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Introduction

In March 2022, the National Resident Matching Program (NRMP) conducted its survey of directors of all programs participating in the Main Residency Match®. The Program Director Survey has historically been a biennial survey conducted by the NRMP in even years (e.g., 2018, 2020) with the primary purpose of characterizing the factors that Program Directors use to (1) select applicants to interview, and (2) rank applicants for the Main Residency Match. However, because of the unprecedented circumstances resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic and the consequent move to virtual recruitment and interviewing for July 2021 residency appointments, the NRMP decided to administer the Program Director Survey in 2021, in part to characterize programs’ experiences with virtual recruitment.

With the continuation of the pandemic, which resulted in a second year of virtual recruitment and interviewing for July 2022 residency appointments, the NRMP deemed it important to obtain an additional year of data concerning the virtual recruitment experience. In addition, this year’s survey solicited information on programs’ practices related to holistic review of applicants, reflecting the increasing role and importance of holistic review in residency recruitment.

The survey was issued to program directors who certified a rank order list as part of the 2022 Main Residency Match. It was fielded during the 11 days between the Rank Order List Certification Deadline and the start of Match Week to prevent match outcomes from influencing respondents' answers. The 2022 survey included the items from the 2021 questionnaire related to the virtual recruitment process, as well as new items related to holistic review.

Survey:
The 2022 Program Director Survey solicited information on:

- **Interview and Ranking Activities**
  - Number of applications received, screened, and reviewed, as well as the number of applicants interviewed and ranked; the frequency with which programs interviewed and ranked specific applicant groups; and the use of test scores in considering which applicants to interview.

- **Virtual Recruitment**
  - Approaches used to engage and communicate with potential applicants, potential challenges posed by the virtual environment, and whether programs anticipated conducting part or all of the application or selection processes virtually in the future.

- **Programs' Practices related to Holistic Review**
  - Models, including the AAMC's Experiences, Attributes, Competencies, and academic or scholarly Metrics, used as frameworks for review; primary reasons for engaging in holistic review; and components considered in programs' holistic review processes, and the importance of those components.
General findings concerning the virtual recruitment experience of programs, including selected, year-over-year (2022 versus 2021) comparisons, for all specialties combined, have been published to the NRMP website in a Research Brief. Herein we expand on the 2022 findings by providing selected specialty-specific results.

As in 2021, some items from prior administrations of the Program Director Survey were deleted for the 2022 administration in order to allow for robust questioning about the virtual experience and holistic review while minimizing respondent burden. Deleted items included questions about:

- Specific target scores on USMLE Step 1 and Step 2 CK exams below which programs generally did not grant interviews and above which they almost always granted interviews;
- Whether programs offered more invitations than interview slots and reasons for that practice;
- Time allowed for applicants to respond to interview invitations;
- Preferred modes of communication with and about applicants during Supplemental Offer and Acceptance Program (SOAP) rounds;
- Factors considered in decisions about which applicants to interview and to rank, and ratings of the importance of each factor; and
- Importance of factors such as professionalism, quality of patient care, clinical competency, and ethics in assessing residents’ success during residency.

Future iterations of the survey will re-introduce questions about interview and ranking behaviors and assessment of applicant success in residency.
The overall response rate for all specialties combined was 33.1 percent (n=1,507). Specialty-specific response rates for Transitional Year programs and programs in the 22 specialties where 10 or more responses were submitted are presented in the table below. The “All Others” category combines into a single group 20 specialties, including 16 combined programs (e.g., Emergency Medicine/Anesthesiology, Pediatrics/Psychiatry/Child Psychiatry), that submitted fewer than 10 responses. The “All Others” category was only used in analyses for all specialties combined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Surveys Sent</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anesthesiology</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Neurology</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatology</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medicine</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Medicine</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Medicine</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Medicine-Pediatrics</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventional Radiology</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurological Surgery</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurology</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstetrics and Gynecology</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopaedic Surgery</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otolaryngology</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathology-Anatomic and Clinical</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatrics</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic Surgery (Integrated)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation Oncology</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiology-Diagnostic</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgery-General</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Year</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vascular Surgery</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4556</strong></td>
<td><strong>1507</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers of responses are presented in most of the graphs. For those graphs reflecting data from multiple survey questions, the largest available N from among the survey questions is listed. Numbers of applicants ranked and positions in the Match are self-reported by respondents.

This report presents results on selected items for all specialties combined and separately for each specialty identified in the table. The NRMP hopes that applicants, program directors, and medical school officials and faculty advisors find these data useful as they prepare for and participate in the Main Residency Match.

The NRMP's data reporting and research activities are guided by its Data Release and Research Committee. NRMP data and reports can be found at: [https://www.nrmp.org/match-data-analytics/](https://www.nrmp.org/match-data-analytics/).
All Specialties Combined
Total N = 1,507
Figure PD_1
All Specialties
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 1,280)

Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quota</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications received</td>
<td>1,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications rejected based on standardized screen</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications receiving holistic review</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview invitations sent</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants interviewed</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants ranked</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure PD_2
All Specialties
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 1,206)

Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications
- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review
Figure PD_3
All Specialties
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021
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Figure PD_4
All Specialties
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities

Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

Interviewing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
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**Figure PD_5**

All Specialties
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

**Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022**

1. Seniors and graduates are considered together.
2. Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
3. Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
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Figure PD_6
All Specialties
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

US DO Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exams</th>
<th>Do not consider</th>
<th>Require pass only</th>
<th>Prefer but do not require target score</th>
<th>Require target score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 1</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 (CK)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 3</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 1</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 2 (CE)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 3</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 1,095

¹DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25% or fewer</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 1,230

Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheduling Format</th>
<th>Number of Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERAS Interview Scheduler</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalamus Interview Management Solution</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Broker</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal process developed for and by my program</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 1,243
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Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022¹

Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy

Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_9
All Specialties
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

- Program Website: 4%
- Social Media: 17%
- FREIDA or other online databases: 5%
- Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs: 17%
- Virtual away rotations: 14%
- Other virtual events with applicants: 16%

N= 1,223
Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- Yes: 63%
- No: 7%
- Do Not Know: 30%

N= 1,176

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- Non-clinical "first-look" opportunities: 48%
- Interview itself: 80%
- Second visits: 12%
- I don’t know yet: 23%

N= 746
### Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022¹

**Virtual Recruitment Circumstance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage/Disadvantage</th>
<th>Mod/Sig Disadv</th>
<th>Slight Disadv</th>
<th>Neither Adv Nor Disadv</th>
<th>Slight Advantage</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating new web-based info materials about program</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More applications to cull through</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer applications to cull through</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to train staff to use online mtg software</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech issues during interviews</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring confidentiality of interviews</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant competency</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant interpersonal skills, alignment with interview team</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of whether program showcased adequately</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer cancelled interviews</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More efficiency of interview process</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More flexibility for interview dates</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

**N= 1,159**
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Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022¹

- **Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review**
  - Yes: 24%
  - No: 76%
  - N= 1,151

- **Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications**
  - Slightly: 1%
  - Moderately: 11%
  - Considerably: 33%
  - A great deal: 35%
  - Not at all: 21%
  - N= 272

- **Reliance on another holistic review model**
  - Yes: 33%
  - No: 67%
  - N= 868

- **Source of non-EACM holistic review model**
  - Specialty designed one: 2%
  - Institution designed one: 6%
  - Program created one on its own: 92%
  - N= 287

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors in Holistic Review and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Anesthesiology
Total N = 65
Figure PD_AN-1
Anesthesiology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 54)

Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022

- Quota: 13
- Applications received: 1,293
- Applications rejected based on standardized: 469
- Applications receiving holistic review: 715
- Interview invitations sent: 171
- Applicants interviewed: 157
- Applicants ranked: 146
Figure PD_AN-2
Anesthesiology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 49)

Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications
- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review
Anesthesiology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021
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Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

### Interviewing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 54

### Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 54

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_AN-5
Anesthesiology
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

US MD Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USMLE Step 1</th>
<th>USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)</th>
<th>USMLE Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Consider</td>
<td>Require pass only</td>
<td>Prefer but do not require target score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMG Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USMLE Step 1</th>
<th>USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)</th>
<th>USMLE Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Consider</td>
<td>Require pass only</td>
<td>Prefer but do not require target score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_AN-6
Anesthesiology
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

US DO Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Do not consider</th>
<th>Require pass only</th>
<th>Prefer but do not require target score</th>
<th>Require target score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 (CK)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 3</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 1</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 2 (CE)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 3</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

**Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually**

- 25% or fewer: 0%
- 26-50%: 0%
- 51-75%: 0%
- 76-99%: 6%
- 100%: 94%

N = 53

**Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format**

- ERAS Interview Scheduler: 42%
- Thalamus Interview Management Solution: 43%
- 0%
- Internal process developed for and by my program: 11%
- Other: 4%

N = 53

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_AN-8
Anesthesiology
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022¹

Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Significant Reliance</th>
<th>Moderate Reliance</th>
<th>Modest Reliance</th>
<th>No Reliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Significantly Beneficial</th>
<th>Moderately Beneficial</th>
<th>Somewhat Beneficial</th>
<th>Not Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

- Program Website: 11%
- Social Media: 22%
- FREIDA or other online databases: 6%
- Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs: 14%
- Virtual away rotations: 11%
- Other virtual events with applicants: 12%

N= 54
Figure PD_AN-10
Anesthesiology
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- Yes: 72%
- No: 0%
- Do Not Know: 28%

N= 53

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- Non-clinical “first-look” opportunities: 58%
- Interview itself: 84%
- Second visits: 18%
- I don’t know yet: 29%

