somewhat Important % (n)	Important % (n)	Very Important % (n)	Important or Very Important % (n)
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
824	12% (102)	88% (722)	9% (63)	21% (152)	25% (183)	45% (324)	70% (507)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant who signaled my program</i>							
817	39% (318)	61% (499)	43% (214)	29% (147)	16% (82)	11% (56)	28% (138)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
814	22% (176)	78% (638)	13% (81)	26% (163)	34% (214)	28% (180)	62% (394)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
819	9% (71)	91% (748)	6% (46)	27% (199)	34% (257)	33% (246)	67% (503)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
816	14% (116)	86% (700)	10% (73)	25% (175)	33% (228)	32% (224)	65% (452)
<i>During the interview to learn more about why an applicant signaled my program</i>							
815	36% (292)	64% (523)	25% (130)	33% (173)	25% (132)	17% (88)	42% (220)

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
814	37% (299)	63% (515)	28% (144)	35% (182)	24% (124)	13% (65)	37% (189)
<i>Other</i>							
241	73% (175)	27% (66)	36% (24)	33% (22)	15% (10)	15% (10)	30% (20)

**Table 21. Responses to Program Signals Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>Program signals helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
801	4% (32)	7% (58)	14% (109)	44% (350)	31% (252)	75% (602)
<i>Based on a review of their application, applicants who signaled my program were better aligned than those who did not.</i>						
801	4% (30)	18% (142)	50% (402)	22% (177)	6% (50)	28% (227)
<i>Applicants who signaled my program were more likely to accept interview invitations.</i>						
799	3% (25)	6% (48)	31% (250)	31% (250)	28% (226)	60% (476)

**Table 22. The number of signals available to applicants in my specialty was:**

<b>Specialty (Maximum Number of Signals)</b>	<b>Too Few % (n)</b>	<b>About Right % (n)</b>	<b>Too Many % (n)</b>	<b>Not Sure % (n)</b>	<b>Total Number</b>
Adult Neurology (3 signals)	33% (12)	47% (17)	3% (1)	17% (6)	36
Anesthesiology (5 signals)	44% (27)	45% (28)	3% (2)	8% (5)	62
Dermatology (3 signals)	36% (10)	61% (17)	4% (1)	0% (0)	28
Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology (6 signals)	7% (5)	68% (48)	7% (5)	18% (13)	71
Emergency Medicine (5 signals)	13% (13)	66% (67)	4% (4)	18% (18)	102
General Surgery (5 signals)	18% (11)	69% (43)	3% (2)	10% (6)	62
Internal Medicine (7 signals)	10% (12)	51% (63)	22% (27)	18% (22)	124
Neurological Surgery (8 signals)	7% (1)	73% (11)	0% (0)	20% (3)	15
Obstetrics and Gynecology (3 Gold, 15 Silver)	1% (1)	58% (52)	26% (23)	15% (13)	89
Orthopedic Surgery (30 signals)	3% (1)	60% (24)	30% (12)	8% (3)	40
Pediatrics (5 signals)	3% (2)	64% (41)	6% (4)	27% (17)	64
Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation (4 signals)	19% (7)	65% (24)	0% (0)	16% (6)	37
Psychiatry (5 signals)	21% (16)	56% (44)	1% (1)	22% (17)	78

**Table 23. How did you interpret a blank value for the program signal?  
(Select all that apply)**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	53% (427)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	15% (125)
<i>Applicant was afraid or unwilling to provide a response</i>	9% (77)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	38% (312)
<i>Treated the same as applicants who signaled my program</i>	11% (87)
<i>Other</i>	4% (31)
Total number	812 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table 24. How did you interpret gold and silver signals? (For Ob-Gyn only)**

Choice	Percentage (n) <sup>1</sup>
<i>Did not differentiate between gold and silver signals</i>	21% (19)
<i>Gold and silver signals had equal value</i>	4% (4)
<i>Gold signals were more valuable than silver signals</i>	71% (63)
<i>Other</i>	3% (3)
Total number	89

1. Only Obstetrics and Gynecology offered Gold and Silver program signal distinctions.



**Table 25. How did your program interpret program signals and geographic preferences?**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)<sup>1</sup></b>
<i>Considered geographic preference and program signals separately</i>	24% (127)
<i>Viewed applicants who reported a preference for my region <u>and</u> signaled my program more favorably</i>	21% (113)
<i>Gave more weight to program signals than geographic preference</i>	53% (280)
<i>Gave more weight to geographic preference than program signals</i>	2% (10)
<b>Total number</b>	<b>530</b>

1. Only programs that used both program signals and geographic preferences answered this question.

### Using Supplemental ERAS® Application Data in the PDWS

- More than 70% of respondents used the AAMC’s supplemental ERAS application resources (Table 26).
- More than 50% of respondents thought the supplemental application data on the PDWS were easy to use (Table 27).

**Table 26. How useful were the following resources in helping you prepare for the 2023 ERAS season?**

Resource	N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Not Useful % (n)	Somewhat Useful % (n)	Useful % (n)	Somewhat Useful or Useful % (n)
Program Director's Workstation (PDWS) Job Aids	836	73% (612)	27% (224)	29% (65)	54% (122)	17% (37)	71% (159)
Supplemental ERAS application: Guide for Residency Programs	837	29% (243)	71% (594)	5% (32)	62% (368)	33% (194)	95% (562)
Supplemental ERAS Application Job Aids	829	70% (582)	30% (247)	24% (59)	55% (136)	21% (52)	76% (188)
Supplemental ERAS Application Resource Webpage on the ERAS PDWS Community Site	831	56% (467)	44% (364)	11% (41)	65% (236)	24% (87)	89% (323)
AAMC webinars on the supplemental ERAS application	831	39% (326)	61% (505)	9% (45)	56% (281)	35% (179)	91% (460)
Specialty-specific or specialty-developed guidance	715	40% (287)	60% (428)	6% (25)	48% (206)	46% (197)	94% (403)
Other(s)	187	86% (161)	14% (26)	27% (7)	46% (12)	27% (7)	73% (19)

**Table 27. The supplemental application data was easy to filter and export on the PDWS.**

N	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
843	7% (56)	10% (88)	30% (256)	40% (339)	12% (104)	53% (443)

## Appendix A

### Results for Adult Neurology

## Survey Response Rate

**Table A.1. Survey Response Rate (N = 155)**

Specialty	Percentage (n)
Adult Neurology	27% (42)

## Past Experiences

**Table A.2. Did you use the meaningful and impactful experiences information during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Adult Neurology	79% (33)	21% (9)	42

**Table A.3. For Adult Neurology: The type of information provided by the most meaningful and impactful experiences responses was:**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Lacking important information</i>	11% (3)
<i>Just about right</i>	43% (12)
<i>Included extraneous information</i>	46% (13)
Total number	28

**Table A.4. For Adult Neurology: How important is the most meaningful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
33	9% (3)	91% (30)	10% (3)	60% (18)	20% (6)	10% (3)	30% (9)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
32	22% (7)	78% (25)	40% (10)	44% (11)	8% (2)	8% (2)	16% (4)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
33	21% (7)	79% (26)	8% (2)	42% (11)	42% (11)	8% (2)	50% (13)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
32	34% (11)	66% (21)	33% (7)	48% (10)	14% (3)	5% (1)	19% (4)
<i>Other</i>							
11	55% (6)	45% (5)	40% (2)	40% (2)	0% (0)	20% (1)	20% (1)

**Table A.5. For Adult Neurology: The most meaningful experiences responses helped me get a better picture of each applicant.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
33	6% (2)	94% (31)	3% (1)	19% (6)	19% (6)	55% (17)	3% (1)	58% (18)

**Table A.6. For Adult Neurology: The most meaningful experiences provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
31	3% (1)	97% (30)	13% (4)	27% (8)	13% (4)	40% (12)	7% (2)	47% (14)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
31	3% (1)	97% (30)	10% (3)	30% (9)	20% (6)	33% (10)	7% (2)	40% (12)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
30	3% (1)	97% (29)	7% (2)	28% (8)	38% (11)	24% (7)	3% (1)	28% (8)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
31	3% (1)	97% (30)	3% (1)	27% (8)	33% (10)	30% (9)	7% (2)	37% (11)

**Table A.7. For Adult Neurology: It was more efficient to use information from the most meaningful experiences than the information from the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
29	3% (1)	97% (28)	7% (2)	32% (9)	21% (6)	36% (10)	4% (1)	39% (11)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
30	7% (2)	93% (28)	7% (2)	43% (12)	25% (7)	18% (5)	7% (2)	25% (7)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
29	3% (1)	97% (28)	4% (1)	43% (12)	32% (9)	18% (5)	4% (1)	21% (6)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
29	3% (1)	97% (28)	7% (2)	36% (10)	39% (11)	14% (4)	4% (1)	18% (5)

**Table A.8. For Adult Neurology: How important is the other impactful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
33	3% (1)	97% (32)	19% (6)	59% (19)	16% (5)	6% (2)	22% (7)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
32	19% (6)	81% (26)	42% (11)	35% (9)	19% (5)	4% (1)	23% (6)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
33	12% (4)	88% (29)	24% (7)	34% (10)	38% (11)	3% (1)	41% (12)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
32	31% (10)	69% (22)	41% (9)	50% (11)	5% (1)	5% (1)	9% (2)
<i>Other</i>							
12	58% (7)	42% (5)	40% (2)	60% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

**Table A.9. For Adult Neurology: The other impactful experiences essay helped put the main ERAS application in context.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agree % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
31	0% (0)	100% (31)	6% (2)	26% (8)	29% (9)	29% (9)	10% (3)	39% (12)



**Table A.10. For Adult Neurology: The other impactful experiences essay provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
30	3% (1)	97% (29)	10% (3)	17% (5)	34% (10)	28% (8)	10% (3)	38% (11)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
29	3% (1)	97% (28)	11% (3)	21% (6)	25% (7)	39% (11)	4% (1)	43% (12)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
30	3% (1)	97% (29)	10% (3)	17% (5)	38% (11)	28% (8)	7% (2)	34% (10)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
29	3% (1)	97% (28)	11% (3)	18% (5)	36% (10)	32% (9)	4% (1)	36% (10)

**Table A.11. For Adult Neurology: Responses to the Experiences Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>The key characteristics helped me get a better picture of each applicant.</i>								
32	28% (9)	72% (23)	9% (2)	22% (5)	30% (7)	35% (8)	4% (1)	39% (9)
<i>The primary focus area helped me better understand applicant's alignment to my program's mission.</i>								
31	23% (7)	77% (24)	13% (3)	21% (5)	50% (12)	17% (4)	0% (0)	17% (4)

**Table A.12. For Adult Neurology: It was more efficient to use the experience types, key characteristics, and primary focus areas to better understand applicant qualities than the information from the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
29	17% (5)	83% (24)	4% (1)	50% (12)	29% (7)	13% (3)	4% (1)	17% (4)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
29	17% (5)	83% (24)	8% (2)	42% (10)	42% (10)	8% (2)	0% (0)	8% (2)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
29	17% (5)	83% (24)	8% (2)	46% (11)	33% (8)	13% (3)	0% (0)	13% (3)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
30	17% (5)	83% (25)	4% (1)	44% (11)	40% (10)	8% (2)	4% (1)	12% (3)

## Geographic Preferences

**Table A.13. Did you use geographic preference information during the application review process?**

<b>Specialty</b>	<b>Yes % (n)</b>	<b>No % (n)</b>	<b>Total number</b>
Adult Neurology	85% (34)	15% (6)	40

**Table A.14. For Adult Neurology: Responses to Geographic Preferences Questions**

N	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>Geographic preference information helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
33	3% (1)	18% (6)	15% (5)	61% (20)	3% (1)	64% (21)
<i>My program's geographic division as designated by the U.S. Census accurately represents the location of my program.</i>						
33	12% (4)	15% (5)	15% (5)	42% (14)	15% (5)	58% (19)

**Table A.15. For Adult Neurology: How important was the geographic preference information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Not Important % (n)	Somewhat Important % (n)	Important % (n)	Very Important % (n)	Important or Very Important % (n)
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
32	13% (4)	88% (28)	18% (5)	32% (9)	21% (6)	29% (8)	50% (14)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant that selected my region</i>							
32	38% (12)	63% (20)	50% (10)	35% (7)	15% (3)	0% (0)	15% (3)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
32	31% (10)	69% (22)	23% (5)	23% (5)	45% (10)	9% (2)	55% (12)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
32	9% (3)	91% (29)	0% (0)	48% (14)	31% (9)	21% (6)	52% (15)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
32	6% (2)	94% (30)	7% (2)	37% (11)	40% (12)	17% (5)	57% (17)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
33	21% (7)	79% (26)	42% (11)	50% (13)	4% (1)	4% (1)	8% (2)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
32	22% (7)	78% (25)	16% (4)	60% (15)	24% (6)	0% (0)	24% (6)
<i>Other</i>							
8	38% (3)	63% (5)	40% (2)	60% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

**Table A.16. For Adult Neurology: In general, applicants who stated a preference for my region were more likely to accept interview invitations.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
32	3% (1)	13% (4)	41% (13)	28% (9)	16% (5)	44% (14)

**Table A.17. For Adult Neurology: How did you interpret a “No geographic preference” response? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program’s region</i>	6% (2)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	0% (0)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	82% (27)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	42% (14)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	21% (7)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	18% (6)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	6% (2)
<i>Other</i>	0% (0)
<b>Total number</b>	<b>33<sup>1</sup></b>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table A.18. For Adult Neurology: How did you interpret a blank geographic preference? (Select all that apply)**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program's region</i>	48% (16)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	6% (2)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	48% (16)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	24% (8)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	27% (9)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	21% (7)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	6% (2)
<i>Other</i>	0% (0)
Total number	33 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

## Program Signals

**Table A.19. Did you use program signals during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Adult Neurology	93% (37)	8% (3)	40

**Table A.20. For Adult Neurology: How important were program signals at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
36	17% (6)	83% (30)	10% (3)	17% (5)	30% (9)	43% (13)	73% (22)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant who signaled my program</i>							
36	42% (15)	58% (21)	38% (8)	33% (7)	14% (3)	14% (3)	29% (6)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
35	26% (9)	74% (26)	8% (2)	31% (8)	31% (8)	31% (8)	62% (16)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
36	8% (3)	92% (33)	3% (1)	39% (13)	21% (7)	36% (12)	58% (19)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
36	6% (2)	94% (34)	3% (1)	32% (11)	41% (14)	24% (8)	65% (22)
<i>During the interview to learn more about why an applicant signaled my program</i>							
35	37% (13)	63% (22)	18% (4)	55% (12)	18% (4)	9% (2)	27% (6)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
35	31% (11)	69% (24)	17% (4)	46% (11)	25% (6)	13% (3)	38% (9)
<i>Other</i>							
6	67% (4)	33% (2)	50% (1)	50% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

**Table A.21. For Adult Neurology: Responses to Program Signals Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>Program signals helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
35	3% (1)	9% (3)	14% (5)	51% (18)	23% (8)	74% (26)
<i>Based on a review of their application, applicants who signaled my program were better aligned than those who did not.</i>						
35	6% (2)	31% (11)	43% (15)	20% (7)	0% (0)	20% (7)
<i>Applicants who signaled my program were more likely to accept interview invitations.</i>						
35	0% (0)	6% (2)	51% (18)	20% (7)	23% (8)	43% (15)

**Table A.22. The number of signals available to applicants in my specialty was:**

<b>Specialty (Maximum Number of Signals)</b>	<b>Too Few % (n)</b>	<b>About Right % (n)</b>	<b>Too Many % (n)</b>	<b>Not Sure % (n)</b>	<b>Total number</b>
Adult Neurology (3 signals)	33% (12)	47% (17)	3% (1)	17% (6)	36

