

Poster 27: Validation of a Novel Scoring Rubric Utilizing the Holistic Experience-Attributes-Metrics Model to Screen Gynecologic Oncology Subspecialty Fellowship Applicants For Interview

Presenting Author: Kayla Menendez, MD, University of Colorado

Topic

Quality & Healthcare Systems

Objectives

Historically, candidates for Gynecologic Oncology fellowship were evaluated using individualized interpretations of candidates' qualifications. The AAMC Experience-Attributes-Metrics (E-A-M) Model for Holistic Review encourages a more comprehensive view. This framework prioritizes applicants' distance traveled, leadership, values and beliefs while minimizing test and academic scores, which have been shown to disadvantage underrepresented minorities in medicine (URM) applicants. There is no scoring rubric that incorporates these principles for reviewing graduate medical education candidates. We seek to create a rubric that improves screening for applications and augments the interview process by creating a holistically informed rank list.

Methods

We developed a rubric based on the E-A-M framework built within RedCap that tabulates a score out of 100 for each Gynecologic Oncology candidate. This rubric was used in 2023 and 2024 matching 1-2 fellows per year. Time needed to review each application was assessed. The proportion of URM applications reviewed to interviews offered and matched was evaluated pre-rubric in 2022 and post-rubric in 2023 and 2024.

Results

In 2023, the rubric was applied to all applications ($n = 81$) by reviewer A and 8 randomly selected applications by reviewer B. In 2024, the rubric was applied to all applications ($n = 91$) by reviewer A and 46 applications by reviewer B. Reviewer A's median total scores were 55 (26-74) in 2023 and 42 (23-75.5) in 2024. Reviewer B's median total scores were 55 (31-73) in 2023 and 35 (21.2-55) in 2024. There were 8 matched reviews in 2023 and 46 in 2024. The interclass correlation for total scores between the two reviewers was 0.79; $p < 0.001$. The coefficient of variation in reviewer A's and B's scores was 19% in 2023 ($SD=10.6$) and 23% in 2024 ($SD=9.3$). The proportion of URM candidates interviewed improved from 22% (8/36) pre-rubric to 28% (8.25/30) post-rubric. URM candidates matched improved from 0 pre-rubric to 4/6 (66%) post-rubric. The average time to complete a rubric score was 15 minutes in 2023 and 13 minutes in 2024.

Conclusions

There was minimal to moderate variability between reviewer A and B, suggesting inconsistency between scores that was addressed by rubric revisions. After implementing the rubric, a larger proportion of URM applicants were offered interviews and matched.

Uploaded File(s)

Abstract Table or Graph

[NWNUUGRI-2090638-1-ANY\(1\).pdf](#)