N= 38
**Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022¹**

**Virtual Recruitment Circumstance**

- Creating new web-based info materials about program: 6% Mod/Sig Disadv, 15% Slight Disadv, 37% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 13% Slight Advantage, 25% Mod/Sig Adv, 4% N/A
- More applications to cull through: 26% Mod/Sig Disadv, 26% Slight Disadv, 23% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 13% Slight Advantage, 6% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- Fewer applications to cull through: 24% Mod/Sig Disadv, 2% Slight Disadv, 75% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 4% Slight Advantage, 4% Mod/Sig Adv, 11% N/A
- Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform: 8% Mod/Sig Disadv, 11% Slight Disadv, 62% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 4% Slight Advantage, 4% Mod/Sig Adv, 11% N/A
- Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary: 9% Mod/Sig Disadv, 17% Slight Disadv, 53% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 6% Slight Advantage, 8% Mod/Sig Adv, 8% N/A
- Time to train staff to use online mtg software: 13% Mod/Sig Disadv, 19% Slight Disadv, 51% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 6% Slight Advantage, 2% Mod/Sig Adv, 9% N/A
- Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute: 6% Mod/Sig Disadv, 21% Slight Disadv, 40% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 9% Slight Advantage, 11% Mod/Sig Adv, 13% N/A
- Tech issues during interviews: 4% Mod/Sig Disadv, 11% Slight Disadv, 51% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 42% Slight Advantage, 15% Mod/Sig Adv, 4% N/A
- Ensuring confidentiality of interviews: 11% Mod/Sig Disadv, 23% Slight Disadv, 51% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 43% Slight Advantage, 6% Mod/Sig Adv, 4% N/A
- Assessment of applicant competency: 17% Mod/Sig Disadv, 25% Slight Disadv, 26% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 43% Slight Advantage, 4% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program: 9% Mod/Sig Disadv, 26% Slight Disadv, 38% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 42% Slight Advantage, 23% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- Assessment of whether program showcased adequately: 4% Mod/Sig Disadv, 11% Slight Disadv, 25% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 55% Slight Advantage, 23% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses: 8% Mod/Sig Disadv, 29% Slight Disadv, 25% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 29% Slight Advantage, 27% Mod/Sig Adv, 8% N/A
- Fewer cancelled interviews: 7% Mod/Sig Disadv, 26% Slight Disadv, 28% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 38% Slight Advantage, 32% Mod/Sig Adv, 8% N/A
- More efficiency of interview process: 2% Mod/Sig Disadv, 29% Slight Disadv, 30% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 30% Slight Advantage, 34% Mod/Sig Adv, 8% N/A
- More flexibility for interview dates: 6% Mod/Sig Disadv, 42% Slight Disadv, 50% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 6% Slight Advantage, 4% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.: 6% Mod/Sig Disadv, 15% Slight Disadv, 30% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 13% Slight Advantage, 9% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.: 15% Mod/Sig Disadv, 29% Slight Disadv, 25% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 44% Slight Advantage, 19% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process: 15% Mod/Sig Disadv, 29% Slight Disadv, 30% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 25% Slight Advantage, 44% Mod/Sig Adv, 2% N/A
- Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants: 15% Mod/Sig Disadv, 29% Slight Disadv, 25% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 44% Slight Advantage, 19% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022¹

- **Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review**
  - Yes: 72%
  - No: 28%
  - N= 50

- **Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications**
  - Slightly: 21%
  - Moderately: 36%
  - Considerably: 36%
  - A great deal: 7%
  - Not at all: 21%
  - N= 14

- **Reliance on another holistic review model**
  - Yes: 50%
  - No: 50%
  - N= 36

- **Source of non-EACM holistic review model**
  - 100%
  - N= 18

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

- Increase resident diversity: 75%
- Identify promising applicants: 78%
- Improve applicant program alignment: 67%
- Support institution mission better: 67%
- Other factor(s): 16%

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating\(^1\) of Said Factors, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant personal attributes</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant interests</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant interpersonal skills, ethics, and</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant personal experiences</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant geographic preferences</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other component or components</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Child Neurology
Total N = 26
Figure PD_CN-1

Child Neurology

Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities

(Total N = 20)

Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 19)

Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications
- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review
Figure PD_CN-3
Child Neurology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021
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Figure PD_CN-4
Child Neurology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities

Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

Interviewing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_CN-5
Child Neurology
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

US MD Applicants

IMG Applicants

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

US DO Applicants

- USMLE Step 1: 6% Do not consider, 38% Require pass only, 56% Prefer but do not require target score, 0% Require target score
- USMLE Step 2 (CK): 6% Do not consider, 19% Require pass only, 75% Prefer but do not require target score, 0% Require target score
- USMLE Step 3: 0% Do not consider, 13% Require pass only, 40% Prefer but do not require target score, 0% Require target score
- COMLEX-USA Level 1: 19% Do not consider, 44% Require pass only, 25% Prefer but do not require target score, 13% Require target score
- COMLEX-USA Level 2 (CE): 19% Do not consider, 31% Require pass only, 38% Prefer but do not require target score, 13% Require target score
- COMLEX-USA Level 3: 44% Do not consider, 25% Require pass only, 31% Prefer but do not require target score, 0% Require target score

¹DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they “seldom” or “often” consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_CN-7
Child Neurology
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually

- 0% for 25% or fewer
- 0% for 26-50%
- 0% for 51-75%
- 0% for 76-99%
- 100% for 100%

Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format

- ERAS Interview Scheduler: 53%
- Thalamus Interview Management Solution: 21%
- Interview Broker: 5%
- Internal process developed for and by my program: 21%
- Other: 0%

N= 19

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022¹

### Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>No Reliance</th>
<th>Modest Reliance</th>
<th>Moderate Reliance</th>
<th>Significant Reliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual &quot;Open Houses&quot; or residency fairs</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Not Beneficial</th>
<th>Somewhat Beneficial</th>
<th>Moderately Beneficial</th>
<th>Significantly Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual &quot;Open Houses&quot; or residency fairs</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

N= 19
**Figure PD_CN-10**

Child Neurology

Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- **Yes**: 61%
- **No**: 0%
- **Do Not Know**: 39%

N= 18

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- **Non-clinical “first-look” opportunities**: 73%
- **Interview itself**: 82%
- **Second visits**: 36%
- **I don’t know yet**: 36%

N= 11

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022¹

N= 17

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022¹

**Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review**

- Yes: 83%
- No: 17%

**Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications**

- Slightly: 33%
- Moderately: 67%

**Reliance on another holistic review model**

- Yes: 33%
- No: 67%

**Source of non-EACM holistic review model**

- Specialty designed one: 20%
- Institution designed one: 80%

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Dermatology
Total N = 29
Dermatology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 22)

Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022

- Quota: 4
- Applications received: 559
- Applications rejected based on standardized: 99
- Applications receiving holistic review: 432
- Interview invitations sent: 44
- Applicants interviewed: 43
- Applicants ranked: 41
Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications

- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_D-3
Dermatology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021

- Applications received: 48% more, 43% more, 9% less
- Applications rejected based on standardized screen: 91% more
- Applications receiving holistic review: 91%
- Interview invitations sent: 86%
- Interview invitations cancelled by applicants: 73%
- Applicants interviewed: 82%
- Applicants ranked: 86%
Figure PD_D-4
Dermatology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities

Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

Interviewing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_D-5
Dermatology
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

**US MD Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**: 90% 
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 14%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 5%
  - Require target score: 45%

- **USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)**: 71% 
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 10%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 14%
  - Require target score: 5%

- **USMLE Step 3**: 59% 
  - Do Not Consider: 14%
  - Require pass only: 5%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 18%
  - Require target score: 36%

**IMG Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**: 69% 
  - Do Not Consider: 19%
  - Require pass only: 31%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 19%
  - Require target score: 38%

- **USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)**: 54% 
  - Do Not Consider: 19%
  - Require pass only: 44%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 13%
  - Require target score: 6%

- **USMLE Step 3**: 69% 
  - Do Not Consider: 13%
  - Require pass only: 19%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 6%
  - Require target score: 6%

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they “seldom” or “often” consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022

**US DO Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**: 0% Do not consider, 44% Require pass only, 50% Prefer but do not require target score, 6% Require target score
- **USMLE Step 2 (CK)**: 11% Do not consider, 22% Require pass only, 61% Prefer but do not require target score, 6% Require target score
- **USMLE Step 3**: 56% Do not consider, 28% Require pass only, 6% Prefer but do not require target score, 6% Require target score
- **COMLEX-USA Level 1**: 53% Do not consider, 18% Require pass only, 6% Prefer but do not require target score, 6% Require target score
- **COMLEX-USA Level 2 (CE)**: 61% Do not consider, 22% Require pass only, 6% Prefer but do not require target score, 6% Require target score
- **COMLEX-USA Level 3**: 61% Do not consider, 17% Require pass only, 6% Prefer but do not require target score, 6% Require target score

**Notes**

1. DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
2. Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
3. Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

**Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually**

- 0% for 25% or fewer
- 0% for 26-50%
- 0% for 51-75%
- 0% for 76-99%
- 100% for 100%

**N= 22**

**Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format**

- 26% for ERAS Interview Scheduler
- 22% for Thalamus Interview Management Solution
- 0% for Interview Broker
- 52% for Internal process developed for and by my program
- 0% for Other

**N= 23**
Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

### Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Significant Reliance</th>
<th>Moderate Reliance</th>
<th>Modest Reliance</th>
<th>No Reliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Significantly Beneficial</th>
<th>Moderately Beneficial</th>
<th>Somewhat Beneficial</th>
<th>Not Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.*
Figure PD_D-9
Dermatology
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

N= 23
Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- Yes: 68%
- No: 0%
- Do Not Know: 32%

N= 22

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- Non-clinical “first-look” opportunities: 53%
- Interview itself: 80%
- Second visits: 0%
- I don’t know yet: 20%

N= 15
Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022

Virtual Recruitment Circumstance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage/Disadvantage</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Slight Disadv</th>
<th>Neither Adv Nor Disadv</th>
<th>Slight Advantage</th>
<th>Mod/Sig Adv</th>
<th>Mod/Sig Disadv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating new web-based info materials about program</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More applications to cull through</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer applications to cull through</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to train staff to use online mtg software</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech issues during interviews</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring confidentiality of interviews</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant competency</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant interpersonal skills, alignment with interview team</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of whether program showcased adequately</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer cancelled interviews</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More efficiency of interview process</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More flexibility for interview dates</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 21

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022¹

**Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review**
- Yes: 90%
- No: 10%

**Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications**
- Slightly
- Moderately
- Considerably
- A great deal
- Not at all
- None

**Reliance on another holistic review model**
- Yes: 32%
- No: 68%

**Source of non-EACM holistic review model**
- Specialty designed one: 17%
- Institution designed one
- Program created one on its own: 83%

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Emergency Medicine
Total N = 104
Figure PD_EM-1
Emergency Medicine
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 85)

Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022
Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review

[Bar chart showing the percentages of applications rejected and reviewed.]
NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

Interviewing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview,
2022¹ ² ³

US MD Applicants

IMG Applicants

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_EM-6
Emergency Medicine
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