**Table A.23. For Adult Neurology: How did you interpret a blank value for the program signal? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	39% (14)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	17% (6)
<i>Applicant was afraid or unwilling to provide a response</i>	6% (2)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	53% (19)
<i>Treated the same as applicants who signaled my program</i>	17% (6)
<i>Other</i>	0% (0)
<b>Total number</b>	<b>36<sup>1</sup></b>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table A.24. For Adult Neurology: How did your program interpret program signals and geographic preferences?**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)<sup>1</sup></b>
<i>Considered geographic preference and program signals separately</i>	44% (14)
<i>Viewed applicants who reported a preference for my region <u>and</u> signaled my program more favorably</i>	9% (3)
<i>Gave more weight to program signals than geographic preference</i>	41% (13)
<i>Gave more weight to geographic preference than program signals</i>	6%(2)
<b>Total number</b>	<b>32</b>

1. Only respondents in programs that used both program signals and geographic preferences answered this question.



## Appendix B

### Results for Anesthesiology

## Survey Response Rate

**Table B.1. Survey Response Rate (N = 154)**

Specialty	Percentage (n)
Anesthesiology	46% (71)

## Past Experiences

**Table B.2. Did you use the meaningful and impactful experiences information during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Anesthesiology	61% (43)	39% (28)	71

**Table B.3. For Anesthesiology: The type of information provided by the most meaningful and impactful experiences responses was:**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Lacking important information</i>	10% (4)
<i>Just about right</i>	50% (20)
<i>Included extraneous information</i>	40% (16)
Total number	40

**Table B.4. For Anesthesiology: How important is the most meaningful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
43	14% (6)	86% (37)	14% (5)	49% (18)	19% (7)	19% (7)	38% (14)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
43	35% (15)	65% (28)	39% (11)	36% (10)	14% (4)	11% (3)	25% (7)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
43	7% (3)	93% (40)	13% (5)	43% (17)	33% (13)	13% (5)	45% (18)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
43	30% (13)	70% (30)	43% (13)	37% (11)	13% (4)	7% (2)	20% (6)
<i>Other</i>							
14	86% (12)	14% (2)	100% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

**Table B.5. For Anesthesiology: The most meaningful experiences responses helped me get a better picture of each applicant.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
43	9% (4)	91% (39)	8% (3)	5% (2)	28% (11)	54% (21)	5% (2)	59% (23)

**Table B.6. For Anesthesiology: The most meaningful experiences provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
38	11% (4)	89% (34)	18% (6)	29% (10)	9% (3)	41% (14)	3% (1)	44% (15)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
38	11% (4)	89% (34)	15% (5)	35% (12)	18% (6)	29% (10)	3% (1)	32% (11)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
38	11% (4)	89% (34)	15% (5)	29% (10)	26% (9)	29% (10)	0% (0)	29% (10)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
38	13% (5)	87% (33)	15% (5)	21% (7)	12% (4)	42% (14)	9% (3)	52% (17)

**Table B.7. For Anesthesiology: It was more efficient to use information from the most meaningful experiences than the information from the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
38	5% (2)	95% (36)	22% (8)	11% (4)	25% (9)	39% (14)	3% (1)	42% (15)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
38	5% (2)	95% (36)	25% (9)	22% (8)	19% (7)	33% (12)	0% (0)	33% (12)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
38	5% (2)	95% (36)	25% (9)	33% (12)	28% (10)	14% (5)	0% (0)	14% (5)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
38	8% (3)	92% (35)	26% (9)	17% (6)	17% (6)	34% (12)	6% (2)	40% (14)

**Table B.8. For Anesthesiology: How important is the other impactful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
42	21% (9)	79% (33)	15% (5)	42% (14)	27% (9)	15% (5)	42% (14)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
42	33% (14)	67% (28)	43% (12)	29% (8)	18% (5)	11% (3)	29% (8)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
42	17% (7)	83% (35)	9% (3)	60% (21)	17% (6)	14% (5)	31% (11)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
42	43% (18)	57% (24)	38% (9)	42% (10)	8% (2)	13% (3)	21% (5)
<i>Other</i>							
15	73% (11)	27% (4)	75% (3)	25% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

**Table B.9. For Anesthesiology: The other impactful experiences essay helped put the main ERAS application in context.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
43	14% (6)	86% (37)	5% (2)	5% (2)	24% (9)	54% (20)	11% (4)	65% (24)

**Table B.10. For Anesthesiology: The other impactful experiences essay provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
37	8% (3)	92% (34)	18% (6)	18% (6)	15% (5)	44% (15)	6% (2)	50% (17)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
37	8% (3)	92% (34)	18% (6)	15% (5)	32% (11)	35% (12)	0% (0)	35% (12)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
37	8% (3)	92% (34)	15% (5)	24% (8)	32% (11)	29% (10)	0% (0)	29% (10)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
37	11% (4)	89% (33)	15% (5)	12% (4)	24% (8)	36% (12)	12% (4)	48% (16)

**Table B.11. For Anesthesiology: Responses to the Experiences Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>The key characteristics helped me get a better picture of each applicant.</i>								
43	23% (10)	77% (33)	15% (5)	9% (3)	42% (14)	30% (10)	3% (1)	33% (11)
<i>The primary focus area helped me better understand applicant's alignment to my program's mission.</i>								
43	28% (12)	72% (31)	16% (5)	13% (4)	48% (15)	19% (6)	3% (1)	23% (7)

**Table B.12. For Anesthesiology: It was more efficient to use the experience types, key characteristics, and primary focus areas to better understand applicant qualities than the information from the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
38	18% (7)	82% (31)	29% (9)	10% (3)	35% (11)	26% (8)	0% (0)	26% (8)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
38	18% (7)	82% (31)	32% (10)	13% (4)	39% (12)	16% (5)	0% (0)	16% (5)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
38	18% (7)	82% (31)	35% (11)	16% (5)	32% (10)	13% (4)	3% (1)	16% (5)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
37	19% (7)	81% (30)	37% (11)	3% (1)	40% (12)	13% (4)	7% (2)	20% (6)

## Geographic Preferences

**Table B.13. Did you use geographic preference information during the application review process?**

<b>Specialty</b>	<b>Yes % (n)</b>	<b>No % (n)</b>	<b>Total number</b>
Anesthesiology	88% (56)	13% (8)	64

**Table B.14. For Anesthesiology: Responses to Geographic Preferences Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>Geographic preference information helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
55	5% (3)	15% (8)	22% (12)	45% (25)	13% (7)	58% (32)
<i>My program's geographic division as designated by the U.S. Census accurately represents the location of my program.</i>						
54	4% (2)	9% (5)	22% (12)	44% (24)	20% (11)	65% (35)

**Table B.15. For Anesthesiology: How important was the geographic preference information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
56	9% (5)	91% (51)	4% (2)	31% (16)	37% (19)	27% (14)	65% (33)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant that selected my region</i>							
56	48% (27)	52% (29)	52% (15)	31% (9)	17% (5)	0% (0)	17% (5)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
55	11% (6)	89% (49)	14% (7)	37% (18)	33% (16)	16% (8)	49% (24)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
55	7% (4)	93% (51)	4% (2)	39% (20)	31% (16)	25% (13)	57% (29)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
56	21% (12)	79% (44)	5% (2)	45% (20)	27% (12)	23% (10)	50% (22)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
56	32% (18)	68% (38)	34% (13)	55% (21)	11% (4)	0% (0)	11% (4)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
56	38% (21)	63% (35)	34% (12)	43% (15)	23% (8)	0% (0)	23% (8)
<i>Other</i>							
11	82% (9)	18% (2)	50% (1)	0% (0)	50% (1)	0% (0)	50% (1)



**Table B.16. For Anesthesiology: In general, applicants who stated a preference for my region were more likely to accept interview invitations.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
55	7% (4)	11% (6)	33% (18)	36% (20)	13% (7)	49% (27)

**Table B.17. For Anesthesiology: How did you interpret a “No geographic preference” response? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program’s region</i>	5% (3)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	2% (1)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	80% (45)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	48% (27)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	18% (10)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	20% (11)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	25% (14)
<i>Other</i>	0% (0)
<b>Total number</b>	<b>56<sup>1</sup></b>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table B.18. For Anesthesiology: How did you interpret a blank geographic preference? (Select all that apply)**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program's region</i>	46% (26)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	18% (10)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	41% (23)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	30% (17)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	25% (14)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	27% (15)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	13% (7)
<i>Other</i>	4% (2)
Total number	56 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

## Program Signals

**Table B.19. Did you use program signals during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Anesthesiology	98% (62)	2% (1)	63

**Table B.20. For Anesthesiology: How important were program signals at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
62	8% (5)	92% (57)	0% (0)	12% (7)	28% (16)	60% (34)	88% (50)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant who signaled my program</i>							
62	39% (24)	61% (38)	37% (14)	37% (14)	18% (7)	8% (3)	26% (10)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
61	8% (5)	92% (56)	5% (3)	23% (13)	38% (21)	34% (19)	71% (40)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
61	5% (3)	95% (58)	3% (2)	22% (13)	31% (18)	43% (25)	74% (43)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
62	15% (9)	85% (53)	4% (2)	25% (13)	30% (16)	42% (22)	72% (38)
<i>During the interview to learn more about why an applicant signaled my program</i>							
62	37% (23)	63% (39)	28% (11)	26% (10)	31% (12)	15% (6)	46% (18)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
62	42% (26)	58% (36)	25% (9)	36% (13)	19% (7)	19% (7)	39% (14)
<i>Other</i>							
13	62% (8)	38% (5)	40% (2)	20% (1)	40% (2)	0% (0)	40% (2)

**Table B.21. For Anesthesiology: Responses to Program Signals Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>Program signals helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
62	2% (1)	3% (2)	11% (7)	40% (25)	44% (27)	84% (52)
<i>Based on a review of their application, applicants who signaled my program were better aligned than those who did not.</i>						
62	6% (4)	15% (9)	56% (35)	21% (13)	2% (1)	23% (14)
<i>Applicants who signaled my program were more likely to accept interview invitations.</i>						
62	10% (6)	6% (4)	39% (24)	21% (13)	24% (15)	45% (28)

**Table B.22. The number of signals available to applicants in my specialty was:**

<b>Specialty (Maximum Number of Signals)</b>	<b>Too Few % (n)</b>	<b>About Right % (n)</b>	<b>Too Many % (n)</b>	<b>Not Sure % (n)</b>	<b>Total number</b>
Anesthesiology (5 signals)	44% (27)	45% (28)	3% (2)	8% (5)	62

**Table B.23. For Anesthesiology: How did you interpret a blank value for the program signal? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	66% (41)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	10% (6)
<i>Applicant was afraid or unwilling to provide a response</i>	5% (3)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	32% (20)
<i>Treated the same as applicants who signaled my program</i>	3% (2)
<i>Other</i>	2% (1)
<b>Total number</b>	62 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table B.24. For Anesthesiology: How did your program interpret program signals and geographic preferences?**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)<sup>1</sup></b>
<i>Considered geographic preference and program signals separately</i>	20% (11)
<i>Viewed applicants who reported a preference for my region <u>and</u> signaled my program more favorably</i>	28% (15)
<i>Gave more weight to program signals than geographic preference</i>	52% (28)
<i>Gave more weight to geographic preference than program signals</i>	0% (0)
<b>Total number</b>	<b>54</b>

1. Only programs that used both program signals and geographic preferences answered this question.

## Appendix C

### Results for Dermatology

## Survey Response Rate

**Table C.1. Survey Response Rate by Specialty (N = 123)**

Specialty	Percentage (n)
Dermatology	29% (36)

## Past Experiences

**Table C.2. Did you use the meaningful and impactful experiences information during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Dermatology	83% (30)	17% (6)	100% (36)

**Table C.3. For Dermatology: The type of information provided by the most meaningful and impactful experiences responses was:**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Lacking important information</i>	4% (1)
<i>Just about right</i>	85% (22)
<i>Included extraneous information</i>	12% (3)
Total number	26

**Table C.4. For Dermatology: How important is the most meaningful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
26	0% (0)	100% (26)	8% (2)	35% (9)	38% (10)	19% (5)	58% (15)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
26	8% (2)	92% (24)	38% (9)	33% (8)	21% (5)	8% (2)	29% (7)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
26	8% (2)	92% (24)	13% (3)	29% (7)	46% (11)	13% (3)	58% (14)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
25	28% (7)	72% (18)	39% (7)	39% (7)	11% (2)	11% (2)	22% (4)
<i>Other</i>							
10	80% (8)	20% (2)	50% (1)	50% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

**Table C.5. For Dermatology: The most meaningful experiences responses helped me get a better picture of each applicant.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
27	0% (0)	100% (27)	0% (0)	4% (1)	15% (4)	70% (19)	11% (3)	81% (22)



**Table C.6. For Dermatology: The most meaningful experiences provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
24	4% (1)	96% (23)	0% (0)	22% (5)	26% (6)	39% (9)	13% (3)	52% (12)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
24	0% (0)	100% (24)	0% (0)	21% (5)	17% (4)	54% (13)	8% (2)	63% (15)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
24	0% (0)	100% (24)	4% (1)	21% (5)	33% (8)	33% (8)	8% (2)	42% (10)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
24	0% (0)	100% (24)	0% (0)	29% (7)	21% (5)	38% (9)	13% (3)	50% (12)

**Table C.7. For Dermatology: It was more efficient to use information from the most meaningful experiences than the information from the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
24	4% (1)	96% (23)	4% (1)	22% (5)	26% (6)	35% (8)	13% (3)	48% (11)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
24	4% (1)	96% (23)	4% (1)	26% (6)	26% (6)	35% (8)	9% (2)	43% (10)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
24	4% (1)	96% (23)	9% (2)	30% (7)	26% (6)	26% (6)	9% (2)	35% (8)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
24	4% (1)	96% (23)	9% (2)	26% (6)	17% (4)	39% (9)	9% (2)	48% (11)

**Table C.8. For Dermatology: How important is the other impactful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
26	8% (2)	92% (24)	8% (2)	42% (10)	29% (7)	21% (5)	50% (12)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
25	16% (4)	84% (21)	33% (7)	43% (9)	14% (3)	10% (2)	24% (5)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
25	8% (2)	92% (23)	22% (5)	39% (9)	30% (7)	9% (2)	39% (9)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
25	20% (5)	80% (20)	35% (7)	45% (9)	15% (3)	5% (1)	20% (4)
<i>Other</i>							
12	75% (9)	25% (3)	67% (2)	33% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

**Table C.9. For Dermatology: The other impactful experiences essay helped put the main ERAS application in context.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
27	4% (1)	96% (26)	0% (0)	4% (1)	35% (9)	38% (10)	23% (6)	62% (16)

**Table C.10. For Dermatology: The other impactful experiences essay provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
24	8% (2)	92% (22)	5% (1)	9% (2)	27% (6)	41% (9)	18% (4)	59% (13)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
24	8% (2)	92% (22)	5% (1)	9% (2)	27% (6)	50% (11)	9% (2)	59% (13)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
24	8% (2)	92% (22)	5% (1)	14% (3)	41% (9)	32% (7)	9% (2)	41% (9)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
24	8% (2)	92% (22)	5% (1)	14% (3)	23% (5)	50% (11)	9% (2)	59% (13)

**Table C.11. For Dermatology: Responses to the Experiences Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>The key characteristics helped me get a better picture of each applicant.</i>								
27	7% (2)	93% (25)	4% (1)	4% (1)	36% (9)	48% (12)	8% (2)	56% (14)
<i>The primary focus area helped me better understand applicant's alignment to my program's mission.</i>								
27	7% (2)	93% (25)	4% (1)	4% (1)	28% (7)	56% (14)	8% (2)	64% (16)

**Table C.12. For Dermatology: It was more efficient to use the experience types, key characteristics, and primary focus areas to better understand applicant qualities than the information from the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
24	8% (2)	92% (22)	14% (3)	14% (3)	45% (10)	18% (4)	9% (2)	27% (6)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
24	8% (2)	92% (22)	14% (3)	9% (2)	45% (10)	23% (5)	9% (2)	32% (7)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
24	8% (2)	92% (22)	14% (3)	23% (5)	45% (10)	14% (3)	5% (1)	18% (4)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
24	8% (2)	92% (22)	14% (3)	23% (5)	45% (10)	14% (3)	5% (1)	18% (4)

## Geographic Preferences

**Table C.13. Did you use geographic preference information during the application review process?**

<b>Specialty</b>	<b>Yes % (n)</b>	<b>No % (n)</b>	<b>Total number</b>
Dermatology	81% (25)	19% (6)	31

**Table C.14. For Dermatology: Responses to Geographic Preferences Questions**

N	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>Geographic preference information helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
24	13% (3)	0% (0)	21% (5)	58% (14)	8% (2)	67% (16)
<i>My program's geographic division as designated by the U.S. Census accurately represents the location of my program.</i>						
22	0% (0)	9% (2)	23% (5)	64% (14)	5% (1)	68% (15)

**Table C.15. For Dermatology: How important was the geographic preference information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Not Important % (n)	Somewhat Important % (n)	Important % (n)	Very Important % (n)	Important or Very Important % (n)
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
23	17% (4)	83% (19)	26% (5)	32% (6)	26% (5)	16% (3)	42% (8)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant that selected my region</i>							
24	42% (10)	58% (14)	57% (8)	29% (4)	14% (2)	0% (0)	14% (2)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
24	42% (10)	58% (14)	29% (4)	43% (6)	21% (3)	7% (1)	29% (4)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
24	4% (1)	96% (23)	9% (2)	52% (12)	17% (4)	22% (5)	39% (9)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
24	8% (2)	92% (22)	18% (4)	50% (11)	32% (7)	0% (0)	32% (7)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
23	26% (6)	74% (17)	59% (10)	29% (5)	12% (2)	0% (0)	12% (2)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
24	33% (8)	67% (16)	56% (9)	19% (3)	25% (4)	0% (0)	25% (4)
<i>Other</i>							
10	70% (7)	30% (3)	67% (2)	0% (0)	33% (1)	0% (0)	33% (1)

**Table C.16. For Dermatology: In general, applicants who stated a preference for my region were more likely to accept interview invitations.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
24	17% (4)	4% (1)	42% (10)	33% (8)	4% (1)	38% (9)

**Table C.17. For Dermatology: How did you interpret a “No geographic preference” response? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program’s region</i>	17% (4)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	4% (1)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	83% (20)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	38% (9)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	42% (10)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	8% (2)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	4% (1)
<i>Other</i>	4% (1)
<b>Total number</b>	<b>24<sup>1</sup></b>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table C.18. For Dermatology: How did you interpret a blank geographic preference? (Select all that apply)**

Choice	% (n)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program's region</i>	58% (14)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	13% (3)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	38% (9)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	17% (4)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	50% (12)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	8% (2)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	0% (0)
<i>Other</i>	8% (2)
Total number	24 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

## Program Signals

**Table C.19. Did you use program signals during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Dermatology	94% (29)	6% (2)	31

**Table C.20. For Dermatology: How important were program signals at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
28	18% (5)	82% (23)	4% (1)	17% (4)	22% (5)	57% (13)	78% (18)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant who signaled my program</i>							
27	48% (13)	52% (14)	57% (8)	14% (2)	7% (1)	21% (3)	29% (4)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
28	29% (8)	71% (20)	20% (4)	20% (4)	25% (5)	35% (7)	60% (12)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
28	4% (1)	96% (27)	7% (2)	22% (6)	30% (8)	41% (11)	70% (19)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
28	4% (1)	96% (27)	11% (3)	30% (8)	26% (7)	33% (9)	59% (16)
<i>During the interview to learn more about why an applicant signaled my program</i>							
28	25% (7)	75% (21)	24% (5)	38% (8)	14% (3)	24% (5)	38% (8)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
28	43% (12)	57% (16)	38% (6)	31% (5)	19% (3)	13% (2)	31% (5)
<i>Other</i>							
10	60% (6)	40% (4)	75% (3)	25% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)



**Table C.21. For Dermatology: Responses to Program Signals Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>Program signals helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
28	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (4)	36% (10)	50% (14)	86% (24)
<i>Based on a review of their application, applicants who signaled my program were better aligned than those who did not.</i>						
28	7% (2)	4% (1)	43% (12)	32% (9)	14% (4)	46% (13)
<i>Applicants who signaled my program were more likely to accept interview invitations.</i>						
28	0% (0)	7% (2)	54% (15)	18% (5)	21% (6)	39% (11)

**Table C.22. The number of signals available to applicants in my specialty was:**

<b>Specialty (Maximum Number of Signals)</b>	<b>Too Few % (n)</b>	<b>About Right % (n)</b>	<b>Too Many % (n)</b>	<b>Not Sure % (n)</b>	<b>Total number</b>
Dermatology (3 signals)	36% (10)	61% (17)	4% (1)	0% (0)	28

**Table C.23. For Dermatology: How did you interpret a blank value for the program signal? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	46% (13)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	21% (6)
<i>Applicant was afraid or unwilling to provide a response</i>	14% (4)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	29% (8)
<i>Treated the same as applicants who signaled my program</i>	0% (0)
<i>Other</i>	14% (4)
<b>Total number</b>	28 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table C.24. For Dermatology: How did your program interpret program signals and geographic preferences?**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)<sup>1</sup></b>
<i>Considered geographic preference and program signals separately</i>	22% (5)
<i>Viewed applicants who reported a preference for my region <u>and</u> signaled my program more favorably</i>	17% (4)
<i>Gave more weight to program signals than geographic preference</i>	61% (14)
<i>Gave more weight to geographic preference than program signals</i>	0% (0)
<b>Total number</b>	<b>23</b>

1. Only programs that used both program signals and geographic preferences answered this question.

## Appendix D

### Results for Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology

## Survey Response Rate

**Table D.1. Survey Response Rate by Specialty (N = 271)**

Specialty	Percentage (n)
Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology	30% (80)

## Past Experiences

**Table D.2. Did you use the meaningful and impactful experiences information during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology	75% (60)	25% (20)	80

**Table D.3. For Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology: The type of information provided by the most meaningful and impactful experiences responses was:**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Lacking important information</i>	7% (4)
<i>Just about right</i>	82% (46)
<i>Included extraneous information</i>	11% (6)
Total number	56

**Table D.4. For Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology: How important is the most meaningful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
60	2% (1)	98% (59)	10% (6)	39% (23)	34% (20)	17% (10)	51% (30)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
59	22% (13)	78% (46)	30% (14)	22% (10)	37% (17)	11% (5)	48% (22)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
59	10% (6)	90% (53)	13% (7)	36% (19)	38% (20)	13% (7)	51% (27)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
58	22% (13)	78% (45)	31% (14)	38% (17)	24% (11)	7% (3)	31% (14)
<i>Other</i>							
20	70% (14)	30% (6)	83% (5)	17% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

**Table D.5. For Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology: The most meaningful experiences responses helped me get a better picture of each applicant.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
61	2% (1)	98% (60)	2% (1)	2% (1)	12% (7)	65% (39)	20% (12)	85% (51)

**Table D.6. For Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology: The most meaningful experiences provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
57	2% (1)	98% (56)	2% (1)	11% (6)	27% (15)	50% (28)	11% (6)	61% (34)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
57	4% (2)	96% (55)	2% (1)	15% (8)	27% (15)	42% (23)	15% (8)	56% (31)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
57	2% (1)	98% (56)	2% (1)	14% (8)	36% (20)	36% (20)	13% (7)	48% (27)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
57	2% (1)	98% (56)	4% (2)	11% (6)	27% (15)	43% (24)	16% (9)	59% (33)

**Table D.7. For Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology: It was more efficient to use information from the most meaningful experiences than the information from the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
57	2% (1)	98% (56)	7% (4)	13% (7)	30% (17)	34% (19)	16% (9)	50% (28)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
57	4% (2)	96% (55)	5% (3)	16% (9)	38% (21)	27% (15)	13% (7)	40% (22)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
57	2% (1)	98% (56)	7% (4)	25% (14)	39% (22)	18% (10)	11% (6)	29% (16)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
57	2% (1)	98% (56)	7% (4)	20% (11)	32% (18)	25% (14)	16% (9)	41% (23)

**Table D.8. For Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology: How important is the other impactful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
60	3% (2)	97% (58)	10% (6)	52% (30)	24% (14)	14% (8)	38% (22)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
58	19% (11)	81% (47)	40% (19)	23% (11)	28% (13)	9% (4)	36% (17)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
58	14% (8)	86% (50)	16% (8)	40% (20)	30% (15)	14% (7)	44% (22)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
58	26% (15)	74% (43)	33% (14)	37% (16)	23% (10)	7% (3)	30% (13)
<i>Other</i>							
21	62% (13)	38% (8)	75% (6)	25% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

**Table D.9. For Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology: The other impactful experiences essay helped put the main ERAS application in context.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
59	8% (5)	92% (54)	2% (1)	6% (3)	30% (16)	48% (26)	15% (8)	63% (34)

**Table D.10. For Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology: The other impactful experiences essay provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
57	5% (3)	95% (54)	2% (1)	13% (7)	30% (16)	39% (21)	17% (9)	56% (30)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
57	7% (4)	93% (53)	2% (1)	21% (11)	28% (15)	32% (17)	17% (9)	49% (26)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
56	5% (3)	95% (53)	4% (2)	19% (10)	34% (18)	28% (15)	15% (8)	43% (23)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
56	5% (3)	95% (53)	2% (1)	19% (10)	25% (13)	36% (19)	19% (10)	55% (29)

**Table D.11. For Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology: Responses to the Experiences Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>The key characteristics helped me get a better picture of each applicant.</i>								
60	13% (8)	87% (52)	4% (2)	8% (4)	27% (14)	46% (24)	15% (8)	62% (32)
<i>The primary focus area helped me better understand applicant's alignment to my program's mission.</i>								
60	27% (16)	73% (44)	5% (2)	7% (3)	45% (20)	32% (14)	11% (5)	43% (19)



**Table D.12. For Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology: It was more efficient to use the experience types, key characteristics, and primary focus areas to better understand applicant qualities than the information from the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
56	14% (8)	86% (48)	6% (3)	25% (12)	40% (19)	19% (9)	10% (5)	29% (14)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
56	14% (8)	86% (48)	6% (3)	27% (13)	38% (18)	21% (10)	8% (4)	29% (14)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
56	14% (8)	86% (48)	8% (4)	31% (15)	33% (16)	19% (9)	8% (4)	27% (13)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
55	15% (8)	85% (47)	6% (3)	30% (14)	36% (17)	17% (8)	11% (5)	28% (13)

## Geographic Preferences

**Table D.13. Did you use geographic preference information during the application review process?**

<b>Specialty</b>	<b>Yes % (n)</b>	<b>No % (n)</b>	<b>Total number</b>
Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology	92% (70)	8% (6)	76

**Table D.14. For Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology: Responses to Geographic Preferences Questions**

N	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>Geographic preference information helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
68	4% (3)	10% (7)	18% (12)	38% (26)	29% (20)	68% (46)
<i>My program's geographic division as designated by the U.S. Census accurately represents the location of my program.</i>						
68	6% (4)	10% (7)	16% (11)	44% (30)	24% (16)	68% (46)

**Table D.15. For Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology: How important was the geographic preference information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Not Important % (n)	Somewhat Important % (n)	Important % (n)	Very Important % (n)	Important or Very Important % (n)
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
70	9% (6)	91% (64)	8% (5)	33% (21)	17% (11)	42% (27)	59% (38)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant that selected my region</i>							
70	33% (23)	67% (47)	45% (21)	28% (13)	17% (8)	11% (5)	28% (13)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
69	17% (12)	83% (57)	9% (5)	32% (18)	33% (19)	26% (15)	60% (34)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
70	1% (1)	99% (69)	3% (2)	39% (27)	29% (20)	29% (20)	58% (40)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
69	6% (4)	94% (65)	12% (8)	31% (20)	29% (19)	28% (18)	57% (37)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
70	23% (16)	77% (54)	43% (23)	37% (20)	17% (9)	4% (2)	20% (11)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
69	28% (19)	72% (50)	30% (15)	38% (19)	24% (12)	8% (4)	32% (16)
<i>Other</i>							
22	86% (19)	14% (3)	33% (1)	33% (1)	0% (0)	33% (1)	33% (1)

**Table D.16. For Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology: In general, applicants who stated a preference for my region were more likely to accept interview invitations.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
68	1% (1)	6% (4)	37% (25)	34% (23)	22% (15)	56% (38)

**Table D.17. For Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology: How did you interpret a “No geographic preference” response? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>% (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program’s region</i>	13% (9)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	13% (9)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	86% (59)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	54% (37)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	22% (15)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	13% (9)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	10% (7)
<i>Other</i>	1% (1)
<b>Total number</b>	<b>69<sup>1</sup></b>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table D.18. For Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology: How did you interpret a blank geographic preference? (Select all that apply)**

Choice	% (n)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program's region</i>	62% (43)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	38% (26)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	35% (24)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	25% (17)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	33% (23)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	9% (6)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	6% (4)
<i>Other</i>	0% (0)
Total number	69 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

## Program Signals

**Table D.19. Did you use program signals during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology	96% (72)	4% (3)	75

**Table D.20. For Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology: How important were program signals at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
72	7% (5)	93% (67)	3% (2)	15% (10)	24% (16)	58% (39)	82% (55)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant who signaled my program</i>							
71	34% (24)	66% (47)	17% (8)	28% (13)	36% (17)	19% (9)	55% (26)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
72	15% (11)	85% (61)	8% (5)	18% (11)	38% (23)	36% (22)	74% (45)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
72	4% (3)	96% (69)	1% (1)	19% (13)	45% (31)	35% (24)	80% (55)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
72	14% (10)	86% (62)	5% (3)	23% (14)	34% (21)	39% (24)	73% (45)
<i>During the interview to learn more about why an applicant signaled my program</i>							
72	32% (23)	68% (49)	16% (8)	35% (17)	31% (15)	18% (9)	49% (24)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
71	32% (23)	68% (48)	13% (6)	33% (16)	33% (16)	21% (10)	54% (26)
<i>Other</i>							
24	79% (19)	21% (5)	20% (1)	20% (1)	20% (1)	40% (2)	60% (3)

**Table D.21. For Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology: Responses to Program Signals Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>Program signals helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
69	0% (0)	3% (2)	12% (8)	36% (25)	49% (34)	86% (59)
<i>Based on a review of their application, applicants who signaled my program were better aligned than those who did not.</i>						
69	0% (0)	12% (8)	43% (30)	32% (22)	13% (9)	45% (31)
<i>Applicants who signaled my program were more likely to accept interview invitations.</i>						
69	3% (2)	9% (6)	28% (19)	26% (18)	35% (24)	61% (42)

**Table D.22. The number of signals available to applicants in my specialty was:**

<b>Specialty (Maximum Number of Signals)</b>	<b>Too Few % (n)</b>	<b>About Right % (n)</b>	<b>Too Many % (n)</b>	<b>Not Sure % (n)</b>	<b>Total number</b>
Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology (6 signals)	7% (5)	68% (48)	7% (5)	18% (13)	71

**Table D.23. For Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology: How did you interpret a blank value for the program signal? (Select all that apply)**

Choice	% (n)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	75% (53)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	14% (10)
<i>Applicant was afraid or unwilling to provide a response</i>	8% (6)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	24% (17)
<i>Treated the same as applicants who signaled my program</i>	4% (3)
<i>Other</i>	0% (0)
Total number	71 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table D.24. For Diagnostic Radiology and Interventional Radiology: How did your program interpret program signals and geographic preferences?**

Choice	Percentage (n) <sup>1</sup>
<i>Considered geographic preference and program signals separately</i>	22% (14)
<i>Viewed applicants who reported a preference for my region <u>and</u> signaled my program more favorably</i>	20% (13)
<i>Gave more weight to program signals than geographic preference</i>	55% (36)
<i>Gave more weight to geographic preference than program signals</i>	3% (2)
Total number	65

1. Only programs that used both program signals and geographic preferences answered this question.

## Appendix E

### Results for Emergency Medicine



## Survey Response Rate

**Table E.1. Survey Response Rate by Specialty (N = 261)**

Specialty	Percentage (n)
Emergency Medicine	45% (117)

## Program Signals

**Table E.2. Did you use program signals during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Emergency Medicine	92% (108)	8% (9)	117