US DO Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Do not consider</th>
<th>Require pass only</th>
<th>Prefer but do not require target score</th>
<th>Require target score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 1</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 (CK)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 3</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 2 (CE)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 3</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 74

¹DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they “seldom” or “often” consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually

- 25% or fewer: 0%
- 26-50%: 0%
- 51-75%: 0%
- 76-99%: 8%
- 100%: 92%

N = 78

Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format

- ERAS Interview Scheduler: 33%
- Thalamus Interview Management Solution: 26%
- Interview Broker: 27%
- Internal process developed for and by my program: 11%
- Other: 2%

N = 81
Figure PD_EM-8
Emergency Medicine
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022¹

Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Strategy</th>
<th>No Reliance</th>
<th>Modest Reliance</th>
<th>Moderate Reliance</th>
<th>Significant Reliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Strategy</th>
<th>Not Beneficial</th>
<th>Somewhat Beneficial</th>
<th>Moderately Beneficial</th>
<th>Significantly Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

- Program Website: 4%
- Social Media: 11%
- FREIDA or other online databases: 1%
- Virtual "Open Houses" or residency fairs: 11%
- Virtual away rotations: 12%
- Other virtual events with applicants: 16%

N= 80
Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- Yes: 55%
- No: 8%
- Do Not Know: 37%

N = 76

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- Non-clinical "first-look" opportunities: 50%
- Interview itself: 88%
- Second visits: 10%
- I don't know yet: 10%

N = 42
### Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022¹

#### Virtual Recruitment Circumstance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage/Disadvantage</th>
<th>Slight Advantage</th>
<th>Neither Adv Nor Disadv</th>
<th>Slight Disadv</th>
<th>Mod/Sig Adv</th>
<th>Mod/Sig Disadv</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating new web-based info materials about program</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More applications to cull through</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer applications to cull through</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to train staff to use online mtg software</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech issues during interviews</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring confidentiality of interviews</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant competency</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant interpersonal skills, alignment with interview team</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of whether program showcased adequately</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer cancelled interviews</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More efficiency of interview process</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More flexibility for interview process</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

N= 75

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022¹

Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review

- Yes: 73%
- No: 27%

Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications

- Slightly: 5%
- Moderately: 33%
- Considerably: 33%
- A great deal: 29%
- Not at all: 0%

Reliance on another holistic review model

- Yes: 34%
- No: 66%

Source of non-EACM holistic review model

- Specialty designed one: 11%
- Institution designed one: 0%
- Program created one on its own: 89%

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Family Medicine
Total N = 232
Figure PD_FM-1
Family Medicine
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 197)

Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022

- Quota: 7
- Applications received: 1,007
- Applications rejected based on standardized: 553
- Applications receiving holistic review: 322
- Interview invitations sent: 121
- Applicants interviewed: 101
- Applicants ranked: 87
Figure PD_FM-2
Family Medicine
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 176)

Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications
- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review
Figure PD_FM-3
Family Medicine
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

Interviewing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Interviewing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 180

Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 181

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022¹²³

**US MD Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**
  - Do Not Consider: 1%
  - Require pass only: 68%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 13%
  - Require target score: 17%

- **USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)**
  - Do Not Consider: 3%
  - Require pass only: 45%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 33%
  - Require target score: 19%

- **USMLE Step 3**
  - Do Not Consider: 79%
  - Require pass only: 4%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 6%
  - Require target score: 10%

**IMG Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**
  - Do Not Consider: 1%
  - Require pass only: 63%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 12%
  - Require target score: 24%

- **USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)**
  - Do Not Consider: 3%
  - Require pass only: 47%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 25%
  - Require target score: 25%

- **USMLE Step 3**
  - Do Not Consider: 68%
  - Require pass only: 6%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 6%
  - Require target score: 21%

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

US DO Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 1</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 (CK)</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 3</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 2 (CE)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 3</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually

- 25% or fewer: 4%
- 26-50%: 3%
- 51-75%: 2%
- 76-99%: 6%
- 100%: 84%

Total: N=187

Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format

- ERAS Interview Scheduler: 59%
- Thalamus Interview Management Solution: 16%
- Interview Broker: 3%
- Internal process developed for and by my program: 19%
- Other: 3%

Total: N=186

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022¹

**Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy**

- **Program Website**: 51% Significant, 36% Moderate, 11% Modest, 2% No Reliance
- **Social Media**: 24% Significant, 37% Moderate, 29% Modest, 7% No Reliance
- **FREIDA or other online databases**: 10% Significant, 41% Moderate, 20% Modest, 7% No Reliance
- **Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs**: 10% Significant, 29% Moderate, 25% Modest, 3% No Reliance
- **Virtual away rotations**: 13% Significant, 33% Moderate, 29% Modest, 4% No Reliance
- **Other virtual events with applicants**: 4% Significant, 57% Moderate, 17% Modest, 6% No Reliance

**Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy**

- **Program Website**: 43% Significantly Beneficial, 31% Moderately Beneficial, 23% Somewhat Beneficial, 3% Not Beneficial
- **Social Media**: 26% Significantly Beneficial, 36% Moderately Beneficial, 29% Somewhat Beneficial, 4% Not Beneficial
- **FREIDA or other online databases**: 27% Significantly Beneficial, 43% Moderately Beneficial, 27% Somewhat Beneficial, 3% Not Beneficial
- **Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs**: 19% Significantly Beneficial, 42% Moderately Beneficial, 30% Somewhat Beneficial, 2% Not Beneficial
- **Virtual away rotations**: 9% Significantly Beneficial, 90% Moderately Beneficial, 10% Somewhat Beneficial, 3% Not Beneficial
- **Other virtual events with applicants**: 18% Significantly Beneficial, 52% Moderately Beneficial, 7% Somewhat Beneficial, 7% Not Beneficial

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

- Program Website: 3%
- Social Media: 18%
- FREIDA or other online databases: 4%
- Virtual "Open Houses" or residency fairs: 17%
- Virtual away rotations: 18%
- Other virtual events with applicants: 22%

N= 184

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_FM-10
Family Medicine
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- Yes: 66%
- No: 7%
- Do Not Know: 27%

N= 176

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- Non-clinical “first-look” opportunities: 42%
- Interview itself: 75%
- Second visits: 18%
- I don’t know yet: 24%

N= 116

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022

Virtual Recruitment Circumstance

Creating new web-based info materials about program
More applications to cull through
Fewer applications to cull through
Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform
Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary
Time to train staff to use online mtg software
Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute
Tech issues during interviews
Ensuring confidentiality of interviews
Assessment of applicant competency
Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program
Assessment of applicant interpersonal skills, alignment with interview team
Assessment of whether program showcased adequately
Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses
Fewer cancelled interviews
More efficiency of interview process
More flexibility for interview dates
More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.
Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.
More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process
Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants

N= 173

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review</th>
<th>Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="PieChart1.png" alt="Pie Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="PieChart2.png" alt="Pie Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Familiarity with the EACM Model of Holistic Review**
  - 16% Yes
  - 84% No
  - N=172

- **Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications**
  - 26% Slightly
  - 30% Moderately
  - 37% Considerably
  - 7% A great deal
  - 6% Not at all
  - N=27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliance on another holistic review model</th>
<th>Source of non-EACM holistic review model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="PieChart3.png" alt="Pie Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="PieChart4.png" alt="Pie Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Reliance on another holistic review model**
  - 38% Yes
  - 62% No
  - N=143

- **Source of non-EACM holistic review model**
  - 94% Program created one on its own
  - 6% Specialty designed one
  - N=54

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Internal Medicine
Total N = 170
Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022

- Quota: 18
- Applications received: 2,876
- Applications rejected based on standardized: 1,688
- Applications receiving holistic review: 799
- Interview invitations sent: 275
- Applicants interviewed: 229
- Applicants ranked: 204
Figure PD_IM-2
Internal Medicine
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 130)

Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications
- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review
NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_IM-4
Internal Medicine
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities

Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

Interviewing

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Ranking

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_IM-5
Internal Medicine
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

US MD Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USMLE Step 1</th>
<th>USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)</th>
<th>USMLE Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMG Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USMLE Step 1</th>
<th>USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)</th>
<th>USMLE Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_IM-6
Internal Medicine
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US DO Applicants</th>
<th>USMLE Step 1</th>
<th>USMLE Step 2 (CK)</th>
<th>USMLE Step 3</th>
<th>COMLEX-USA Level 1</th>
<th>COMLEX-USA Level 2 (CE)</th>
<th>COMLEX-USA Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not consider</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require pass only</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer but do not require target score</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require target score</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 138

¹DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually

- 0%: 1%
- 25% or fewer: 1%
- 26-50%: 0%
- 51-75%: 1%
- 76-99%: 97%
- 100%: 0%

N= 141

Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format

- ERAS Interview Scheduler: 49%
- Thalamus Interview Management Solution: 25%
- Interview Broker: 10%
- Internal process developed for and by my program: 14%
- Other: 1%

N= 146
Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022¹

**Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Significant Reliance</th>
<th>Moderate Reliance</th>
<th>Modest Reliance</th>
<th>No Reliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual &quot;Open Houses&quot; or residency fairs</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Significantly Beneficial</th>
<th>Moderately Beneficial</th>
<th>Somewhat Beneficial</th>
<th>Not Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual &quot;Open Houses&quot; or residency fairs</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

N= 142
Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- **Yes**: 80%
- **No**: 3%
- **Do Not Know**: 17%

N= 140

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- **Non-clinical “first-look” opportunities**: 40%
- **Interview itself**: 81%
- **Second visits**: 12%
- **I don’t know yet**: 24%

N= 112
**Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022¹**

Virtual Recruitment Circumstance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage/Disadvantage</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating new web-based info materials about program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
<td>20% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More applications to cull through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
<td>17% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer applications to cull through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
<td>32% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
<td>15% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
<td>22% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to train staff to use online mtg software</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
<td>22% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
<td>27% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech issues during interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
<td>17% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring confidentiality of interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
<td>24% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant competency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
<td>28% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of whether program showcased adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
<td>5% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
<td>8% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More efficiency of interview process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
<td>22% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More flexibility for interview dates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
<td>34% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
<td>43% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
<td>43% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
<td>7% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
<td>7% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
**Familiarity with the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022¹**

- **Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review**
  - Yes: 24%
  - No: 76%
  - N = 133