**Table E.3. For Emergency Medicine: How important were program signals at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Not Important % (n)	Somewhat Important % (n)	Important % (n)	Very Important % (n)	Important or Very Important % (n)
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
107	21% (23)	79% (84)	15% (13)	38% (32)	20% (17)	26% (22)	46% (39)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant who signaled my program</i>							
106	31% (33)	69% (73)	45% (33)	30% (22)	10% (7)	15% (11)	25% (18)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
106	34% (36)	66% (70)	20% (14)	39% (27)	27% (19)	14% (10)	41% (29)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
105	14% (15)	86% (90)	12% (11)	37% (33)	22% (20)	29% (26)	51% (46)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
107	20% (21)	80% (86)	14% (12)	31% (27)	29% (25)	26% (22)	55% (47)
<i>During the interview to learn more about why an applicant signaled my program</i>							
107	33% (35)	67% (72)	19% (14)	36% (26)	21% (15)	24% (17)	44% (32)

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
107	36% (38)	64% (69)	33% (23)	35% (24)	22% (15)	10% (7)	32% (22)
<i>Other</i>							
30	77% (23)	23% (7)	43% (3)	29% (2)	0% (0)	29% (2)	29% (2)

**Table E.4. For Emergency Medicine: Responses to Program Signals Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>Program signals helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
101	6% (6)	10% (10)	15% (15)	54% (55)	15% (15)	69% (70)
<i>Based on a review of their application, applicants who signaled my program were better aligned than those who did not.</i>						
101	4% (4)	21% (21)	59% (60)	12% (12)	4% (4)	16% (16)
<i>Applicants who signaled my program were more likely to accept interview invitations.</i>						
100	0% (0)	4% (4)	18% (18)	32% (32)	46% (46)	78% (78)

**Table E.5. The number of signals available to applicants in my specialty was:**

Specialty (Maximum Number of Signals)	Too Few % (n)	About Right % (n)	Too Many % (n)	Not Sure % (n)	Total number
Emergency Medicine (5 signals)	13% (13)	66% (67)	4% (4)	18% (18)	102

**Table E.6. For Emergency Medicine: How did you interpret a blank value for the program signal? (Select all that apply)**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	29% (30)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	13% (13)
<i>Applicant was afraid or unwilling to provide a response</i>	3% (3)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	62% (64)
<i>Treated the same as applicants who signaled my program</i>	15% (15)
<i>Other</i>	5% (5)
Total number	103 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

## Appendix F

### Results for General Surgery

## Survey Response Rate

**Table F.1. Survey Response Rate by Specialty (N = 283)**

Specialty	Percentage (n)
General Surgery	30% (86)

## Past Experiences

**Table F.2. Did you use the meaningful and impactful experiences information during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
General Surgery	62% (53)	38% (33)	86

**Table F.3. For General Surgery: The type of information provided by the most meaningful and impactful experiences responses was:**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Lacking important information</i>	18% (9)
<i>Just about right</i>	63% (31)
<i>Included extraneous information</i>	18% (9)
Total number	49

**Table F.4. For General Surgery: How important is the most meaningful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
52	4% (2)	96% (50)	4% (2)	50% (25)	42% (21)	4% (2)	46% (23)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
51	20% (10)	80% (41)	37% (15)	39% (16)	24% (10)	0% (0)	24% (10)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
52	8% (4)	92% (48)	17% (8)	35% (17)	42% (20)	6% (3)	48% (23)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
52	23% (12)	77% (40)	33% (13)	40% (16)	28% (11)	0% (0)	28% (11)
<i>Other</i>							
18	50% (9)	50% (9)	33% (3)	44% (4)	22% (2)	0% (0)	22% (2)

**Table F.5. For General Surgery: The most meaningful experiences responses helped me get a better picture of each applicant.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
51	6% (3)	94% (48)	2% (1)	10% (5)	21% (10)	58% (28)	8% (4)	67% (32)

**Table F.6. For General Surgery: The most meaningful experiences provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
49	4% (2)	96% (47)	9% (4)	11% (5)	30% (14)	45% (21)	6% (3)	51% (24)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
49	2% (1)	98% (48)	6% (3)	13% (6)	27% (13)	52% (25)	2% (1)	54% (26)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
49	2% (1)	98% (48)	6% (3)	29% (14)	38% (18)	25% (12)	2% (1)	27% (13)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
49	2% (1)	98% (48)	6% (3)	21% (10)	33% (16)	38% (18)	2% (1)	40% (19)

**Table F.7. For General Surgery: It was more efficient to use information from the most meaningful experiences than the information from the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
49	2% (1)	98% (48)	13% (6)	15% (7)	23% (11)	38% (18)	13% (6)	50% (24)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
48	2% (1)	98% (47)	9% (4)	21% (10)	36% (17)	26% (12)	9% (4)	34% (16)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
49	2% (1)	98% (48)	15% (7)	29% (14)	31% (15)	21% (10)	4% (2)	25% (12)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
49	2% (1)	98% (48)	17% (8)	29% (14)	31% (15)	15% (7)	8% (4)	23% (11)



**Table F.8. For General Surgery: How important is the other impactful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
52	4% (2)	96% (50)	12% (6)	52% (26)	30% (15)	6% (3)	36% (18)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
52	19% (10)	81% (42)	36% (15)	40% (17)	24% (10)	0% (0)	24% (10)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
52	13% (7)	87% (45)	27% (12)	33% (15)	33% (15)	7% (3)	40% (18)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
52	27% (14)	73% (38)	39% (15)	42% (16)	16% (6)	3% (1)	18% (7)
<i>Other</i>							
21	67% (14)	33% (7)	29% (2)	29% (2)	29% (2)	14% (1)	43% (3)

**Table F.9. For General Surgery: The other impactful experiences essay helped put the main ERAS application in context.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
53	6% (3)	94% (50)	4% (2)	6% (3)	28% (14)	54% (27)	8% (4)	62% (31)

**Table F.10. For General Surgery: The other impactful experiences essay provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
47	0% (0)	100% (47)	6% (3)	15% (7)	28% (13)	43% (20)	9% (4)	51% (24)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
47	0% (0)	100% (47)	6% (3)	15% (7)	32% (15)	38% (18)	9% (4)	47% (22)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
47	0% (0)	100% (47)	6% (3)	19% (9)	45% (21)	21% (10)	9% (4)	30% (14)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
47	0% (0)	100% (47)	6% (3)	17% (8)	40% (19)	26% (12)	11% (5)	36% (17)

**Table F.11. For General Surgery: Responses to the Experiences Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>The key characteristics helped me get a better picture of each applicant.</i>								
53	17% (9)	83% (44)	2% (1)	7% (3)	36% (16)	52% (23)	2% (1)	55% (24)
<i>The primary focus area helped me better understand applicant's alignment to my program's mission.</i>								
53	19% (10)	81% (43)	5% (2)	19% (8)	42% (18)	30% (13)	5% (2)	35% (15)

**Table F.12. For General Surgery: It was more efficient to use the experience types, key characteristics, and primary focus areas to better understand applicant qualities than the information from the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
48	17% (8)	83% (40)	15% (6)	20% (8)	25% (10)	23% (9)	18% (7)	40% (16)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
48	17% (8)	83% (40)	15% (6)	25% (10)	33% (13)	20% (8)	8% (3)	28% (11)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
48	17% (8)	83% (40)	15% (6)	23% (9)	40% (16)	18% (7)	5% (2)	23% (9)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
48	17% (8)	83% (40)	18% (7)	20% (8)	38% (15)	20% (8)	5% (2)	25% (10)

## Geographic Preferences

**Table F.13. Did you use geographic preference information during the application review process?**

<b>Specialty</b>	<b>Yes % (n)</b>	<b>No % (n)</b>	<b>Total number</b>
General Surgery	80% (66)	20% (16)	82

**Table F.14. For General Surgery: Responses to Geographic Preferences Questions**

N	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>Geographic preference information helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
63	5% (3)	24% (15)	24% (15)	44% (28)	3% (2)	48% (30)
<i>My program's geographic division as designated by the U.S. Census accurately represents the location of my program.</i>						
63	5% (3)	10% (6)	16% (10)	57% (36)	13% (8)	70% (44)

**Table F.15. For General Surgery: How important was the geographic preference information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Not Important % (n)	Somewhat Important % (n)	Important % (n)	Very Important % (n)	Important or Very Important % (n)
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
66	15% (10)	85% (56)	18% (10)	43% (24)	34% (19)	5% (3)	39% (22)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant that selected my region</i>							
66	44% (29)	56% (37)	65% (24)	22% (8)	11% (4)	3% (1)	14% (5)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
65	23% (15)	77% (50)	36% (18)	30% (15)	24% (12)	10% (5)	34% (17)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
66	6% (4)	94% (62)	11% (7)	47% (29)	27% (17)	15% (9)	42% (26)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
66	17% (11)	83% (55)	25% (14)	36% (20)	25% (14)	13% (7)	38% (21)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
66	30% (20)	70% (46)	50% (23)	26% (12)	22% (10)	2% (1)	24% (11)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
65	28% (18)	72% (47)	34% (16)	38% (18)	21% (10)	6% (3)	28% (13)
<i>Other</i>							
17	76% (13)	24% (4)	75% (3)	0% (0)	25% (1)	0% (0)	25% (1)

**Table F.16. For General Surgery: In general, applicants who stated a preference for my region were more likely to accept interview invitations.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
63	2% (1)	8% (5)	56% (35)	30% (19)	5% (3)	35% (22)

**Table F.17. For General Surgery: How did you interpret a “No geographic preference” response? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program’s region</i>	6% (4)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	2% (1)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	70% (45)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	42% (27)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	17% (11)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	34% (22)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	17% (11)
<i>Other</i>	2% (1)
<b>Total number</b>	<b>64<sup>1</sup></b>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table F.18. For General Surgery: How did you interpret a blank geographic preference? (Select all that apply)**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program's region</i>	15% (10)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	6% (4)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	46% (30)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	31% (20)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	26% (17)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	37% (24)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	12% (8)
<i>Other</i>	3% (2)
Total number	65 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

## Program Signals

**Table F.19. Did you use program signals during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
General Surgery	77% (62)	23% (19)	81

**Table F.20. For General Surgery: How important were program signals at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
62	15% (9)	85% (53)	23% (12)	21% (11)	32% (17)	25% (13)	57% (30)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant who signaled my program</i>							
62	35% (22)	65% (40)	63% (25)	28% (11)	8% (3)	3% (1)	10% (4)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
61	10% (6)	90% (55)	24% (13)	33% (18)	25% (14)	18% (10)	44% (24)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
62	3% (2)	97% (60)	12% (7)	32% (19)	43% (26)	13% (8)	57% (34)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
62	10% (6)	90% (56)	13% (7)	23% (13)	46% (26)	18% (10)	64% (36)
<i>During the interview to learn more about why an applicant signaled my program</i>							
62	24% (15)	76% (47)	30% (14)	34% (16)	30% (14)	6% (3)	36% (17)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
62	32% (20)	68% (42)	31% (13)	31% (13)	29% (12)	10% (4)	38% (16)
<i>Other</i>							
18	72% (13)	28% (5)	60% (3)	40% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

**Table F.21. For General Surgery: Responses to Program Signals Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>Program signals helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
59	2% (1)	8% (5)	24% (14)	49% (29)	17% (10)	66% (39)
<i>Based on a review of their application, applicants who signaled my program were better aligned than those who did not.</i>						
59	5% (3)	24% (14)	53% (31)	19% (11)	0% (0)	19% (11)
<i>Applicants who signaled my program were more likely to accept interview invitations.</i>						
59	3% (2)	5% (3)	46% (27)	32% (19)	14% (8)	46% (27)

**Table F.22. The number of signals available to applicants in my specialty was:**

Specialty (Maximum Number of Signals)	Too Few % (n)	About Right % (n)	Too Many % (n)	Not Sure % (n)	Total number
General Surgery (5 signals)	18% (11)	69% (43)	3% (2)	10% (6)	62

**Table F.23. For General Surgery: How did you interpret a blank value for the program signal? (Select all that apply)**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	37% (23)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	11% (7)
<i>Applicant was afraid or unwilling to provide a response</i>	5% (3)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	56% (35)
<i>Treated the same as applicants who signaled my program</i>	8% (5)
<i>Other</i>	5% (3)
Total number	62 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table F.24. For General Surgery: How did your program interpret program signals and geographic preferences?**

Choice	% (n) <sup>1</sup>
<i>Considered geographic preference and program signals separately</i>	27% (14)
<i>Viewed applicants who reported a preference for my region <u>and</u> signaled my program more favorably</i>	21% (11)
<i>Gave more weight to program signals than geographic preference</i>	50% (26)
<i>Gave more weight to geographic preference than program signals</i>	2% (1)
Total number	52

1. Only programs that used both program signals and geographic preferences answered this question.



## Appendix G

### Results for Internal Medicine

## Survey Response Rate

**Table G.1. Survey Response Rate by Specialty (N = 512)**

Specialty	Percentage (n)
Internal Medicine	30% (154)

## Past Experiences

**Table G.2. Did you use the meaningful and impactful experiences information during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Internal Medicine	69% (105)	31% (48)	153

**Table G.3. For Internal Medicine: The type of information provided by the most meaningful and impactful experiences responses was:**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Lacking important information</i>	10% (9)
<i>Just about right</i>	71% (64)
<i>Included extraneous information</i>	19% (17)
Total number	90

**Table G.4. For Internal Medicine: How important is the most meaningful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
103	6% (6)	94% (97)	15% (15)	41% (40)	28% (27)	15% (15)	43% (42)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
103	17% (18)	83% (85)	34% (29)	36% (31)	22% (19)	7% (6)	29% (25)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
103	12% (12)	88% (91)	14% (13)	35% (32)	36% (33)	14% (13)	51% (46)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
103	32% (33)	68% (70)	34% (24)	43% (30)	19% (13)	4% (3)	23% (16)
<i>Other</i>							
39	72% (28)	28% (11)	73% (8)	27% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

**Table G.5. For Internal Medicine: The most meaningful experiences responses helped me get a better picture of each applicant.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
99	4% (4)	96% (95)	5% (5)	5% (5)	26% (25)	55% (52)	8% (8)	63% (60)

**Table G.6. For Internal Medicine: The most meaningful experiences provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
92	3% (3)	97% (89)	9% (8)	10% (9)	20% (18)	48% (43)	12% (11)	61% (54)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
92	4% (4)	96% (88)	7% (6)	11% (10)	25% (22)	43% (38)	14% (12)	57% (50)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
93	4% (4)	96% (89)	8% (7)	15% (13)	25% (22)	42% (37)	11% (10)	53% (47)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
92	4% (4)	96% (88)	6% (5)	17% (15)	18% (16)	41% (36)	18% (16)	59% (52)

**Table G.7. For Internal Medicine: It was more efficient to use information from the most meaningful experiences than the information from the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
91	4% (4)	96% (87)	6% (5)	18% (16)	18% (16)	37% (32)	21% (18)	57% (50)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
92	5% (5)	95% (87)	9% (8)	22% (19)	26% (23)	31% (27)	11% (10)	43% (37)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
92	4% (4)	96% (88)	10% (9)	28% (25)	24% (21)	26% (23)	11% (10)	38% (33)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
92	4% (4)	96% (88)	7% (6)	23% (20)	28% (25)	27% (24)	15% (13)	42% (37)

**Table G.8. For Internal Medicine: How important is the other impactful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Not Important % (n)	Somewhat Important % (n)	Important % (n)	Very Important % (n)	Important or Very Important % (n)
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
103	13% (13)	87% (90)	17% (15)	42% (38)	28% (25)	13% (12)	41% (37)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
101	24% (24)	76% (77)	34% (26)	39% (30)	23% (18)	4% (3)	27% (21)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
102	18% (18)	82% (84)	18% (15)	35% (29)	37% (31)	11% (9)	48% (40)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
102	29% (30)	71% (72)	47% (34)	36% (26)	15% (11)	1% (1)	17% (12)
<i>Other</i>							
50	68% (34)	32% (16)	81% (13)	13% (2)	0% (0)	6% (1)	6% (1)

**Table G.9. For Internal Medicine: The other impactful experiences essay helped put the main ERAS application in context.**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
98	5% (5)	95% (93)	4% (4)	5% (5)	32% (30)	46% (43)	12% (11)	58% (54)

**Table G.10. For Internal Medicine: The other impactful experiences essay provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
91	7% (6)	93% (85)	7% (6)	14% (12)	21% (18)	36% (31)	21% (18)	58% (49)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
92	9% (8)	91% (84)	8% (7)	11% (9)	23% (19)	43% (36)	15% (13)	58% (49)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
92	8% (7)	92% (85)	8% (7)	16% (14)	25% (21)	39% (33)	12% (10)	51% (43)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
90	8% (7)	92% (83)	7% (6)	17% (14)	20% (17)	40% (33)	16% (13)	55% (46)

**Table G.11. For Internal Medicine: Responses to the Experiences Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>The key characteristics helped me get a better picture of each applicant.</i>								
97	15% (15)	85% (82)	7% (6)	7% (6)	41% (34)	43% (35)	1% (1)	44% (36)
<i>The primary focus area helped me better understand applicant's alignment to my program's mission.</i>								
97	13% (13)	87% (84)	8% (7)	11% (9)	37% (31)	39% (33)	5% (4)	44% (37)

**Table G.12. For Internal Medicine: It was more efficient to use the experience types, key characteristics, and primary focus areas to better understand applicant qualities than the information from the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
90	14% (13)	86% (77)	9% (7)	12% (9)	31% (24)	34% (26)	14% (11)	48% (37)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
91	16% (15)	84% (76)	8% (6)	14% (11)	36% (27)	26% (20)	16% (12)	42% (32)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
89	16% (14)	84% (75)	11% (8)	23% (17)	32% (24)	23% (17)	12% (9)	35% (26)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
91	15% (14)	85% (77)	8% (6)	21% (16)	38% (29)	22% (17)	12% (9)	34% (26)

## Geographic Preferences

**Table G.13. For Internal Medicine: Did you use geographic preference information during the application review process?**

<b>Specialty</b>	<b>Yes % (n)</b>	<b>No % (n)</b>	<b>Total number</b>
Internal Medicine	86% (125)	14% (20)	145



**Table G.14. For Internal Medicine: Responses to Geographic Preferences Questions**

N	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>Geographic preference information helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
122	5% (6)	13% (16)	21% (26)	51% (62)	10% (12)	61% (74)
<i>My program's geographic division as designated by the U.S. Census accurately represents the location of my program.</i>						
120	11% (13)	18% (21)	21% (25)	41% (49)	10% (12)	51% (61)

**Table G.15. For Internal Medicine: How important was the geographic preference information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Not Important % (n)	Somewhat Important % (n)	Important % (n)	Very Important % (n)	Important or Very Important % (n)
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
123	12% (15)	88% (108)	12% (13)	36% (39)	31% (33)	21% (23)	52% (56)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant that selected my region</i>							
121	40% (49)	60% (72)	47% (34)	33% (24)	14% (10)	6% (4)	19% (14)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
122	34% (41)	66% (81)	21% (17)	36% (29)	32% (26)	11% (9)	43% (35)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
122	7% (8)	93% (114)	6% (7)	38% (43)	40% (46)	16% (18)	56% (64)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
119	13% (16)	87% (103)	8% (8)	38% (39)	39% (40)	16% (16)	54% (56)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
121	33% (40)	67% (81)	32% (26)	31% (25)	28% (23)	9% (7)	37% (30)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
121	31% (38)	69% (83)	28% (23)	43% (36)	23% (19)	6% (5)	29% (24)
<i>Other</i>							
45	89% (40)	11% (5)	60% (3)	40% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

**Table G.16. For Internal Medicine: In general, applicants who stated a preference for my region were more likely to accept interview invitations.**

N	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
121	2% (3)	12% (15)	40% (48)	37% (45)	8% (10)	45% (55)

**Table G.17. For Internal Medicine: How did you interpret a “No geographic preference” response? (Select all that apply)**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program’s region</i>	10% (13)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	2% (3)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	77% (96)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	42% (52)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	27% (34)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	24% (30)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	13% (16)
<i>Other</i>	1% (1)
Total number	124 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table G.18. For Internal Medicine: How did you interpret a blank geographic preference?  
(Select all that apply)**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program's region</i>	36% (45)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	14% (17)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	46% (57)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	28% (35)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	27% (33)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	31% (38)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	10% (12)
<i>Other</i>	3% (4)
Total number	124 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

## Program Signals

**Table G.19. Did you use program signals during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Internal Medicine	89% (128)	11% (16)	144

**Table G.20. For Internal Medicine: How important were program signals at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
126	10% (13)	90% (113)	6% (7)	22% (25)	30% (34)	42% (47)	72% (81)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant who signaled my program</i>							
123	41% (51)	59% (72)	49% (35)	26% (19)	17% (12)	8% (6)	25% (18)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
125	20% (25)	80% (100)	12% (12)	25% (25)	37% (37)	26% (26)	63% (63)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
125	10% (12)	90% (113)	6% (7)	28% (32)	32% (36)	34% (38)	65% (74)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
120	14% (17)	86% (103)	10% (10)	27% (28)	35% (36)	28% (29)	63% (65)
<i>During the interview to learn more about why an applicant signaled my program</i>							
124	36% (45)	64% (79)	23% (18)	34% (27)	23% (18)	20% (16)	43% (34)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
123	33% (40)	67% (83)	27% (22)	33% (27)	29% (24)	12% (10)	41% (34)
<i>Other</i>							
43	79% (34)	21% (9)	33% (3)	44% (4)	11% (1)	11% (1)	22% (2)

**Table G.21. For Internal Medicine: Responses to Program Signals Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>Program signals helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
124	1% (1)	8% (10)	10% (13)	45% (56)	35% (44)	81% (100)
<i>Based on a review of their application, applicants who signaled my program were better aligned than those who did not.</i>						
124	3% (4)	16% (20)	44% (55)	30% (37)	6% (8)	36% (45)
<i>Applicants who signaled my program were more likely to accept interview invitations.</i>						
124	2% (3)	6% (8)	31% (39)	31% (39)	28% (35)	60% (74)

**Table G.22. The number of signals available to applicants in my specialty was:**

Specialty (Maximum Number of Signals)	Too Few % (n)	About Right % (n)	Too Many % (n)	Not Sure % (n)	Total number
Internal Medicine (7 signals)	10% (12)	51% (63)	22% (27)	18% (22)	124

**Table G.23. For Internal Medicine: How did you interpret a blank value for the program signal? (Select all that apply)**

Choice	Percentage (n)
Applicant was less interested in my program	51% (63)
Applicant was willing to go anywhere	23% (28)
Applicant was afraid or unwilling to provide a response	14% (17)
Did not draw any conclusions	33% (41)
Treated the same as applicants who signaled my program	12% (15)
Other	5% (6)
Total number	123 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table G.24. For Internal Medicine: How did your program interpret program signals and geographic preferences?**

Choice	Percentage (n) <sup>1</sup>
<i>Considered geographic preference and program signals separately</i>	23% (25)
<i>Viewed applicants who reported a preference for my region <u>and</u> signaled my program more favorably</i>	23% (25)
<i>Gave more weight to program signals than geographic preference</i>	54% (60)
<i>Gave more weight to geographic preference than program signals</i>	1% (1)
Total number	111

1. Only programs that used both program signals and geographic preferences answered this question.

## Appendix H

### Results for Neurological Surgery

## Survey Response Rate

**Table H.1. Survey Response Rate by Specialty (N = 110)**

Specialty	Percentage (n)
Neurological Surgery	21% (23)

## Past Experiences

**Table H.2. Did you use the meaningful and impactful experiences information during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Neurological Surgery	39% (9)	61% (14)	23

**Table H.3. For Neurological Surgery: The type of information provided by the most meaningful and impactful experiences responses was:**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Lacking important information</i>	10% (1)
<i>Just about right</i>	90% (9)
<i>Included extraneous information</i>	0% (0)
Total number	10

**Table H.4. For Neurological Surgery: How important is the most meaningful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	13% (1)	38% (3)	38% (3)	13% (1)	50% (4)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	13% (1)	38% (3)	38% (3)	13% (1)	50% (4)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	0% (0)	25% (2)	38% (3)	38% (3)	75% (6)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	13% (1)	25% (2)	63% (5)	0% (0)	63% (5)
<i>Other</i>							
2	100% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

**Table H.5. For Neurological Surgery: The most meaningful experiences responses helped me get a better picture of each applicant.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
10	20% (2)	80% (8)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (8)	0% (0)	100% (8)



**Table H.6. For Neurological Surgery: The most meaningful experiences provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	75% (6)	13% (1)	88% (7)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	0% (0)	13% (1)	25% (2)	50% (4)	13% (1)	63% (5)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	0% (0)	13% (1)	25% (2)	50% (4)	13% (1)	63% (5)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	0% (0)	25% (2)	25% (2)	38% (3)	13% (1)	50% (4)

**Table H.7. For Neurological Surgery: It was more efficient to use information from the most meaningful experiences than the information from the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
8	13% (1)	88% (7)	0% (0)	43% (3)	29% (2)	0% (0)	29% (2)	29% (2)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
8	13% (1)	88% (7)	14% (1)	29% (2)	43% (3)	0% (0)	14% (1)	14% (1)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	13% (1)	25% (2)	38% (3)	13% (1)	13% (1)	25% (2)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
8	13% (1)	88% (7)	0% (0)	71% (5)	14% (1)	0% (0)	14% (1)	14% (1)

**Table H.8. For Neurological Surgery: How important is the other impactful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	13% (1)	50% (4)	38% (3)	0% (0)	38% (3)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	13% (1)	38% (3)	50% (4)	0% (0)	50% (4)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	0% (0)	50% (4)	50% (4)	0% (0)	50% (4)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	13% (1)	38% (3)	50% (4)	0% (0)	50% (4)
<i>Other</i>							
2	50% (1)	50% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)	100% (1)

**Table H.9. For Neurological Surgery: The other impactful experiences essay helped put the main ERAS application in context.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
8	25% (2)	75% (6)	0% (0)	0% (0)	17% (1)	67% (4)	17% (1)	83% (5)

**Table H.10. For Neurological Surgery: The other impactful experiences essay provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	0% (0)	13% (1)	38% (3)	25% (2)	25% (2)	50% (4)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	0% (0)	13% (1)	63% (5)	13% (1)	13% (1)	25% (2)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	0% (0)	13% (1)	63% (5)	13% (1)	13% (1)	25% (2)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	0% (0)	25% (2)	38% (3)	25% (2)	13% (1)	38% (3)

**Table H.11. For Neurological Surgery: Responses to the Experiences Questions**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>The key characteristics helped me get a better picture of each applicant.</i>								
10	20% (2)	80% (8)	0% (0)	0% (0)	25% (2)	75% (6)	0% (0)	75% (6)
<i>The primary focus area helped me better understand applicant's alignment to my program's mission.</i>								
10	30% (3)	70% (7)	0% (0)	0% (0)	43% (3)	57% (4)	0% (0)	57% (4)

**Table H.12. For Neurological Surgery: It was more efficient to use the experience types, key characteristics, and primary focus areas to better understand applicant qualities than the information from the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	0% (0)	38% (3)	25% (2)	38% (3)	0% (0)	38% (3)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	0% (0)	38% (3)	38% (3)	25% (2)	0% (0)	25% (2)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	0% (0)	38% (3)	38% (3)	25% (2)	0% (0)	25% (2)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	0% (0)	50% (4)	25% (2)	25% (2)	0% (0)	25% (2)

## Geographic Preferences

**Table H.13. Did you use geographic preference information during the application review process?**

<b>Specialty</b>	<b>Yes % (n)</b>	<b>No % (n)</b>	<b>Total number</b>
Neurological Surgery	41% (9)	59% (13)	22

**Table H.14. For Neurological Surgery: Responses to Geographic Preferences Questions**

N	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>Geographic preference information helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
9	11% (1)	22% (2)	11% (1)	44% (4)	11% (1)	56% (5)
<i>My program's geographic division as designated by the U.S. Census accurately represents the location of my program.</i>						
9	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	67% (6)	22% (2)	89% (8)

**Table H.15. For Neurological Surgery: How important was the geographic preference information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Not Important % (n)	Somewhat Important % (n)	Important % (n)	Very Important % (n)	Important or Very Important % (n)
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
9	22% (2)	78% (7)	14% (1)	57% (4)	0% (0)	29% (2)	29% (2)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant that selected my region</i>							
9	44% (4)	56% (5)	20% (1)	40% (2)	20% (1)	20% (1)	40% (2)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
9	11% (1)	89% (8)	13% (1)	50% (4)	13% (1)	25% (2)	38% (3)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
9	0% (0)	100% (9)	11% (1)	44% (4)	11% (1)	33% (3)	44% (4)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
9	0% (0)	100% (9)	0% (0)	22% (2)	44% (4)	33% (3)	78% (7)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
8	25% (2)	75% (6)	50% (3)	33% (2)	17% (1)	0% (0)	17% (1)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
9	22% (2)	78% (7)	0% (0)	71% (5)	14% (1)	14% (1)	29% (2)
<i>Other</i>							
1	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

**Table H.16. For Neurological Surgery: In general, applicants who stated a preference for my region were more likely to accept interview invitations.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
9	0% (0)	0% (0)	44% (4)	33% (3)	22% (2)	56% (5)

**Table H.17. For Neurological Surgery: How did you interpret a “No geographic preference” response? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program’s region</i>	0% (0)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	0% (0)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	100% (9)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	33% (3)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	22% (2)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	0% (0)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	0% (0)
<i>Other</i>	0% (0)
<b>Total number</b>	9 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table H.18. For Neurological Surgery: How did you interpret a blank geographic preference? (Select all that apply)**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program's region</i>	11% (1)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	0% (0)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	67% (6)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	0% (0)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	22% (2)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	22% (2)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	0% (0)
<i>Other</i>	0% (0)
Total number	9 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

## Program Signals

**Table H.19. Did you use program signals during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Neurological Surgery	68% (15)	32% (7)	22



**Table H.20. For Neurological Surgery: How important were program signals at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
15	33% (5)	67% (10)	50% (5)	20% (2)	10% (1)	20% (2)	30% (3)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant who signaled my program</i>							
15	33% (5)	67% (10)	60% (6)	30% (3)	10% (1)	0% (0)	10% (1)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
15	13% (2)	87% (13)	38% (5)	23% (3)	23% (3)	15% (2)	38% (5)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
15	13% (2)	87% (13)	23% (3)	23% (3)	31% (4)	23% (3)	54% (7)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
14	0% (0)	100% (14)	7% (1)	29% (4)	21% (3)	43% (6)	64% (9)
<i>During the interview to learn more about why an applicant signaled my program</i>							
15	27% (4)	73% (11)	27% (3)	45% (5)	18% (2)	9% (1)	27% (3)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
14	21% (3)	79% (11)	9% (1)	55% (6)	36% (4)	0% (0)	36% (4)
<i>Other</i>							
1	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

**Table H.21. For Neurological Surgery: Responses to Program Signals Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>Program signals helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
14	29% (4)	0% (0)	29% (4)	29% (4)	14% (2)	43% (6)
<i>Based on a review of their application, applicants who signaled my program were better aligned than those who did not.</i>						
14	14% (2)	29% (4)	36% (5)	21% (3)	0% (0)	21% (3)
<i>Applicants who signaled my program were more likely to accept interview invitations.</i>						
12	0% (0)	8% (1)	33% (4)	25% (3)	33% (4)	58% (7)

**Table H.22. The number of signals available to applicants in my specialty was:**

<b>Specialty (Maximum Number of Signals)</b>	<b>Too Few % (n)</b>	<b>About Right % (n)</b>	<b>Too Many % (n)</b>	<b>Not Sure % (n)</b>	<b>Total number</b>
Neurological Surgery (8 signals)	7% (1)	73% (11)	0% (0)	20% (3)	15