- **Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications**
  - Slightly: 9%
  - Moderately: 16%
  - Considerably: 34%
  - A great deal: 41%
  - Not at all: 9%
  - N = 32

- **Reliance on another holistic review model**
  - Yes: 34%
  - No: 66%
  - N = 98

- **Source of non-EACM holistic review model**
  - Specialty designed one: 3%
  - Institution designed one: 6%
  - Program created one on its own: 91%
  - N = 33

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Internal Medicine/Pediatrics
Total N = 27
Figure PD_IMP-1

Internal Medicine/Pediatrics
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 23)

Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022
NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022

Figure PD_IMP-3
Internal Medicine/Pediatrics
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021

Applications received

- More than 25% fewer: 4%
- 10-25% fewer: 0%
- About the same (+/-10%): 13%
- 10-25% more: 0%
- More than 25% more: 4%

Applications rejected based on standardized screen

- More than 25% fewer: 0%
- 10-25% fewer: 14%
- About the same (+/-10%): 100%
- 10-25% more: 0%
- More than 25% more: 0%

Applications receiving holistic review

- More than 25% fewer: 0%
- 10-25% fewer: 0%
- About the same (+/-10%): 75%
- 10-25% more: 5%
- More than 25% more: 5%

Interview invitations sent

- More than 25% fewer: 0%
- 10-25% fewer: 9%
- About the same (+/-10%): 77%
- 10-25% more: 9%
- More than 25% more: 0%

Interview invitations cancelled by applicants

- More than 25% fewer: 5%
- 10-25% fewer: 23%
- About the same (+/-10%): 73%
- 10-25% more: 0%
- More than 25% more: 0%

Applicants interviewed

- More than 25% fewer: 0%
- 10-25% fewer: 0%
- About the same (+/-10%): 73%
- 10-25% more: 0%
- More than 25% more: 0%

Applicants ranked

- More than 25% fewer: 5%
- 10-25% fewer: 9%
- About the same (+/-10%): 77%
- 10-25% more: 9%
- More than 25% more: 0%

N= 22

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_IMP-4
Internal Medicine/Pediatrics
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities

Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

Interviewing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
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Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

**US MD Applicants**

- USMLE Step 1:
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 74%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 17%
  - Require target score: 9%

- USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK):
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 39%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 26%
  - Require target score: 13%

- USMLE Step 3:
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 82%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 5%
  - Require target score: 5%

**IMG Applicants**

- USMLE Step 1:
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 54%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 15%
  - Require target score: 15%

- USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK):
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 38%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 38%
  - Require target score: 8%

- USMLE Step 3:
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 67%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 17%
  - Require target score: 8%

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

US DO Applicants

- **USMLE Step 1**: 11% do not consider, 22% require pass only, 50% prefer but do not require target score, 17% require target score.
- **USMLE Step 2 (CK)**: 28% do not consider, 28% require pass only, 33% prefer but do not require target score, 11% require target score.
- **USMLE Step 3**: 83% do not consider, 6% prefer but do not require target score, 11% require target score.
- **COMLEX-USA Level 1**: 41% do not consider, 6% prefer but do not require target score, 22% require target score.
- **COMLEX-USA Level 2 (CE)**: 28% do not consider, 22% prefer but do not require target score, 11% require target score.
- **COMLEX-USA Level 3**: 72% do not consider, 11% prefer but do not require target score, 0% require target score.

¹DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually

- 100% of programs conducted all interviews virtually.

Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format

- 35% scheduled using ERAS Interview Scheduler
- 9% scheduled using Thalamus Interview Management Solution
- 39% scheduled using Interview Broker
- 13% scheduled using internal process developed for and by my program
- 4% scheduled using Other methods
Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

**Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Significant Reliance</th>
<th>Moderate Reliance</th>
<th>Modest Reliance</th>
<th>No Reliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Significantly Beneficial</th>
<th>Moderately Beneficial</th>
<th>Somewhat Beneficial</th>
<th>Not Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 21

N= 22

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

- Program Website: 0%
- Social Media: 0%
- FREIDA or other online databases: 0%
- Virtual "Open Houses" or residency fairs: 11%
- Virtual away rotations: 14%
- Other virtual events with applicants: 12%

N= 23
Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- Yes: 83%
- No: 0%
- Do Not Know: 17%

N= 23

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- Non-clinical "first-look" opportunities: 32%
- Interview itself: 58%
- Second visits: 5%
- I don't know yet: 37%

N= 19

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
**Virtual Recruitment Circumstance**

- Creating new web-based info materials about program: 22% Mod/Sig Disadv, 43% Slight Disadv, 26% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 30% Slight Advantage, 13% Mod/Sig Adv, 9% N/A
- More applications to cull through: 4% Mod/Sig Disadv, 13% Slight Disadv, 26% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 4% Slight Advantage, 26% Mod/Sig Adv, 9% 17% N/A
- Fewer applications to cull through: 4% Mod/Sig Disadv, 18% Slight Disadv, 26% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 55% Slight Advantage, 9% 5% Mod/Sig Adv, 14% 9% N/A
- Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform: 4% Mod/Sig Disadv, 13% Slight Disadv, 39% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 35% Slight Advantage, 39% Mod/Sig Adv, 4% 9% N/A
- Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary: 4% Mod/Sig Disadv, 18% Slight Disadv, 30% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 55% Slight Advantage, 39% Mod/Sig Adv, 22% 4% 9% N/A
- Time to train staff to use online mtg software: 4% Mod/Sig Disadv, 22% Slight Disadv, 4% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 35% Slight Advantage, 39% Mod/Sig Adv, 4% 17% N/A
- Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute: 13% Mod/Sig Disadv, 4% Slight Disadv, 39% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 35% Slight Advantage, 4% 4% Mod/Sig Adv, 9% N/A
- Tech issues during interviews: 17% Mod/Sig Disadv, 18% Slight Disadv, 39% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 61% Slight Advantage, 35% Mod/Sig Adv, 4% 9% N/A
- Ensuring confidentiality of interviews: 18% Mod/Sig Disadv, 14% Slight Disadv, 9% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 64% Slight Advantage, 18% Mod/Sig Adv, 14% N/A
- Assessment of applicant competency: 14% Mod/Sig Disadv, 27% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 32% Slight Advantage, 5% Mod/Sig Adv, 5% 14% 5% N/A
- Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program: 18% Mod/Sig Disadv, 18% Slight Disadv, 9% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 50% Slight Advantage, 50% Mod/Sig Adv, 14% N/A
- Assessment of whether program showcased adequately: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 9% Slight Disadv, 5% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 18% Slight Advantage, 55% Mod/Sig Adv, 36% 14% N/A
- Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses: 9% Mod/Sig Disadv, 18% Slight Disadv, 5% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 14% Slight Advantage, 50% Mod/Sig Adv, 23% 14% N/A
- Fewer cancelled interviews: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 9% Slight Disadv, 27% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 23% Slight Advantage, 55% Mod/Sig Adv, 41% 14% N/A
- More efficiency of interview process: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 18% Slight Disadv, 27% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 23% Slight Advantage, 55% Mod/Sig Adv, 59% 9% N/A
- More flexibility for interview dates: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 18% Slight Disadv, 5% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 32% Slight Advantage, 55% Mod/Sig Adv, 45% 5% N/A
- More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 9% Slight Disadv, 5% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 41% Slight Advantage, 55% Mod/Sig Adv, 45% 5% N/A
- Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 9% Slight Disadv, 5% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 32% Slight Advantage, 55% Mod/Sig Adv, 45% 5% N/A
- More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process: 9% Mod/Sig Disadv, 9% Slight Disadv, 5% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 41% Slight Advantage, 55% Mod/Sig Adv, 45% 5% N/A
- Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 9% Slight Disadv, 5% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 32% Slight Advantage, 55% Mod/Sig Adv, 45% 5% N/A

N= 23

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022

- Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review: 82% Yes, 18% No
- Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications: 33% Slightly, 67% Moderately
- Reliance on another holistic review model: 61% Yes, 39% No
- Source of non-EACM holistic review model: 100% Program created one on its own

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

- Increase resident diversity: 95%
- Identify promising applicants: 86%
- Improve applicant program alignment: 77%
- Support institution mission better: 68%
- Other factor(s): 0%

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant personal attributes</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant interests</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant interpersonal skills, ethics, and</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professionalism</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant personal experiences</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant geographic preferences</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other component or components</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Interventional Radiology (Integrated)

Total N = 18
Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022
Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications
- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review
Interventional Radiology (Integrated)
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021

Applications received:
- 77% about the same (+/-10%)
- 15% 10-25% more
- 8% More than 25% more

Applications rejected based on standardized screen:
- 92% about the same (+/-10%)
- 0% 10-25% more
- 0% More than 25% more

Applications receiving holistic review:
- 77% about the same (+/-10%)
- 15% 10-25% more
- 8% More than 25% more

Interview invitations sent:
- 69% about the same (+/-10%)
- 15% 10-25% more
- 8% More than 25% more

Interview invitations cancelled by applicants:
- 31% 10-25% fewer
- 8% More than 25% fewer
- 62% about the same (+/-10%)

Applicants interviewed:
- 69% about the same (+/-10%)
- 15% 10-25% more
- 8% More than 25% more

Applicants ranked:
- 62% about the same (+/-10%)
- 23% 10-25% more
- 8% More than 25% more

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
N= 13
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N= 13
Figure PD_IR-4
Interventional Radiology (Integrated)
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities

Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

Interviewing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_IR-5
Interventional Radiology (Integrated)
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

**US MD Applicants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USMLE Step 1</th>
<th>USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)</th>
<th>USMLE Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Consider</td>
<td>Require pass only</td>
<td>Prefer but do not require target score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMG Applicants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USMLE Step 1</th>
<th>USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)</th>
<th>USMLE Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Consider</td>
<td>Require pass only</td>
<td>Prefer but do not require target score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they “seldom” or “often” consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_IR-6  
Interventional Radiology (Integrated)  
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

US DO Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test/Test 1</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>8%</th>
<th>17%</th>
<th>17%</th>
<th>17%</th>
<th>25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 (CK)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 3</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 2 (CE)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Do not consider
- Require pass only
- Prefer but do not require target score
- Require target score

¹DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_IR-7
Interventional Radiology (Integrated)
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually

N= 14

Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format

N= 14

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022¹

1Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

Program Website: 7%
Social Media: 8%
FREIDA or other online databases: 0%
Virtual "Open Houses" or residency fairs: 8%
Virtual away rotations: 8%
Other virtual events with applicants: 0%

N= 14
Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- **Yes**: 36%
- **No**: 14%
- **Do Not Know**: 50%

N = 14

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- **Non-clinical “first-look” opportunities**: 60%
- **Interview itself**: 60%
- **Second visits**: 0%
- **I don’t know yet**: 20%

N = 5
Figure PD_IR-11
Interventional Radiology (Integrated)
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022¹

Virtual Recruitment Circumstance

Creating new web-based info materials about program
More applications to cull through
Fewer applications to cull through
Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform
Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary
Time to train staff to use online mtg software
Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute
Tech issues during interviews
Ensuring confidentiality of interviews
Assessment of applicant competency
Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program
Assessment of applicant interpersonal skills, alignment with interview team
Assessment of whether program showcased adequately
Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses
Fewer cancelled interviews
More efficiency of interview process
More flexibility for interview dates
More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.
Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.
More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process
Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Interventional Radiology (Integrated)
Summary of Program Holistic Review

Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022¹

- Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review:
  - Yes: 31%
  - No: 69%

- Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications:
  - Slightly: 25%
  - Moderately: 50%
  - Considerably: 25%

- Reliance on another holistic review model:
  - Yes: 11%
  - No: 89%

- Source of non-EACM holistic review model:
  - 100%

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_IR-13
Interventional Radiology (Integrated)
Summary of Program Holistic Review

Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

- Increase resident diversity: 62%
- Identify promising applicants: 92%
- Improve applicant program alignment: 77%
- Support institution mission better: 54%
- Other factor(s): 0%

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

- Applicant personal attributes: 92%
- Applicant interests: 85%
- Applicant interpersonal skills, ethics, and professionalism: 85%
- Applicant personal experiences: 100%
- Applicant geographic preferences: 77%
- Other component or components: 0%

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Neurological Surgery
Total N = 28
Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022
Neurological Surgery
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 22)

Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications
- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021

- Applications received: 79% more, 16% 10-25% more, 5% about the same (+/-10%), 0% 10-25% fewer, 0% more than 25% fewer
- Applications rejected based on standardized screen: 80% more, 5% 10-25% more, 15% about the same (+/-10%), 0% 10-25% fewer, 0% more than 25% fewer
- Applications receiving holistic review: 79% more, 16% 10-25% more, 5% about the same (+/-10%), 0% 10-25% fewer, 0% more than 25% fewer
- Interview invitations sent: 89% more, 0% 10-25% more, 11% about the same (+/-10%), 0% 10-25% fewer, 0% more than 25% fewer
- Interview invitations cancelled by applicants: 94% more, 6% 10-25% more, 0% about the same (+/-10%), 5% 10-25% fewer, 0% more than 25% fewer
- Applicants interviewed: 94% more, 0% 10-25% more, 6% about the same (+/-10%), 0% 10-25% fewer, 0% more than 25% fewer
- Applicants ranked: 94% more, 6% 10-25% more, 0% about the same (+/-10%), 0% 10-25% fewer, 0% more than 25% fewer

N=19, N=20, N=18
Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

Interviewing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_NS-5
Neurological Surgery
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022

US MD Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exam</th>
<th>Do Not Consider</th>
<th>Require pass only</th>
<th>Prefer but do not require target score</th>
<th>Require target score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 CK</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 3</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMG Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exam</th>
<th>Do Not Consider</th>
<th>Require pass only</th>
<th>Prefer but do not require target score</th>
<th>Require target score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 CK</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 3</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 18
N= 12

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they “seldom” or “often” consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

US DO Applicants

- USMLE Step 1: 33% do not consider, 56% require pass only, 22% prefer but do not require target score, 0% require target score
- USMLE Step 2 (CK): 33% do not consider, 22% require pass only, 11% prefer but do not require target score, 0% require target score
- USMLE Step 3: 0% do not consider, 0% require pass only, 0% prefer but do not require target score, 11% require target score
- COMLEX-USA Level 1: 33% do not consider, 33% require pass only, 33% prefer but do not require target score, 0% require target score
- COMLEX-USA Level 2 (CE): 11% do not consider, 0% require pass only, 11% prefer but do not require target score, 0% require target score
- COMLEX-USA Level 3: 22% do not consider, 0% require pass only, 0% prefer but do not require target score, 0% require target score

¹DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually

0% 0% 0% 5% 95%

- 25% or fewer
- 26-50%
- 51-75%
- 76-99%
- 100%

N= 20

Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format

- ERAS Interview Scheduler: 48%
- Thalamus Interview Management Solution: 5%
- Interview Broker: 0%
- Internal process developed for and by my program: 38%
- Other: 10%

N= 21
Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy

Program Website
- Significant Reliance: 24%
- Moderate Reliance: 19%
- Modest Reliance: 5%
- No Reliance: 14%

Social Media
- Significant Reliance: 57%
- Moderate Reliance: 33%
- Modest Reliance: 33%
- No Reliance: 16%

FREIDA or other online databases
- Significant Reliance: 45%
- Moderate Reliance: 50%
- Modest Reliance: 29%
- No Reliance: 25%

Virtual "Open Houses" or residency fairs
- Significant Reliance: 14%
- Moderate Reliance: 50%
- Modest Reliance: 24%
- No Reliance: 70%

Virtual away rotations
- Significant Reliance: 19%
- Moderate Reliance: 33%
- Modest Reliance: 45%
- No Reliance: 5%

Other virtual events with applicants
- Significant Reliance: 15%
- Moderate Reliance: 37%
- Modest Reliance: 37%
- No Reliance: 15%

Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy

Program Website
- Significantly Beneficial: 10%
- Moderately Beneficial: 43%
- Somewhat Beneficial: 48%
- Not Beneficial: 15%

Social Media
- Significantly Beneficial: 20%
- Moderately Beneficial: 35%
- Somewhat Beneficial: 30%
- Not Beneficial: 15%

FREIDA or other online databases
- Significantly Beneficial: 5%
- Moderately Beneficial: 37%
- Somewhat Beneficial: 58%
- Not Beneficial: 15%

Virtual "Open Houses" or residency fairs
- Significantly Beneficial: 11%
- Moderately Beneficial: 21%
- Somewhat Beneficial: 32%
- Not Beneficial: 75%

Virtual away rotations
- Significantly Beneficial: 10%
- Moderately Beneficial: 15%
- Somewhat Beneficial: 37%
- Not Beneficial: 75%

Other virtual events with applicants
- Significantly Beneficial: 6%
- Moderately Beneficial: 28%
- Somewhat Beneficial: 50%
- Not Beneficial: 17%

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

- Program Website: 5%
- Social Media: 11%
- FREIDA or other online databases: 21%
- Virtual "Open Houses" or residency fairs: 20%
- Virtual away rotations: 27%
- Other virtual events with applicants: 21%

N= 21
Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

N= 17

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

N= 6

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_NS-11
Neurological Surgery
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022¹

Virtual Recruitment Circumstance

Creating new web-based info materials about program
More applications to cull through
Fewer applications to cull through
Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform
Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary
Time to train staff to use online mtg software
Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute
Tech issues during interviews
Ensuring confidentiality of interviews
Assessment of applicant competency
Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program
Assessment of applicant interpersonal skills, alignment with interview team
Assessment of whether program showcased adequately
Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses
Fewer cancelled interviews
More efficiency of interview process
More flexibility for interview dates
More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.
Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.
More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process
Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Summary of Program Holistic Review

Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N= 20</th>
<th>N= 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N= 16</th>
<th>N= 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliance on another holistic review model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N= 16</th>
<th>N= 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of non-EACM holistic review model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty designed one</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution designed one</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program created one on its own</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Neurology
Total N = 52
Neurology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 47)

Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022

- Quota: 6
- Applications received: 638
- Applications rejected based on standardized: 255
- Applications receiving holistic review: 330
- Interview invitations sent: 97
- Applicants interviewed: 84
- Applicants ranked: 78
Figure PD_N-2
Neurology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 42)

Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications
- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review
Figure PD_N-3
Neurology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021

Applications received

Applications rejected based on standardized screen

Applications receiving holistic review

Interview invitations sent

Interview invitations cancelled by applicants

Applicants interviewed

Applicants ranked

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

**Interviewing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ranking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

**US MD Applicants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Do Not Consider</th>
<th>Require pass only</th>
<th>Prefer but do not require target score</th>
<th>Require target score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 CK</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 3</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMG Applicants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Do Not Consider</th>
<th>Require pass only</th>
<th>Prefer but do not require target score</th>
<th>Require target score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 CK</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 3</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_N-6
Neurology
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

![Bar chart showing percentages of programs using standardized licensure exams to select DO applicants for interview, 2022.]

1. DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
2. Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
3. Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually

- 2% in 25% or fewer
- 0% in 26-50%
- 0% in 51-75%
- 6% in 76-99%
- 91% in 100%

Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format

- 57% in ERAS Interview Scheduler
- 17% in Thalamus Interview Management Solution
- 2% in Interview Broker
- 23% in Internal process developed for and by my program
- 0% in Other

N= 47
Figure PD_N-8
Neurology
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022¹

Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy

Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

- Program Website: 4%
- Social Media: 28%
- FREIDA or other online databases: 5%
- Virtual "Open Houses" or residency fairs: 14%
- Virtual away rotations: 4%
- Other virtual events with applicants: 7%

N= 46
Figure PD_N-10
Neurology
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- Yes: 72%
- No: 9%
- Do Not Know: 19%

N= 47

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- Non-clinical "first-look" opportunities: 56%
- Interview itself: 82%
- Second visits: 15%
- I don't know yet: 32%

N= 34
Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022¹

Virtual Recruitment Circumstance

- Creating new web-based info materials about program
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- More applications to cull through
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- Fewer applications to cull through
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- Time to train staff to use online mtg software
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- Tech issues during interviews
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- Ensuring confidentiality of interviews
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- Assessment of applicant competency
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- Assessment of applicant interpersonal skills, alignment with interview team
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- Assessment of whether program showcased adequately
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- Fewer cancelled interviews
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- More efficiency of interview process
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- More flexibility for interview dates
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

- Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A

N= 47

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022¹

Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review

- Yes: 19%
- No: 81%

Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications

- Slightly: 13%
- Moderately: 88%

Reliance on another holistic review model

- Yes: 32%
- No: 68%

Source of non-EACM holistic review model

- Specialty designed one: 18%
- Institution designed one: 82%

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_N-13
Neurology
Summary of Program Holistic Review

Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage Citing</th>
<th>Mean Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase resident diversity</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify promising applicants</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve applicant program alignment</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support institution mission better</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other factor(s)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Obstetrics and Gynecology

Total N = 128
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 112)

Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022

- Quota: 6
- Applications received: 706
- Applications rejected based on standardized: 292
- Applications receiving holistic review: 407
- Interview invitations sent: 90
- Applicants interviewed: 81
- Applicants ranked: 73

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_OG-2
Obstetrics and Gynecology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 107)

Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications
- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review
Figure PD_OG-3
Obstetrics and Gynecology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022

163
Figure PD_OG-4  
Obstetrics and Gynecology  
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities

Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

Interviewing

Ranking

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_OG-5
Obstetrics and Gynecology
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

US MD Applicants

IMG Applicants

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they “seldom” or “often” consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022

1 DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
2 Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
3 Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

**Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually**

- 1% of programs conducted 25% or fewer interviews virtually.
- 0% of programs conducted 26-50% interviews virtually.
- 0% of programs conducted 51-75% interviews virtually.
- 3% of programs conducted 76-99% interviews virtually.
- 96% of programs conducted 100% interviews virtually.

**Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format**

- 30% of programs scheduled interviews using ERAS Interview Scheduler.
- 47% of programs scheduled interviews using Thalamus Interview Management Solution.
- 6% of programs scheduled interviews using Interview Broker.
- 14% of programs scheduled interviews using an internal process developed for and by their program.
- 3% of programs scheduled interviews using other methods.

N=111
Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022¹

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

- Program Website: 2%
- Social Media: 6%
- FREIDA or other online databases: 5%
- Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs: 11%
- Virtual away rotations: 13%
- Other virtual events with applicants: 14%

N= 108
Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- Yes: 69%
- No: 4%
- Do Not Know: 27%

N= 106

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- Non-clinical “first-look” opportunities: 49%
- Interview itself: 85%
- Second visits: 10%
- I don't know yet: 18%

N= 73
### Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtual Recruitment Circumstance</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Slight Disadv</th>
<th>Neither Adv Nor Disadv</th>
<th>Slight Advantage</th>
<th>Mod/Sig Adv</th>
<th>Mod/Sig Disadv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating new web-based info materials about program</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More applications to cull through</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer applications to cull through</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to train staff to use online mtg software</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech issues during interviews</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring confidentiality of interviews</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant competency</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant interpersonal skills, alignment with interview team</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More efficiency of interview process</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More flexibility for interview dates</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 106

*Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.*

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No: 70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slightly: 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately: 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerably: 48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliance on another holistic review model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No: 59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of non-EACM holistic review model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialty designed one: 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution designed one: 93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Orthopaedic Surgery
Total N = 52
Orthopaedic Surgery
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 44)

Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022

- Quota: 5
- Applications received: 742
- Applications rejected based on standardized: 277
- Applications receiving holistic review: 414
- Interview invitations sent: 62
- Applicants interviewed: 59
- Applicants ranked: 51
Figure PD_OS-2
Orthopaedic Surgery
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 43)

Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications
- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review
Figure PD_OS-3
Orthopaedic Surgery
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021

Applications received

Applications rejected based on standardized screen

Applications receiving holistic review

Interview invitations sent

Interview invitations cancelled by applicants

Applicants interviewed

Applicants ranked

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022

**Interviewing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ranking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N= 40
N= 41

*Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

**US MD Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**
  - Do Not Consider: 79%
  - Require pass only: 22%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 8%
  - Require target score: 8%

- **USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)**
  - Do Not Consider: 47%
  - Require pass only: 30%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 14%
  - Require target score: 19%

- **USMLE Step 3**
  - Do Not Consider: 58%
  - Require pass only: 21%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 16%
  - Require target score: 14%

**IMG Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**
  - Do Not Consider: 65%
  - Require pass only: 30%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 30%
  - Require target score: 16%

- **USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)**
  - Do Not Consider: 35%
  - Require pass only: 25%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 15%
  - Require target score: 15%

- **USMLE Step 3**
  - Do Not Consider: 47%
  - Require pass only: 21%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 16%
  - Require target score: 16%

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022\(^1\) \(^2\) \(^3\)

**US DO Applicants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exam Type</th>
<th>Do not consider</th>
<th>Require pass only</th>
<th>Prefer but do not require target score</th>
<th>Require target score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 (CK)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 3</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 1</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 2 (CE)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.

\(^2\)Total number of respondents who indicated they “seldom” or “often” consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.

\(^3\)Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

**Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually**

- 2% for 25% or fewer
- 2% for 26-50%
- 0% for 51-75%
- 10% for 76-99%
- 86% for 100%

**Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format**

- 19% for ERAS Interview Scheduler
- 24% for Thalamus Interview Management Solution
- 2% for Interview Broker
- 45% for Internal process developed for and by my program
- 10% for Other

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022¹

Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy

![Bar chart showing reliance on various virtual engagement strategies.](chart)

Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy

![Bar chart showing benefit of various virtual engagement strategies.](chart)

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

- Program Website: 3%
- Social Media: 11%
- FREIDA or other online databases: 3%
- Virtual "Open Houses" or residency fairs: 9%
- Virtual away rotations: 13%
- Other virtual events with applicants: 12%

N= 40
Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- Yes: 44%
- No: 22%
- Do Not Know: 34%

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- Non-clinical "first-look" opportunities: 44%
- Interview itself: 78%
- Second visits: 0%
- I don't know yet: 22%
Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022¹

Virtual Recruitment Circumstance

Creating new web-based info materials about program  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 15%  
- Slight Adv: 34%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 26%  
- Slight Disadv: 8%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 5%

More applications to cull through  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 18%  
- Slight Adv: 29%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 20%  
- Slight Disadv: 15%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 5%

Fewer applications to cull through  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 44%  
- Slight Adv: 44%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 5%  
- Slight Disadv: 5%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 0%

Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 4%  
- Slight Adv: 41%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 12%  
- Slight Disadv: 2%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 7%

Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 5%  
- Slight Adv: 49%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 7%  
- Slight Disadv: 2%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 10%

Time to train staff to use online mtg software  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 7%  
- Slight Adv: 44%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 3%  
- Slight Disadv: 3%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 10%

Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 27%  
- Slight Adv: 27%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 7%  
- Slight Disadv: 7%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 10%

Tech issues during interviews  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 31%  
- Slight Adv: 31%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 3%  
- Slight Disadv: 3%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 4%

Ensuring confidentiality of interviews  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 22%  
- Slight Adv: 22%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 17%  
- Slight Disadv: 13%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 8%

Assessment of applicant competency  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 11%  
- Slight Adv: 31%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 3%  
- Slight Disadv: 5%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 10%

Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 24%  
- Slight Adv: 24%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 8%  
- Slight Disadv: 8%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 5%

Assessment of applicant interpersonal skills, alignment with interview team  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 18%  
- Slight Adv: 26%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 13%  
- Slight Disadv: 11%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 5%

Assessment of whether program showcased adequately  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 21%  
- Slight Adv: 21%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 5%  
- Slight Disadv: 8%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 10%

Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 25%  
- Slight Adv: 25%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 7%  
- Slight Disadv: 8%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 3%

Fewer cancelled interviews  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 26%  
- Slight Adv: 26%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 3%  
- Slight Disadv: 3%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 5%

More efficiency of interview process  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 14%  
- Slight Adv: 14%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 8%  
- Slight Disadv: 8%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 5%

More flexibility for interview dates  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 8%  
- Slight Adv: 8%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 8%  
- Slight Disadv: 8%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 5%

More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 18%  
- Slight Adv: 18%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 8%  
- Slight Disadv: 8%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 3%

Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 8%  
- Slight Adv: 8%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 5%  
- Slight Disadv: 3%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 10%

More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 8%  
- Slight Adv: 8%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 5%  
- Slight Disadv: 5%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 10%

Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants  
- Mod/Sig Adv: 18%  
- Slight Adv: 18%  
- Neither Adv Nor Disadv: 8%  
- Slight Disadv: 8%  
- Mod/Sig Disadv: 3%

N= 41

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliance on another holistic review model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of non-EACM holistic review model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialty designed one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution designed one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

- Increase resident diversity: 84%
- Identify promising applicants: 68%
- Improve applicant program alignment: 57%
- Support institution mission better: 65%
- Other factor(s): 3%

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

- Applicant personal attributes: 95%, Rating 4.6
- Applicant interests: 86%, Rating 4.1
- Applicant interpersonal skills, ethics, and professionalism: 78%, Rating 4.7
- Applicant personal experiences: 76%, Rating 3.9
- Applicant geographic preferences: 35%, Rating 3.9
- Other component or components: 14%, Rating 4.6

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Otolaryngology
Total N = 39
Figure PD_O-1
Otolaryngology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 32)

Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quota</th>
<th>Applications received</th>
<th>Applications rejected based on standardized</th>
<th>Applications receiving holistic review</th>
<th>Interview invitations sent</th>
<th>Applicants interviewed</th>
<th>Applicants ranked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure PD_O-2
Otolaryngology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 32 )

Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications
- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review
Figure PD_O-3
Otolaryngology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021
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Figure PD_O-4
Otolaryngology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities

Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

### Interviewing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 27

### Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 27

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_O-5
Otolaryngology
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022¹²³

US MD Applicants

- USMLE Step 1: 0%, 37%, 19%, 44%
- USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK): 22%, 15%, 48%, 15%
- USMLE Step 3: 84%, 12%, 4%

IMG Applicants

- USMLE Step 1: 13%, 38%, 13%, 38%
- USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK): 31%, 13%, 44%, 13%
- USMLE Step 3: 69%, 6%, 19%, 6%

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

**US DO Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**: 0% do not consider, 42% require pass only, 21% prefer but do not require target score, 37% require target score.
- **USMLE Step 2 (CK)**: 5% do not consider, 26% require pass only, 16% prefer but do not require target score, 37% require target score.
- **USMLE Step 3**: 17% do not consider, 78% require pass only, 5% prefer but do not require target score, 26% require target score.
- **COMLEX-USA Level 1**: 11% do not consider, 8% require pass only, 32% prefer but do not require target score, 26% require target score.
- **COMLEX-USA Level 2 (CE)**: 22% do not consider, 20% require pass only, 21% prefer but do not require target score, 26% require target score.
- **COMLEX-USA Level 3**: 11% do not consider, 0% require pass only, 11% prefer but do not require target score, 67% require target score.

¹DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_O-7
Otolaryngology
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually

- 97% of interviews were conducted virtually.

Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format

- 43% of interviews were scheduled using the ERAS Interview Scheduler.
- 7% were scheduled using Thalamus Interview Management Solution.
- 3% were scheduled using Interview Broker.
- 43% were scheduled using an internal process developed for and by the program.
- 3% were scheduled using other methods.

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD-O-8
Otolaryngology
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022¹

Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Significant Reliance</th>
<th>Moderate Reliance</th>
<th>Modest Reliance</th>
<th>No Reliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual &quot;Open Houses&quot; or residency fairs</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Significantly Beneficial</th>
<th>Moderately Beneficial</th>
<th>Somewhat Beneficial</th>
<th>Not Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual &quot;Open Houses&quot; or residency fairs</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

- Program Website: 0%
- Social Media: 17%
- FREIDA or other online databases: 0%
- Virtual "Open Houses" or residency fairs: 15%
- Virtual away rotations: 17%
- Other virtual events with applicants: 13%

N= 30
Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- Yes: 37%
- No: 19%
- Do Not Know: 44%

N = 27

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- Non-clinical “first-look” opportunities: 40%
- Interview itself: 70%
- Second visits: 10%
- I don’t know yet: 30%

N = 10

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_O-11

Otolaryngology
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022¹

Virtual Recruitment Circumstance

- Creating new web-based info materials about program
  - Mod/Sig Disadv
  - Slight Disadv
  - Neither Adv Nor Disadv
  - Slight Advantage
  - Mod/Sig Adv
  - N/A
  - N= 27

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
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Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022¹

Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review

- Yes: 21%
- No: 79%

N = 28

Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications

- Slightly: 17%
- Moderately: 33%
- Considerably: 50%

N = 6

Reliance on another holistic review model

- Yes: 36%
- No: 64%

N = 22

Source of non-EACM holistic review model

- Specialty designed one: 13%
- Institution designed one: 13%
- Program created one on its own: 75%

N = 8

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
### Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase resident diversity</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify promising applicants</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve applicant program alignment</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support institution mission better</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other factor(s)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating of Said Factors, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant personal attributes</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant interests</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant interpersonal skills, ethics, and professionalism</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant personal experiences</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant geographic preferences</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other component or components</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Pathology-Anatomic and Clinical
Total N = 42
Figure PD_PA-1
Pathology-Anatomic and Clinical
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 36)

Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quota</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications received</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications rejected based on</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standardized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications receiving holistic</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview invitations sent</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants interviewed</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants ranked</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure PD_PA-2
Pathology-Anatomic and Clinical
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 32)

Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications
- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review
Figure PD_PA-3
Pathology-Anatomic and Clinical
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021

Applications received

Applications rejected based on standardized screen

Applications receiving holistic review

Interview invitations sent

Interview invitations cancelled by applicants

Applicants interviewed

Applicants ranked

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

![Interviewing chart](chart-interviewing.png)

![Ranking chart](chart-ranking.png)

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_PA-5
Pathology-Anatomic and Clinical
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

US MD Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Level</th>
<th>Do Not Consider</th>
<th>Require pass only</th>
<th>Prefer but do not require target score</th>
<th>Require target score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 CK</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMG Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Level</th>
<th>Do Not Consider</th>
<th>Require pass only</th>
<th>Prefer but do not require target score</th>
<th>Require target score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 CK</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

US DO Applicants

- USMLE Step 1: 48% Do not consider, 31% Require pass only, 14% Prefer but do not require target score
- USMLE Step 2 (CK): 55% Do not consider, 21% Require pass only, 7% Prefer but do not require target score
- USMLE Step 3: 4% Do not consider, 19% Require pass only, 74% Prefer but do not require target score
- COMLEX-USA Level 1: 29% Do not consider, 46% Require pass only, 7% Prefer but do not require target score
- COMLEX-USA Level 2 (CE): 18% Do not consider, 46% Require pass only, 7% Prefer but do not require target score
- COMLEX-USA Level 3: 0% Do not consider, 19% Require pass only, 73% Prefer but do not require target score

¹DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_PA-7
Pathology-Anatomic and Clinical
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually

Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format
Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022¹

**Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy**

- **Program Website**: 9% (Significant), 3% (No), 27% (Modest), 61% (Moderate), 13% (Significant)
- **Social Media**: 9% (Significant), 23% (No), 21% (Moderate), 35% (Significant), 13% (No)
- **FREIDA or other online databases**: 23% (Significant), 21% (No), 6% (Moderate), 52% (Significant), 29% (No)
- **Virtual "Open Houses" or residency fairs**: 9% (Significant), 9% (No), 22% (Moderate), 47% (Significant), 22% (No)
- **Virtual away rotations**: 3% (Significant), 3% (No), 22% (Moderate), 97% (Significant), 97% (No)
- **Other virtual events with applicants**: 6% (Significant), 6% (No), 13% (Moderate), 78% (Significant), 88% (No)

**Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy**

- **Program Website**: 13% (Not Beneficial), 18% (Somewhat Beneficial), 27% (Moderately Beneficial), 55% (Significantly Beneficial)
- **Social Media**: 29% (Not Beneficial), 29% (Somewhat Beneficial), 25% (Moderately Beneficial), 29% (Significantly Beneficial)
- **FREIDA or other online databases**: 32% (Not Beneficial), 29% (Somewhat Beneficial), 50% (Moderately Beneficial), 27% (Significantly Beneficial)
- **Virtual "Open Houses" or residency fairs**: 22% (Not Beneficial), 27% (Somewhat Beneficial), 13% (Moderately Beneficial), 27% (Significantly Beneficial)
- **Virtual away rotations**: 14% (Not Beneficial), 7% (Somewhat Beneficial), 14% (Moderately Beneficial), 8% (Significantly Beneficial)
- **Other virtual events with applicants**: 14% (Not Beneficial), 7% (Somewhat Beneficial), 14% (Moderately Beneficial), 66% (Significantly Beneficial)

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_PA-9
Pathology-Anatomic and Clinical
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual &quot;Open Houses' or residency fairs</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 31
Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- Yes: 45%
- No: 6%
- Do Not Know: 48%

N= 31

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- Non-clinical “first-look” opportunities: 57%
- Interview itself: 93%
- Second visits: 21%
- I don’t know yet: 14%

N= 14

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtual Recruitment Circumstance</th>
<th>Mod/Sig Disadv</th>
<th>Slight Disadv</th>
<th>Neither Adv Nor Disadv</th>
<th>Slight Advantage</th>
<th>Mod/Sig Adv</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating new web-based info materials about program</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More applications to cull through</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer applications to cull through</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to train staff to use online mtg software</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech issues during interviews</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring confidentiality of interviews</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant competency</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant interpersonal skills, alignment with interview team</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of whether program showcased adequately</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer cancelled interviews</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More efficiency of interview process</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More flexibility for interview process</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022

Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review

- Yes: 81%
- No: 19%

N = 31

Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications

- Slightly: 17%
- Moderately: 33%
- Considerably: 33%
- A great deal: 17%
- Not at all: 33%

N = 6

Reliance on another holistic review model

- Yes: 28%
- No: 72%

N = 25

Source of non-EACM holistic review model

- Specialty designed one: 14%
- Institution designed one:
- Program created one on its own: 86%

N = 7

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Rating¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase resident diversity</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify promising applicants</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve applicant program alignment</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support institution mission better</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other factor(s)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Pediatrics
Total N = 83
Figure PD_P-1
Pediatrics
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 67)

Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 60)

Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications

- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review
Figure PD_P-3
Pediatrics
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021

Applications received

- More than 25% fewer: 0%
- 10-25% fewer: 5%
- About the same (+/-10%): 79%
- 10-25% more: 14%
- More than 25% more: 2%

Applications rejected based on standardized screen

- More than 25% fewer: 0%
- 10-25% fewer: 10%
- About the same (+/-10%): 81%
- 10-25% more: 8%
- More than 25% more: 2%

Applications receiving holistic review

- More than 25% fewer: 0%
- 10-25% fewer: 0%
- About the same (+/-10%): 87%
- 10-25% more: 30%
- More than 25% more: 3%

Interview invitations sent

- More than 25% fewer: 0%
- 10-25% fewer: 10%
- About the same (+/-10%): 71%
- 10-25% more: 17%
- More than 25% more: 2%

Interview invitations cancelled by applicants

- More than 25% fewer: 5%
- 10-25% fewer: 18%
- About the same (+/-10%): 60%
- 10-25% more: 16%
- More than 25% more: 2%

Applicants interviewed

- More than 25% fewer: 0%
- 10-25% fewer: 14%
- About the same (+/-10%): 67%
- 10-25% more: 17%
- More than 25% more: 2%

Applicants ranked

- More than 25% fewer: 0%
- 10-25% fewer: 13%
- About the same (+/-10%): 67%
- 10-25% more: 19%
- More than 25% more: 2%

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

*Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.*
Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

**US MD Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**: 0% Do Not Consider, 53% Require pass only, 21% Prefer but do not require target score, 26% Require target score
- **USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)**: 5% Do Not Consider, 24% Require pass only, 48% Prefer but do not require target score, 2% Require target score
- **USMLE Step 3**: 89% Do Not Consider, 9% Require pass only, 0% Prefer but do not require target score, 2% Require target score

**IMG Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**: 3% Do Not Consider, 47% Require pass only, 14% Prefer but do not require target score, 36% Require target score
- **USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)**: 9% Do Not Consider, 24% Require pass only, 33% Prefer but do not require target score, 34% Require target score
- **USMLE Step 3**: 71% Do Not Consider, 5% Require pass only, 18% Prefer but do not require target score, 5% Require target score

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

¹DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

**Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually**

- 98% in the 76-99% category
- 0% in the 25% or fewer category
- 0% in the 26-50% category
- 0% in the 51-75% category
- 2% in the 76-99% category

**Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format**

- 45% for ERAS Interview Scheduler
- 30% for Thalamus Interview Management Solution
- 13% for Interview Broker
- 9% for Internal process developed for and by my program
- 3% for Other