**Table H.23. For Neurological Surgery: How did you interpret a blank value for the program signal? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	33% (5)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	27% (4)
<i>Applicant was afraid or unwilling to provide a response</i>	13% (2)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	47% (7)
<i>Treated the same as applicants who signaled my program</i>	13% (2)
<i>Other</i>	0% (0)
<b>Total number</b>	15 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table H.24. For Neurological Surgery: How did your program interpret program signals and geographic preferences?**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)<sup>1</sup></b>
<i>Considered geographic preference and program signals separately</i>	44% (4)
<i>Viewed applicants who reported a preference for my region <u>and</u> signaled my program more favorably</i>	44% (4)
<i>Gave more weight to program signals than geographic preference</i>	11% (1)
<i>Gave more weight to geographic preference than program signals</i>	0% (0)
Total number	9

1. Only programs that used both program signals and geographic preferences answered this question.

## Appendix I

### Results for Obstetrics and Gynecology

## Survey Response Rate

**Table I.1. Survey Response Rate by Specialty (N = 272)**

Specialty	Percentage (n)
Obstetrics and Gynecology	37% (100)

## Program Signals

**Table I.2. Did you use program signals during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Obstetrics and Gynecology	93% (93)	7% (7)	100

**Table I.3. For Obstetrics and Gynecology: How important were program signals at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Not Important % (n)	Somewhat Important % (n)	Important % (n)	Very Important % (n)	Important or Very Important % (n)
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
93	6% (6)	94% (87)	6% (5)	22% (19)	23% (20)	49% (43)	72% (63)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant who signaled my program</i>							
92	41% (38)	59% (54)	50% (27)	35% (19)	6% (3)	9% (5)	15% (8)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
91	24% (22)	76% (69)	12% (8)	20% (14)	39% (27)	29% (20)	68% (47)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
92	9% (8)	91% (84)	5% (4)	20% (17)	42% (35)	33% (28)	75% (63)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
92	13% (12)	87% (80)	9% (7)	23% (18)	31% (25)	38% (30)	69% (55)
<i>During the interview to learn more about why an applicant signaled my program</i>							
89	44% (39)	56% (50)	46% (23)	24% (12)	24% (12)	6% (3)	30% (15)

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Not Important % (n)	Somewhat Important % (n)	Important % (n)	Very Important % (n)	Important or Very Important % (n)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
92	33% (30)	67% (62)	32% (20)	44% (27)	21% (13)	3% (2)	24% (15)
<i>Other</i>							
23	87% (20)	13% (3)	67% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	33% (1)	33% (1)

**Table I.4. For Obstetrics and Gynecology: Responses to Program Signals Questions**

N	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>Program signals helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
89	6% (5)	15% (13)	12% (11)	44% (39)	24% (21)	67% (60)
<i>Based on a review of their application, applicants who signaled my program were better aligned than those who did not.</i>						
89	3% (3)	20% (18)	51% (45)	17% (15)	9% (8)	26% (23)
<i>Applicants who signaled my program were more likely to accept interview invitations.</i>						
89	4% (4)	9% (8)	26% (23)	30% (27)	30% (27)	61% (54)

**Table I.5. The number of signals available to applicants in my specialty was:**

Specialty (Maximum Number of Signals)	Too Few % (n)	About Right % (n)	Too Many % (n)	Not Sure % (n)	Total number
Obstetrics and Gynecology (3 Gold, 15 Silver)	1% (1)	58% (52)	26% (23)	15% (13)	89

**Table I.6. For Obstetrics and Gynecology: How did you interpret a blank value for the program signal? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	69% (61)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	17% (15)
<i>Applicant was afraid or unwilling to provide a response</i>	8% (7)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	25% (22)
<i>Treated the same as applicants who signaled my program</i>	12% (11)
<i>Other</i>	6% (5)
Total number	89 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table I.7. For Obstetrics and Gynecology Only: How did you interpret gold and silver signals?**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)</b>
<i>Did not differentiate between gold and silver signals</i>	21% (19)
<i>Gold and silver signals had equal value</i>	4% (4)
<i>Gold signals were more valuable than silver signals</i>	71% (63)
<i>Other</i>	3% (3)
Total number	89

## Appendix J

### Results for Orthopedic Surgery



## Survey Response Rate

**Table J.1. Survey Response Rate by Specialty (N = 182)**

Specialty	Percentage (n)
Orthopedic Surgery	27% (49)

## Past Experiences

**Table J.2. Did you use the meaningful and impactful experiences information during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Orthopedic Surgery	49% (24)	51% (25)	49

**Table J.3. For Orthopedic Surgery: The type of information provided by the most meaningful and impactful experiences responses was:**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Lacking important information</i>	5% (1)
<i>Just about right</i>	70% (14)
<i>Included extraneous information</i>	25% (5)
Total number	20

**Table J.4. For Orthopedic Surgery: How important is the most meaningful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
23	0% (0)	100% (23)	4% (1)	52% (12)	26% (6)	17% (4)	43% (10)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
23	13% (3)	87% (20)	45% (9)	20% (4)	25% (5)	10% (2)	35% (7)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
23	13% (3)	87% (20)	35% (7)	35% (7)	10% (2)	20% (4)	30% (6)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
23	22% (5)	78% (18)	50% (9)	33% (6)	6% (1)	11% (2)	17% (3)
<i>Other</i>							
7	29% (2)	71% (5)	100% (5)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

**Table J.5. For Orthopedic Surgery: The most meaningful experiences responses helped me get a better picture of each applicant.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
21	0% (0)	100% (21)	5% (1)	5% (1)	29% (6)	52% (11)	10% (2)	62% (13)

**Table J.6. For Orthopedic Surgery: The most meaningful experiences provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
19	0% (0)	100% (19)	5% (1)	16% (3)	53% (10)	21% (4)	5% (1)	26% (5)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
19	5% (1)	95% (18)	11% (2)	17% (3)	44% (8)	22% (4)	6% (1)	28% (5)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
19	0% (0)	100% (19)	5% (1)	21% (4)	47% (9)	16% (3)	11% (2)	26% (5)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
19	0% (0)	100% (19)	11% (2)	16% (3)	37% (7)	26% (5)	11% (2)	37% (7)

**Table J.7. For Orthopedic Surgery: It was more efficient to use information from the most meaningful experiences than the information from the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
19	0% (0)	100% (19)	11% (2)	21% (4)	42% (8)	16% (3)	11% (2)	26% (5)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
19	5% (1)	95% (18)	11% (2)	17% (3)	39% (7)	28% (5)	6% (1)	33% (6)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
19	0% (0)	100% (19)	21% (4)	26% (5)	32% (6)	16% (3)	5% (1)	21% (4)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
19	0% (0)	100% (19)	21% (4)	21% (4)	32% (6)	16% (3)	11% (2)	26% (5)

**Table J.8. For Orthopedic Surgery: How important is the other impactful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
23	9% (2)	91% (21)	10% (2)	67% (14)	24% (5)	0% (0)	24% (5)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
23	17% (4)	83% (19)	37% (7)	53% (10)	11% (2)	0% (0)	11% (2)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
23	13% (3)	87% (20)	30% (6)	65% (13)	0% (0)	5% (1)	5% (1)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
23	26% (6)	74% (17)	59% (10)	35% (6)	6% (1)	0% (0)	6% (1)
<i>Other</i>							
10	30% (3)	70% (7)	86% (6)	14% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

**Table J.9. For Orthopedic Surgery: The other impactful experiences essay helped put the main ERAS application in context.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
21	14% (3)	86% (18)	6% (1)	17% (3)	33% (6)	44% (8)	0% (0)	44% (8)

**Table J.10. For Orthopedic Surgery: The other impactful experiences essay provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
19	11% (2)	89% (17)	6% (1)	35% (6)	35% (6)	18% (3)	6% (1)	24% (4)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
19	11% (2)	89% (17)	6% (1)	29% (5)	35% (6)	24% (4)	6% (1)	29% (5)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
19	11% (2)	89% (17)	6% (1)	35% (6)	29% (5)	24% (4)	6% (1)	29% (5)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
19	11% (2)	89% (17)	12% (2)	24% (4)	41% (7)	18% (3)	6% (1)	24% (4)

**Table J.11. For Orthopedic Surgery: Responses to the Experiences Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>The key characteristics helped me get a better picture of each applicant.</i>								
21	14% (3)	86% (18)	6% (1)	17% (3)	44% (8)	28% (5)	6% (1)	33% (6)
<i>The primary focus area helped me better understand applicant's alignment to my program's mission.</i>								
20	15% (3)	85% (17)	6% (1)	18% (3)	29% (5)	47% (8)	0% (0)	47% (8)

**Table J.12. For Orthopedic Surgery: It was more efficient to use the experience types, key characteristics, and primary focus areas to better understand applicant qualities than the information from the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
19	0% (0)	100% (19)	11% (2)	16% (3)	42% (8)	32% (6)	0% (0)	32% (6)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
19	5% (1)	95% (18)	11% (2)	17% (3)	50% (9)	22% (4)	0% (0)	22% (4)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
19	0% (0)	100% (19)	11% (2)	32% (6)	42% (8)	5% (1)	11% (2)	16% (3)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
19	0% (0)	100% (19)	11% (2)	21% (4)	47% (9)	16% (3)	5% (1)	21% (4)

## Geographic Preferences

**Table J.13. Did you use geographic preference information during the application review process?**

<b>Specialty</b>	<b>Yes % (n)</b>	<b>No % (n)</b>	<b>Total number</b>
Orthopedic Surgery	55% (24)	45% (20)	44

**Table J.14. For Orthopedic Surgery: Responses to Geographic Preferences Questions**

N	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>Geographic preference information helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
23	26% (6)	22% (5)	26% (6)	22% (5)	4% (1)	26% (6)
<i>My program's geographic division as designated by the U.S. Census accurately represents the location of my program.</i>						
23	9% (2)	4% (1)	17% (4)	48% (11)	22% (5)	70% (16)

**Table J.15. For Orthopedic Surgery: How important was the geographic preference information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Not Important % (n)	Somewhat Important % (n)	Important % (n)	Very Important % (n)	Important or Very Important % (n)
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
24	17% (4)	83% (20)	10% (2)	55% (11)	20% (4)	15% (3)	35% (7)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant that selected my region</i>							
24	38% (9)	63% (15)	60% (9)	27% (4)	7% (1)	7% (1)	13% (2)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
24	29% (7)	71% (17)	35% (6)	41% (7)	24% (4)	0% (0)	24% (4)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
24	13% (3)	88% (21)	14% (3)	52% (11)	29% (6)	5% (1)	33% (7)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
24	8% (2)	92% (22)	18% (4)	45% (10)	32% (7)	5% (1)	36% (8)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
24	33% (8)	67% (16)	44% (7)	38% (6)	13% (2)	6% (1)	19% (3)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
24	42% (10)	58% (14)	50% (7)	29% (4)	14% (2)	7% (1)	21% (3)
<i>Other</i>							
10	60% (6)	40% (4)	75% (3)	25% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)



**Table J.16. For Orthopedic Surgery: In general, applicants who stated a preference for my region were more likely to accept interview invitations.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
23	13% (3)	4% (1)	57% (13)	22% (5)	4% (1)	26% (6)

**Table J.17. For Orthopedic Surgery: How did you interpret a “No geographic preference” response? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>% (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program’s region</i>	5% (1)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	5% (1)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	82% (18)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	27% (6)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	18% (4)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	32% (7)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	14% (3)
<i>Other</i>	0% (0)
<b>Total number</b>	22 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table J.18. For Orthopedic Surgery: How did you interpret a blank geographic preference? (Select all that apply)**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program's region</i>	41% (9)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	9% (2)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	41% (9)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	18% (4)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	18% (4)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	36% (8)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	9% (2)
<i>Other</i>	0% (0)
Total number	22 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

### Program Signals

**Table J.19. For Orthopedic Surgery: Did you use program signals during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Orthopedic Surgery	95% (40)	5% (2)	42

**Table J.20. For Orthopedic Surgery: How important were program signals at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
40	5% (2)	95% (38)	8% (3)	16% (6)	21% (8)	55% (21)	76% (29)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant who signaled my program</i>							
40	55% (22)	45% (18)	39% (7)	28% (5)	17% (3)	17% (3)	33% (6)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
40	23% (9)	78% (31)	10% (3)	23% (7)	32% (10)	35% (11)	68% (21)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
40	8% (3)	93% (37)	3% (1)	30% (11)	27% (10)	41% (15)	68% (25)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
40	25% (10)	75% (30)	17% (5)	17% (5)	30% (9)	37% (11)	67% (20)
<i>During the interview to learn more about why an applicant signaled my program</i>							
40	45% (18)	55% (22)	18% (4)	32% (7)	32% (7)	18% (4)	50% (11)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
40	50% (20)	50% (20)	40% (8)	25% (5)	15% (3)	20% (4)	35% (7)
<i>Other</i>							
14	64% (9)	36% (5)	60% (3)	20% (1)	0% (0)	20% (1)	20% (1)

**Table J.21. For Orthopedic Surgery: Responses to Program Signals Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>Program signals helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
37	8% (3)	5% (2)	16% (6)	43% (16)	27% (10)	70% (26)
<i>Based on a review of their application, applicants who signaled my program were better aligned than those who did not.</i>						
38	3% (1)	8% (3)	63% (24)	16% (6)	11% (4)	26% (10)
<i>Applicants who signaled my program were more likely to accept interview invitations.</i>						
38	0% (0)	3% (1)	32% (12)	42% (16)	24% (9)	66% (25)

**Table J.22. The number of signals available to applicants in my specialty was:**

<b>Specialty (Maximum Number of Signals)</b>	<b>Too Few % (n)</b>	<b>About Right % (n)</b>	<b>Too Many % (n)</b>	<b>Not Sure % (n)</b>	<b>Total % number</b>
Orthopedic Surgery (30 signals)	3% (1)	60% (24)	30% (12)	8% (3)	40

**Table J.23. For Orthopedic Surgery: How did you interpret a blank value for the program signal? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	75% (30)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	8% (3)
<i>Applicant was afraid or unwilling to provide a response</i>	10% (4)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	18% (7)
<i>Treated the same as applicants who signaled my program</i>	0% (0)
<i>Other</i>	5% (2)
<b>Total number</b>	40 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table J.24. For Orthopedic Surgery: How did your program interpret program signals and geographic preferences?**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)<sup>1</sup></b>
<i>Considered geographic preference and program signals separately</i>	4% (1)
<i>Viewed applicants who reported a preference for my region <u>and</u> signaled my program more favorably</i>	22% (5)
<i>Gave more weight to program signals than geographic preference</i>	74% (17)
<i>Gave more weight to geographic preference than program signals</i>	0% (0)
<b>Total number</b>	<b>23</b>

1. Only programs that used both program signals and geographic preferences answered this question.

## Appendix K

### Results for Pediatrics

## Survey Response Rate

**Table K.1. Survey Response Rate by Specialty (N = 200)**

Specialty	Percentage (n)
Pediatrics	40% (80)

## Past Experiences

**Table K.2. Did you use the meaningful and impactful experiences information during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Pediatrics	86% (69)	14% (11)	80

**Table K.3. For Pediatrics: The type of information provided by the most meaningful and impactful experiences responses was:**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Lacking important information</i>	11% (7)
<i>Just about right</i>	61% (37)
<i>Included extraneous information</i>	28% (17)
Total number	61

**Table K.4. For Pediatrics: How important is the most meaningful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
68	7% (5)	93% (63)	10% (6)	52% (33)	25% (16)	13% (8)	38% (24)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
68	28% (19)	72% (49)	41% (20)	41% (20)	14% (7)	4% (2)	18% (9)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
68	19% (13)	81% (55)	9% (5)	29% (16)	33% (18)	29% (16)	62% (34)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
68	37% (25)	63% (43)	40% (17)	37% (16)	16% (7)	7% (3)	23% (10)
<i>Other</i>							
23	83% (19)	17% (4)	50% (2)	0% (0)	25% (1)	25% (1)	50% (2)

**Table K.5. For Pediatrics: The most meaningful experiences responses helped me get a better picture of each applicant.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
66	3% (2)	97% (64)	6% (4)	9% (6)	13% (8)	63% (40)	9% (6)	72% (46)



**Table K.6. For Pediatrics: The most meaningful experiences provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
60	2% (1)	98% (59)	8% (5)	20% (12)	19% (11)	46% (27)	7% (4)	53% (31)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
60	2% (1)	98% (59)	8% (5)	14% (8)	27% (16)	39% (23)	12% (7)	51% (30)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
60	2% (1)	98% (59)	10% (6)	17% (10)	27% (16)	42% (25)	3% (2)	46% (27)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
60	2% (1)	98% (59)	8% (5)	14% (8)	17% (10)	49% (29)	12% (7)	61% (36)

**Table K.7. For Pediatrics: It was more efficient to use information from the most meaningful experiences than the information from the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
60	2% (1)	98% (59)	12% (7)	17% (10)	19% (11)	37% (22)	15% (9)	53% (31)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
60	2% (1)	98% (59)	10% (6)	22% (13)	25% (15)	36% (21)	7% (4)	42% (25)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
60	2% (1)	98% (59)	14% (8)	27% (16)	31% (18)	22% (13)	7% (4)	29% (17)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
59	2% (1)	98% (58)	14% (8)	21% (12)	31% (18)	24% (14)	10% (6)	34% (20)

**Table K.8. For Pediatrics: How important is the other impactful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
68	7% (5)	93% (63)	10% (6)	44% (28)	35% (22)	11% (7)	46% (29)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
68	26% (18)	74% (50)	36% (18)	48% (24)	12% (6)	4% (2)	16% (8)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
67	24% (16)	76% (51)	10% (5)	35% (18)	35% (18)	20% (10)	55% (28)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
68	28% (19)	72% (49)	33% (16)	47% (23)	16% (8)	4% (2)	20% (10)
<i>Other</i>							
22	82% (18)	18% (4)	25% (1)	0% (0)	50% (2)	25% (1)	75% (3)

**Table K.9. For Pediatrics: The other impactful experiences essay helped put the main ERAS application in context.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
66	5% (3)	95% (63)	5% (3)	8% (5)	22% (14)	56% (35)	10% (6)	65% (41)

**Table K.10. For Pediatrics: The other impactful experiences essay provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
60	2% (1)	98% (59)	3% (2)	7% (4)	24% (14)	53% (31)	14% (8)	66% (39)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
60	2% (1)	98% (59)	3% (2)	7% (4)	29% (17)	54% (32)	7% (4)	61% (36)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
60	2% (1)	98% (59)	5% (3)	14% (8)	27% (16)	49% (29)	5% (3)	54% (32)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
59	2% (1)	98% (58)	5% (3)	9% (5)	24% (14)	50% (29)	12% (7)	62% (36)

**Table K.11. For Pediatrics: Responses to the Experiences Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>The key characteristics helped me get a better picture of each applicant.</i>								
65	14% (9)	86% (56)	9% (5)	20% (11)	25% (14)	45% (25)	2% (1)	46% (26)
<i>The primary focus area helped me better understand applicant's alignment to my program's mission.</i>								
66	23% (15)	77% (51)	10% (5)	22% (11)	31% (16)	35% (18)	2% (1)	37% (19)

**Table K.12. For Pediatrics: It was more efficient to use the experience types, key characteristics, and primary focus areas to better understand applicant qualities than the information from the ...**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
60	17% (10)	83% (50)	18% (9)	26% (13)	26% (13)	26% (13)	4% (2)	30% (15)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
60	17% (10)	83% (50)	18% (9)	24% (12)	32% (16)	18% (9)	8% (4)	26% (13)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
60	17% (10)	83% (50)	16% (8)	24% (12)	32% (16)	26% (13)	2% (1)	28% (14)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
60	17% (10)	83% (50)	16% (8)	22% (11)	30% (15)	24% (12)	8% (4)	32% (16)

## Geographic Preferences

**Table K.13. Did you use geographic preference information during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Pediatrics	83% (59)	17% (12)	71

**Table K.14. For Pediatrics: Responses to Geographic Preferences Questions**

N	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>Geographic preference information helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
58	3% (2)	22% (13)	14% (8)	34% (20)	26% (15)	60% (35)
<i>My program's geographic division as designated by the U.S. Census accurately represents the location of my program.</i>						
58	12% (7)	16% (9)	17% (10)	43% (25)	12% (7)	55% (32)

**Table K.15. For Pediatrics: How important was the geographic preference information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Not Important % (n)	Somewhat Important % (n)	Important % (n)	Very Important % (n)	Important or Very Important % (n)
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
59	17% (10)	83% (49)	18% (9)	24% (12)	29% (14)	29% (14)	57% (28)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant that selected my region</i>							
59	42% (25)	58% (34)	47% (16)	32% (11)	9% (3)	12% (4)	21% (7)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
59	24% (14)	76% (45)	18% (8)	40% (18)	24% (11)	18% (8)	42% (19)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
59	8% (5)	92% (54)	2% (1)	37% (20)	43% (23)	19% (10)	61% (33)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
59	12% (7)	88% (52)	15% (8)	35% (18)	29% (15)	21% (11)	50% (26)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
59	39% (23)	61% (36)	28% (10)	33% (12)	28% (10)	11% (4)	39% (14)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
58	43% (25)	57% (33)	36% (12)	36% (12)	18% (6)	9% (3)	27% (9)
<i>Other</i>							
16	75% (12)	25% (4)	25% (1)	0% (0)	25% (1)	50% (2)	75% (3)

**Table K.16. For Pediatrics: In general, applicants who stated a preference for my region were more likely to accept interview invitations.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
57	2% (1)	4% (2)	46% (26)	39% (22)	11% (6)	49% (28)

**Table K.17. For Pediatrics: How did you interpret a “No geographic preference” response? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program’s region</i>	3% (2)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	3% (2)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	69% (40)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	53% (31)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	22% (13)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	22% (13)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	24% (14)
<i>Other</i>	0% (0)
<b>Total number</b>	<b>58<sup>1</sup></b>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table K.18. For Pediatrics: How did you interpret a blank geographic preference? (Select all that apply)**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program's region</i>	34% (20)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	17% (10)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	40% (23)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	29% (17)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	26% (15)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	33% (19)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	12% (7)
<i>Other</i>	0% (0)
Total number	58 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

### Program Signals

**Table K.19. Did you use program signals during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total (number)
Pediatrics	93% (65)	7% (5)	70



**Table K.20. For Pediatrics: How important were program signals at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
64	16% (10)	84% (54)	9% (5)	19% (10)	33% (18)	39% (21)	72% (39)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant who signaled my program</i>							
64	42% (27)	58% (37)	49% (18)	24% (9)	19% (7)	8% (3)	27% (10)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
64	25% (16)	75% (48)	8% (4)	25% (12)	38% (18)	29% (14)	67% (32)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
64	13% (8)	88% (56)	4% (2)	20% (11)	46% (26)	30% (17)	77% (43)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
64	19% (12)	81% (52)	12% (6)	27% (14)	31% (16)	31% (16)	62% (32)
<i>During the interview to learn more about why an applicant signaled my program</i>							
63	48% (30)	52% (33)	33% (11)	21% (7)	21% (7)	24% (8)	45% (15)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
63	51% (32)	49% (31)	32% (10)	32% (10)	23% (7)	13% (4)	35% (11)
<i>Other</i>							
19	79% (15)	21% (4)	25% (1)	25% (1)	25% (1)	25% (1)	50% (2)

**Table K.21. For Pediatrics: Responses to Program Signals Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>Program signals helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
64	11% (7)	5% (3)	5% (3)	47% (30)	33% (21)	80% (51)
<i>Based on a review of their application, applicants who signaled my program were better aligned than those who did not.</i>						
64	2% (1)	19% (12)	52% (33)	22% (14)	6% (4)	28% (18)
<i>Applicants who signaled my program were more likely to accept interview invitations.</i>						
64	0% (0)	0% (0)	27% (17)	50% (32)	23% (15)	73% (47)

**Table K.22. The number of signals available to applicants in my specialty was:**

<b>Specialty (Maximum Number of Signals)</b>	<b>Too Few % (n)</b>	<b>About Right % (n)</b>	<b>Too Many % (n)</b>	<b>Not Sure % (n)</b>	<b>Total number</b>
Pediatrics (5 signals)	3% (2)	64% (41)	6% (4)	27% (17)	64

**Table K.23. For Pediatrics: How did you interpret a blank value for the program signal? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	44% (28)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	13% (8)
<i>Applicant was afraid or unwilling to provide a response</i>	20% (13)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	48% (31)
<i>Treated the same as applicants who signaled my program</i>	16% (10)
<i>Other</i>	3% (2)
<b>Total number</b>	64 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table K.24. For Pediatrics: How did your program interpret program signals and geographic preferences?**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)<sup>1</sup></b>
<i>Considered geographic preference and program signals separately</i>	33% (18)
<i>Viewed applicants who reported a preference for my region <u>and</u> signaled my program more favorably</i>	15% (8)
<i>Gave more weight to program signals than geographic preference</i>	53% (29)
<i>Gave more weight to geographic preference than program signals</i>	0% (0)
Total number	55

1. Only programs that used both program signals and geographic preferences answered this question.

## Appendix L

### Results for Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation

## Survey Response Rate

**Table L.1. Survey Response Rate by Specialty (N = 95)**

Specialty	Percentage (n)
Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation	42% (40)

## Past Experiences

**Table L.2. Did you use the meaningful and impactful experiences information during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation	78% (31)	23% (9)	40

**Table L.3. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: The type of information provided by the most meaningful and impactful experiences responses was:**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Lacking important information</i>	14% (4)
<i>Just about right</i>	75% (21)
<i>Included extraneous information</i>	11% (3)
Total number	28

**Table L.4. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: How important is the most meaningful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
31	3% (1)	97% (30)	7% (2)	30% (9)	37% (11)	27% (8)	63% (19)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
31	19% (6)	81% (25)	28% (7)	40% (10)	20% (5)	12% (3)	32% (8)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
31	26% (8)	74% (23)	17% (4)	35% (8)	39% (9)	9% (2)	48% (11)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
31	42% (13)	58% (18)	17% (3)	50% (9)	22% (4)	11% (2)	33% (6)
<i>Other</i>							
13	69% (9)	31% (4)	0% (0)	25% (1)	50% (2)	25% (1)	75% (3)

**Table L.5. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: The most meaningful experiences responses helped me get a better picture of each applicant.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
30	7% (2)	93% (28)	0% (0)	4% (1)	25% (7)	50% (14)	21% (6)	71% (20)

**Table L.6. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: The most meaningful experiences provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
30	3% (1)	97% (29)	0% (0)	28% (8)	17% (5)	45% (13)	10% (3)	55% (16)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
30	3% (1)	97% (29)	3% (1)	14% (4)	14% (4)	59% (17)	10% (3)	69% (20)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
30	3% (1)	97% (29)	0% (0)	24% (7)	31% (9)	31% (9)	14% (4)	45% (13)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
30	3% (1)	97% (29)	7% (2)	10% (3)	21% (6)	45% (13)	17% (5)	62% (18)

**Table L.7. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: It was more efficient to use information from the most meaningful experiences than the information from the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
30	3% (1)	97% (29)	0% (0)	21% (6)	24% (7)	34% (10)	21% (6)	55% (16)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
30	3% (1)	97% (29)	0% (0)	28% (8)	34% (10)	28% (8)	10% (3)	38% (11)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
30	3% (1)	97% (29)	10% (3)	28% (8)	31% (9)	31% (9)	0% (0)	31% (9)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
30	3% (1)	97% (29)	14% (4)	31% (9)	31% (9)	17% (5)	7% (2)	24% (7)

**Table L.8. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: How important is the other impactful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
31	10% (3)	90% (28)	14% (4)	43% (12)	36% (10)	7% (2)	43% (12)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
31	35% (11)	65% (20)	35% (7)	55% (11)	10% (2)	0% (0)	10% (2)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
31	35% (11)	65% (20)	15% (3)	55% (11)	25% (5)	5% (1)	30% (6)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
31	52% (16)	48% (15)	27% (4)	53% (8)	13% (2)	7% (1)	20% (3)
<i>Other</i>							
16	69% (11)	31% (5)	20% (1)	0% (0)	80% (4)	0% (0)	80% (4)

**Table L.9. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: The other impactful experiences essay helped put the main ERAS application in context.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
30	7% (2)	93% (28)	0% (0)	7% (2)	39% (11)	32% (9)	21% (6)	54% (15)



**Table L.10. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: The other impactful experiences essay provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
30	10% (3)	90% (27)	0% (0)	11% (3)	22% (6)	52% (14)	15% (4)	67% (18)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
30	7% (2)	93% (28)	0% (0)	14% (4)	36% (10)	32% (9)	18% (5)	50% (14)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
30	7% (2)	93% (28)	11% (3)	18% (5)	29% (8)	36% (10)	7% (2)	43% (12)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
30	7% (2)	93% (28)	11% (3)	14% (4)	32% (9)	36% (10)	7% (2)	43% (12)

**Table L.11. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: Responses to the Experiences Questions**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagree % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>The key characteristics helped me get a better picture of each applicant.</i>								
30	17% (5)	83% (25)	0% (0)	24% (6)	40% (10)	32% (8)	4% (1)	36% (9)
<i>The primary focus area helped me better understand applicant's alignment to my program's mission.</i>								
30	17% (5)	83% (25)	0% (0)	20% (5)	56% (14)	20% (5)	4% (1)	24% (6)

**Table L.12. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: It was more efficient to use the experience types, key characteristics, and primary focus areas to better understand applicant qualities than the information from the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
30	13% (4)	87% (26)	0% (0)	31% (8)	42% (11)	23% (6)	4% (1)	27% (7)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
30	13% (4)	87% (26)	0% (0)	38% (10)	38% (10)	15% (4)	8% (2)	23% (6)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
30	13% (4)	87% (26)	8% (2)	42% (11)	27% (7)	19% (5)	4% (1)	23% (6)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
30	13% (4)	87% (26)	8% (2)	38% (10)	31% (8)	19% (5)	4% (1)	23% (6)

## Geographic Preferences

**Table L.13. Did you use geographic preference information during the application review process?**

<b>Specialty</b>	<b>Yes % (n)</b>	<b>No % (n)</b>	<b>Total number</b>
Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation	77% (30)	23% (9)	39

**Table L.14. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: Responses to Geographic Preferences Questions**

N	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>Geographic preference information helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
30	3% (1)	27% (8)	13% (4)	53% (16)	3% (1)	57% (17)
<i>My program's geographic division as designated by the U.S. Census accurately represents the location of my program.</i>						
30	7% (2)	3% (1)	20% (6)	50% (15)	20% (6)	70% (21)

**Table L.15. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: How important was the geographic preference information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Not Important % (n)	Somewhat Important % (n)	Important % (n)	Very Important % (n)	Important or Very Important % (n)
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
29	21% (6)	79% (23)	4% (1)	43% (10)	22% (5)	30% (7)	52% (12)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant that selected my region</i>							
30	60% (18)	40% (12)	33% (4)	50% (6)	17% (2)	0% (0)	17% (2)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
30	37% (11)	63% (19)	16% (3)	47% (9)	16% (3)	21% (4)	37% (7)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
30	3% (1)	97% (29)	7% (2)	55% (16)	17% (5)	21% (6)	38% (11)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
30	7% (2)	93% (28)	11% (3)	32% (9)	46% (13)	11% (3)	57% (16)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
29	38% (11)	62% (18)	39% (7)	39% (7)	22% (4)	0% (0)	22% (4)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
30	33% (10)	67% (20)	15% (3)	60% (12)	20% (4)	5% (1)	25% (5)
<i>Other</i>							
11	55% (6)	45% (5)	40% (2)	20% (1)	20% (1)	20% (1)	40% (2)

**Table L.16. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: In general, applicants who stated a preference for my region were more likely to accept interview invitations.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
30	7% (2)	10% (3)	33% (10)	33% (10)	17% (5)	50% (15)

**Table L.17. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: How did you interpret a “No geographic preference” response? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program’s region</i>	27% (8)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	0% (0)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	80% (24)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	47% (14)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	33% (10)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	20% (6)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	17% (5)
<i>Other</i>	3% (1)
<b>Total number</b>	<b>30<sup>1</sup></b>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table L.18. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: How did you interpret a blank geographic preference? (Select all that apply)**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program's region</i>	47% (14)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	13% (4)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	50% (15)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	30% (9)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	47% (14)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	20% (6)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	10% (3)
<i>Other</i>	3% (1)
Total number	30 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

## Program Signals

**Table L.19. Did you use program signals during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total % (n)
Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation	95% (37)	5% (2)	100% (39)

**Table L.20. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: How important were program signals at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
37	11% (4)	89% (33)	12% (4)	27% (9)	12% (4)	48% (16)	61% (20)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant who signaled my program</i>							
37	46% (17)	54% (20)	45% (9)	20% (4)	20% (4)	15% (3)	35% (7)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
37	32% (12)	68% (25)	12% (3)	24% (6)	32% (8)	32% (8)	64% (16)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
37	14% (5)	86% (32)	6% (2)	25% (8)	31% (10)	38% (12)	69% (22)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
37	14% (5)	86% (32)	9% (3)	22% (7)	19% (6)	50% (16)	69% (22)
<i>During the interview to learn more about why an applicant signaled my program</i>							
37	35% (13)	65% (24)	21% (5)	33% (8)	29% (7)	17% (4)	46% (11)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
36	39% (14)	61% (22)	23% (5)	32% (7)	18% (4)	27% (6)	45% (10)
<i>Other</i>							
19	42% (8)	58% (11)	18% (2)	45% (5)	18% (2)	18% (2)	36% (4)

**Table L.21. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: Responses to Program Signals Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>Program signals helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
37	5% (2)	8% (3)	19% (7)	35% (13)	32% (12)	68% (25)
<i>Based on a review of their application, applicants who signaled my program were better aligned than those who did not.</i>						
37	8% (3)	16% (6)	51% (19)	16% (6)	8% (3)	24% (9)
<i>Applicants who signaled my program were more likely to accept interview invitations.</i>						
37	11% (4)	5% (2)	27% (10)	27% (10)	30% (11)	57% (21)

**Table L.22. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: The number of signals available to applicants in my specialty was:**

<b>Specialty (Maximum Number of Signals)</b>	<b>Too Few % (n)</b>	<b>About Right % (n)</b>	<b>Too Many % (n)</b>	<b>Not Sure % (n)</b>	<b>Total number</b>
Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation (4 signals)	19% (7)	65% (24)	0% (0)	16% (6)	37

**Table L.23. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: How did you interpret a blank value for the program signal? (Select all that apply)**

Choice	% (n)
Applicant was less interested in my program	43% (16)
Applicant was willing to go anywhere	19% (7)
Applicant was afraid or unwilling to provide a response	16% (6)
Did not draw any conclusions	43% (16)
Treated the same as applicants who signaled my program	16% (6)
Other	5% (2)
Total number	37 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table L.24. For Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation: How did your program interpret program signals and geographic preferences?**

Choice	Percentage (n) <sup>1</sup>
<i>Considered geographic preference and program signals separately</i>	23% (7)
<i>Viewed applicants who reported a preference for my region <u>and</u> signaled my program more favorably</i>	13% (4)
<i>Gave more weight to program signals than geographic preference</i>	60% (18)
<i>Gave more weight to geographic preference than program signals</i>	3% (1)
Total number	30

1. Only programs that used both program signals and geographic preferences answered this question.



## Appendix M

### Results for Psychiatry

## Survey Response Rate

**Table M.1. Survey Response Rate by Specialty (N = 255)**

Specialty	Percentage (n)
Psychiatry	37% (95)

## Past Experiences

**Table M.2. Did you use the meaningful and impactful experiences information during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Psychiatry	77% (73)	23% (22)	95

**Table M.3. For Psychiatry: The type of information provided by the most meaningful and impactful experiences responses was:**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Lacking important information</i>	13% (8)
<i>Just about right</i>	73% (44)
<i>Included extraneous information</i>	13% (8)
Total number	60

**Table M.4. For Psychiatry: How important is the most meaningful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
73	10% (7)	90% (66)	3% (2)	47% (31)	39% (26)	11% (7)	50% (33)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
72	19% (14)	81% (58)	31% (18)	50% (29)	19% (11)	0% (0)	19% (11)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
72	11% (8)	89% (64)	11% (7)	42% (27)	33% (21)	14% (9)	47% (30)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
70	24% (17)	76% (53)	32% (17)	51% (27)	17% (9)	0% (0)	17% (9)
<i>Other</i>							
25	84% (21)	16% (4)	25% (1)	0% (0)	50% (2)	25% (1)	75% (3)

**Table M.5. For Psychiatry: The most meaningful experiences responses helped me get a better picture of each applicant.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
70	3% (2)	97% (68)	6% (4)	9% (6)	15% (10)	62% (42)	9% (6)	71% (48)

**Table M.6. For Psychiatry: The most meaningful experiences provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
66	2% (1)	98% (65)	6% (4)	14% (9)	25% (16)	46% (30)	9% (6)	55% (36)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
66	3% (2)	97% (64)	5% (3)	17% (11)	22% (14)	42% (27)	14% (9)	56% (36)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
66	3% (2)	97% (64)	5% (3)	19% (12)	28% (18)	42% (27)	6% (4)	48% (31)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
66	3% (2)	97% (64)	5% (3)	17% (11)	19% (12)	42% (27)	17% (11)	59% (38)

**Table M.7. For Psychiatry: It was more efficient to use information from the most meaningful experiences than the information from the ...**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
65	2% (1)	98% (64)	8% (5)	22% (14)	22% (14)	41% (26)	8% (5)	48% (31)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
65	3% (2)	97% (63)	13% (8)	27% (17)	25% (16)	25% (16)	10% (6)	35% (22)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
65	3% (2)	97% (63)	17% (11)	29% (18)	37% (23)	14% (9)	3% (2)	17% (11)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
65	5% (3)	95% (62)	15% (9)	23% (14)	21% (13)	31% (19)	11% (7)	42% (26)

**Table M.8. For Psychiatry: How important is the other impactful experiences information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As part of a holistic application review to decide whom to interview</i>							
72	15% (11)	85% (61)	13% (8)	48% (29)	34% (21)	5% (3)	39% (24)
<i>As a tie breaker in deciding who to interview</i>							
71	28% (20)	72% (51)	37% (19)	47% (24)	16% (8)	0% (0)	16% (8)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
71	23% (16)	77% (55)	11% (6)	49% (27)	31% (17)	9% (5)	40% (22)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
70	34% (24)	66% (46)	39% (18)	37% (17)	24% (11)	0% (0)	24% (11)
<i>Other</i>							
23	83% (19)	17% (4)	25% (1)	50% (2)	25% (1)	0% (0)	25% (1)

**Table M.9. For Psychiatry: The other impactful experiences essay helped put the main ERAS application in context.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
69	1% (1)	99% (68)	3% (2)	6% (4)	26% (18)	57% (39)	7% (5)	65% (44)

**Table M.10. For Psychiatry: The other impactful experiences essay provided valuable information beyond what is provided in the ...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
64	3% (2)	97% (62)	5% (3)	16% (10)	23% (14)	47% (29)	10% (6)	56% (35)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
64	5% (3)	95% (61)	5% (3)	15% (9)	23% (14)	41% (25)	16% (10)	57% (35)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
64	5% (3)	95% (61)	7% (4)	15% (9)	36% (22)	34% (21)	8% (5)	43% (26)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
64	5% (3)	95% (61)	5% (3)	11% (7)	28% (17)	36% (22)	20% (12)	56% (34)

**Table M.11. For Psychiatry: Responses to the Experiences Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>The key characteristics helped me get a better picture of each applicant.</i>								
70	13% (9)	87% (61)	11% (7)	8% (5)	36% (22)	43% (26)	2% (1)	44% (27)
<i>The primary focus area helped me better understand applicant's alignment to my program's mission.</i>								
68	13% (9)	87% (59)	12% (7)	14% (8)	37% (22)	34% (20)	3% (2)	37% (22)

**Table M.12. For Psychiatry: It was more efficient to use the experience types, key characteristics, and primary focus areas to better understand applicant qualities than the information from the...**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>existing experiences section of the MyERAS application.</i>								
64	8% (5)	92% (59)	14% (8)	29% (17)	29% (17)	22% (13)	7% (4)	29% (17)
<i>Noteworthy Characteristics section of the MSPE.</i>								
64	8% (5)	92% (59)	14% (8)	37% (22)	27% (16)	19% (11)	3% (2)	22% (13)
<i>personal statement.</i>								
64	8% (5)	92% (59)	12% (7)	41% (24)	29% (17)	15% (9)	3% (2)	19% (11)
<i>letters of recommendation or standardized letter of evaluation.</i>								
64	8% (5)	92% (59)	12% (7)	37% (22)	25% (15)	19% (11)	7% (4)	25% (15)

## Geographic Preferences

**Table M.13. Did you use geographic preference information during the application review process?**

<b>Specialty</b>	<b>Yes % (n)</b>	<b>No % (n)</b>	<b>Total % (n)</b>
Psychiatry	92% (78)	8% (7)	100% (85)

**Table M.14. For Psychiatry: Responses to Geographic Preferences Questions**

N	Strongly Disagreed % (n)	Disagreed % (n)	Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)	Agreed % (n)	Strongly Agreed % (n)	Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)
<i>Geographic preference information helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
77	8% (6)	8% (6)	19% (15)	43% (33)	22% (17)	65% (50)
<i>My program's geographic division as designated by the U.S. Census accurately represents the location of my program.</i>						
77	6% (5)	13% (10)	14% (11)	45% (35)	21% (16)	66% (51)

**Table M.15. For Psychiatry: How important was the geographic preference information at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

N	Did Not Use % (n)	Used % (n)	Not Important % (n)	Somewhat Important % (n)	Important % (n)	Very Important % (n)	Important or Very Important % (n)
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
78	15% (12)	85% (66)	6% (4)	30% (20)	32% (21)	32% (21)	64% (42)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant that selected my region</i>							
78	41% (32)	59% (46)	54% (25)	24% (11)	11% (5)	11% (5)	22% (10)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
76	25% (19)	75% (57)	18% (10)	40% (23)	18% (10)	25% (14)	42% (24)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
78	8% (6)	92% (72)	6% (4)	39% (28)	25% (18)	31% (22)	56% (40)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
77	14% (11)	86% (66)	17% (11)	29% (19)	32% (21)	23% (15)	55% (36)
<i>To prepare for the interview</i>							
77	29% (22)	71% (55)	33% (18)	33% (18)	29% (16)	5% (3)	35% (19)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
76	30% (23)	70% (53)	40% (21)	38% (20)	17% (9)	6% (3)	23% (12)
<i>Other</i>							
20	80% (16)	20% (4)	25% (1)	0% (0)	50% (2)	25% (1)	75% (3)



**Table M.16. For Psychiatry: In general, applicants who stated a preference for my region were more likely to accept interview invitations.**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
77	3% (2)	6% (5)	35% (27)	43% (33)	13% (10)	56% (43)

**Table M.17. For Psychiatry: How did you interpret a “No geographic preference” response? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program’s region</i>	8% (6)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	5% (4)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	81% (63)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	42% (33)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	17% (13)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	19% (15)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	15% (12)
<i>Other</i>	3% (2)
<b>Total number</b>	<b>78<sup>1</sup></b>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table M.18. For Psychiatry: How did you interpret a blank geographic preference? (Select all that apply)**

Choice	Percentage (n)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program's region</i>	36% (28)
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	17% (13)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	46% (36)
<i>Applicant was more interested in factors other than in geography</i>	32% (25)
<i>Applicant was hesitant or unwilling to provide a response</i>	22% (17)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	29% (23)
<i>Treated applicant with blank geographic preference the same applicants who preferred my region</i>	9% (7)
<i>Other</i>	3% (2)
Total number	78 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

## Program Signals

**Table M.19. Did you use program signals during the application review process?**

Specialty	Yes % (n)	No % (n)	Total number
Psychiatry	93% (79)	7% (6)	85

**Table M.20. For Psychiatry: How important were program signals at each of the following stages of the application review process?**

<b>N</b>	<b>Did Not Use % (n)</b>	<b>Used % (n)</b>	<b>Not Important % (n)</b>	<b>Somewhat Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important % (n)</b>	<b>Very Important % (n)</b>	<b>Important or Very Important % (n)</b>
<i>As a screening tool, before a more thorough application review</i>							
79	11% (9)	89% (70)	4% (3)	16% (11)	24% (17)	56% (39)	80% (56)
<i>Sending interview invitations to every applicant who signaled my program</i>							
79	33% (26)	67% (53)	30% (16)	36% (19)	25% (13)	9% (5)	34% (18)
<i>Including in a composite filter to conduct holistic review</i>							
77	18% (14)	82% (63)	8% (5)	24% (15)	32% (20)	37% (23)	68% (43)
<i>As part of a holistic process to help decide who to interview</i>							
79	8% (6)	92% (73)	4% (3)	26% (19)	34% (25)	36% (26)	70% (51)
<i>As a tie breaker when deciding who to interview</i>							
79	14% (11)	86% (68)	16% (11)	19% (13)	34% (23)	31% (21)	65% (44)
<i>During the interview to learn more about why an applicant signaled my program</i>							
78	33% (26)	67% (52)	19% (10)	35% (18)	27% (14)	19% (10)	46% (24)
<i>Plan to use during ROL discussion</i>							
78	38% (30)	62% (48)	35% (17)	33% (16)	19% (9)	13% (6)	31% (15)
<i>Other</i>							
19	74% (14)	26% (5)	0% (0)	60% (3)	40% (2)	0% (0)	40% (2)

**Table M.21. For Psychiatry: Responses to Program Signals Questions**

<b>N</b>	<b>Strongly Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Neither Agreed nor Disagreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>	<b>Agreed or Strongly Agreed % (n)</b>
<i>Program signals helped me identify applicants whom I would have otherwise overlooked.</i>						
79	1% (1)	5% (4)	15% (12)	37% (29)	42% (33)	78% (62)
<i>Based on a review of their application, applicants who signaled my program were better aligned than those who did not.</i>						
78	1% (1)	18% (14)	49% (38)	27% (21)	5% (4)	32% (25)
<i>Applicants who signaled my program were more likely to accept interview invitations.</i>						
79	5% (4)	8% (6)	30% (24)	35% (28)	22% (17)	57% (45)

**Table M.22. The number of signals available to applicants in my specialty was:**

<b>Specialty (Maximum Number of Signals)</b>	<b>Too Few % (n)</b>	<b>About Right % (n)</b>	<b>Too Many % (n)</b>	<b>Not Sure % (n)</b>	<b>Total number</b>
Psychiatry (5 signals)	21% (16)	56% (44)	1% (1)	22% (17)	78

**Table M.23. For Psychiatry: How did you interpret a blank value for the program signal? (Select all that apply)**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)</b>
<i>Applicant was less interested in my program</i>	62% (49)
<i>Applicant was willing to go anywhere</i>	14% (11)
<i>Applicant was afraid or unwilling to provide a response</i>	9% (7)
<i>Did not draw any conclusions</i>	30% (24)
<i>Treated the same as applicants who signaled my program</i>	15% (12)
<i>Other</i>	1% (1)
<b>Total number</b>	79 <sup>1</sup>

1. Number of unique respondents who selected at least one choice on this question.

**Table M.24. For Psychiatry: How did your program interpret program signals and geographic preferences?**

<b>Choice</b>	<b>Percentage (n)<sup>1</sup></b>
<i>Considered geographic preference and program signals separately</i>	19% (14)
<i>Viewed applicants who reported a preference for my region <u>and</u> signaled my program more favorably</i>	27% (20)
<i>Gave more weight to program signals than geographic preference</i>	50% (37)
<i>Gave more weight to geographic preference than program signals</i>	4% (3)
Total number	74

1. Only programs that used both program signals and geographic preferences answered this question.