N= 65 for the first graph and N= 64 for the second graph.
Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy

Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy

Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

- Program Website: 2%
- Social Media: 10%
- FREIDA or other online databases: 6%
- Virtual "Open Houses" or residency fairs: 14%
- Virtual away rotations: 9%
- Other virtual events with applicants: 20%

N= 63
Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- Yes: 76%
- No: 0%
- Do Not Know: 24%

N= 59

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- Non-clinical “first-look” opportunities: 53%
- Interview itself: 78%
- Second visits: 13%
- I don't know yet: 31%

N= 45
Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022¹

Virtual Recruitment Circumstance

- Creating new web-based info materials about program
- More applications to cull through
- Fewer applications to cull through
- Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform
- Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary
- Time to train staff to use online mtg software
- Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute
- Tech issues during interviews
- Ensuring confidentiality of interviews
- Assessment of applicant competency
  - Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program
  - Assessment of applicant interpersonal skills, alignment with interview team
  - Assessment of whether program showcased adequately
- Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses
- Fewer cancelled interviews
- More efficiency of interview process
- More flexibility for interview dates
- More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.
- Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.
- More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process
- Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022¹

Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review

- Yes: 73%
- No: 27%

Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications

- Slightly: 33%
- Moderately: 33%
- Considerably: 33%
- A great deal: 33%
- Not at all: 33%

Reliance on another holistic review model

- Yes: 45%
- No: 55%

Source of non-EACM holistic review model

- Specialty designed one: 6%
- Institution designed one: 94%

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

- Increase resident diversity: 93%
- Identify promising applicants: 86%
- Improve applicant program alignment: 79%
- Support institution mission better: 63%
- Other factor(s): 5%

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

- Applicant personal attributes: 95%, Rating: 4.3
- Applicant interests: 89%, Rating: 4.1
- Applicant interpersonal skills, ethics, and professionalism: 80%, Rating: 4.7
- Applicant personal experiences: 88%, Rating: 3.9
- Applicant geographic preferences: 54%, Rating: 3.7
- Other component or components: 13%, Rating: 4.7

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation
Total N = 28
Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 25)

Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quota</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications received</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications rejected</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications receiving</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview invitations</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants interviewed</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants ranked</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure PD_PMR-2
Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 22)

Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications
- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_PMR-3
Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021

Applications received

Applications rejected based on standardized screen

Applications receiving holistic review

Interview invitations sent

Interview invitations cancelled by applicants

Applicants interviewed

Applicants ranked
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Figure PD_PMR-4
Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities

Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

Interviewing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Interviewing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>95% (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>100% (Never)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>60% (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>65% (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>50% (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>50% (Often)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>100% (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>100% (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>45% (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>50% (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>40% (Often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>30% (Often)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

**US MD Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 25%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 35%
  - Require target score: 40%

- **USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)**
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 45%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 20%
  - Require target score: 58%

- **USMLE Step 3**
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 16%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 21%
  - Require target score: 5%

**IMG Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 27%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 47%
  - Require target score: 0%

- **USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)**
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 47%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 33%
  - Require target score: 0%

- **USMLE Step 3**
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 13%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 20%
  - Require target score: 13%

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Do not consider</th>
<th>Require pass only</th>
<th>Prefer but do not require target score</th>
<th>Require target score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 (CK)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 2 (CE)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

*NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022*
Figure PD_PMR-7
Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually

Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022¹

**Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy**

- **Program Website**: 33% (Significant), 29% (Moderate), 10% (Modest), 9% (No)
- **Social Media**: 42% (Significant), 21% (Moderate), 24% (Modest), 4% (No)
- **FREIDA or other online databases**: 25% (Significant), 38% (Moderate), 24% (Modest), 13% (No)
- **Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs**: 38% (Significant), 43% (Moderate), 17% (Modest), 14% (No)
- **Virtual away rotations**: 4% (Significant), 22% (Moderate), 57% (Moderate), 77% (No)
- **Other virtual events with applicants**: 13% (Significant), 24% (Moderate), 33% (Somewhat), 17% (No)

**Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy**

- **Program Website**: 33% (Significantly), 33% (Moderately), 38% (Somewhat), 17% (Not)
- **Social Media**: 42% (Significantly), 17% (Moderately), 43% (Somewhat), 52% (Not)
- **FREIDA or other online databases**: 25% (Significantly), 46% (Moderately), 19% (Somewhat), 26% (Not)
- **Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs**: 17% (Significantly), 52% (Moderately), 26% (Somewhat), 4% (Not)
- **Virtual away rotations**: 5% (Significantly), 19% (Moderately), 57% (Somewhat), 52% (Not)
- **Other virtual events with applicants**: 17% (Significantly), 30% (Moderately), 33% (Somewhat), 33% (Not)

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

N= 22

- Program Website: 5%
- Social Media: 18%
- FREIDA or other online databases: 5%
- Virtual "Open Houses" or residency fairs: 0%
- Virtual away rotations: 19%
- Other virtual events with applicants: 17%
**Summary of Program Virtual Experience**

**Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022**

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- **Yes:** 50%
- **No:** 5%
- **Do Not Know:** 45%

N= 20

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- **Non-clinical “first-look” opportunities:** 80%
- **Interview itself:** 80%
- **Second visits:** 10%
- **I don't know yet:** 10%

N= 10

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Virtual Recruitment Circumstance

- Creating new web-based info materials about program: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 27% Slight Disadv, 23% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 18% Slight Adv, 9% Mod/Sig Adv, 14% N/A
- More applications to cull through: 14% Mod/Sig Disadv, 9% Slight Disadv, 27% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 18% Slight Adv, 9% Mod/Sig Adv, 14% N/A
- Fewer applications to cull through: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 14% Slight Disadv, 9% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 14% Slight Adv, 45% Mod/Sig Adv, 5% N/A
- Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 14% Slight Disadv, 27% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 50% Slight Adv, 5% Mod/Sig Adv, 9% N/A
- Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary: 9% Mod/Sig Disadv, 27% Slight Disadv, 5% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 36% Slight Adv, 9% Mod/Sig Adv, 9% N/A
- Time to train staff to use online mtg software: 9% Mod/Sig Disadv, 32% Slight Disadv, 41% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 23% Slight Adv, 32% Mod/Sig Adv, 9% N/A
- Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute: 14% Mod/Sig Disadv, 41% Slight Disadv, 45% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 32% Slight Adv, 18% Mod/Sig Adv, 9% N/A
- Tech issues during interviews: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 18% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 32% Slight Adv, 32% Mod/Sig Adv, 14% N/A
- Ensuring confidentiality of interviews: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 18% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 9% Slight Adv, 55% Mod/Sig Adv, 5% N/A
- Assessment of applicant competency: 14% Mod/Sig Disadv, 9% Slight Disadv, 41% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 27% Slight Adv, 55% Mod/Sig Adv, 9% N/A
- Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 9% Slight Disadv, 9% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 41% Slight Adv, 55% Mod/Sig Adv, 9% N/A
- Assessment of applicant interpersonal skills, alignment with interview team: 9% Mod/Sig Disadv, 14% Slight Disadv, 41% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 27% Slight Adv, 32% Mod/Sig Adv, 9% N/A
- Assessment of whether program showcased adequately: 14% Mod/Sig Disadv, 9% Slight Disadv, 9% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 27% Slight Adv, 32% Mod/Sig Adv, 14% N/A
- Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses: 9% Mod/Sig Disadv, 18% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 9% Slight Adv, 55% Mod/Sig Adv, 9% N/A
- Fewer cancelled interviews: 9% Mod/Sig Disadv, 14% Slight Disadv, 55% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 23% Slight Adv, 32% Mod/Sig Adv, 14% N/A
- More efficiency of interview process: 14% Mod/Sig Disadv, 9% Slight Disadv, 41% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 27% Slight Adv, 32% Mod/Sig Adv, 9% N/A
- More flexibility for interview dates: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 43% Slight Disadv, 41% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 14% Slight Adv, 9% Mod/Sig Adv, 9% N/A
- More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 45% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 9% Slight Adv, 36% Mod/Sig Adv, 5% N/A
- Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 36% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 5% Slight Adv, 41% Mod/Sig Adv, 5% N/A
- More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 5% Slight Disadv, 36% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 18% Slight Adv, 32% Mod/Sig Adv, 5% N/A
- Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants: 14% Mod/Sig Disadv, 27% Slight Disadv, 32% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 32% Slight Adv, 9% Mod/Sig Adv, 5% N/A

Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022¹

Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review

- Yes: 23%
- No: 77%

N= 22

Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications

- Slightly: 80%
- Moderately: 20%

N= 5

Reliance on another holistic review model

- Yes: 29%
- No: 71%

N= 17

Source of non-EACM holistic review model

- Specialty designed one: 60%
- Institution designed one: 40%

N= 5

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review

- Increase resident diversity: 95%
- Identify promising applicants: 86%
- Improve applicant program alignment: 82%
- Support institution mission better: 77%
- Other factor(s): 0%

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

- Applicant personal attributes: 95% (Rating: 4.3)
- Applicant interests: 82% (Rating: 4.1)
- Applicant interpersonal skills, ethics, and professionalism: 91% (Rating: 4.6)
- Applicant personal experiences: 91% (Rating: 4.0)
- Applicant geographic preferences: 41% (Rating: 4.1)
- Other component or components: 9% (Rating: 4.5)

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Plastic Surgery (Integrated)
Total N = 17
Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022

Quota: 2
Applications received: 313
Applications rejected based on standardized: 69
Applications receiving holistic review: 241
Interview invitations sent: 42
Applicants interviewed: 37
Applicants ranked: 32
Figure PD_PS-2
Plastic Surgery (Integrated)
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 12)

Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022
Figure PD_PS-3
Plastic Surgery (Integrated)
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021

Applications received

Applications rejected based on standardized screen

Applications receiving holistic review

Interview invitations sent

Interview invitations cancelled by applicants

Applicants interviewed

Applicants ranked

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_PS-5
Plastic Surgery (Integrated)
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

US MD Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Do Not Consider</th>
<th>Require pass only</th>
<th>Prefer but do not require target score</th>
<th>Require target score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 CK</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 3</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMG Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Do Not Consider</th>
<th>Require pass only</th>
<th>Prefer but do not require target score</th>
<th>Require target score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 1</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 CK</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 3</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

US DO Applicants

- USMLE Step 1
  - Do not consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 22%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 44%
  - Require target score: 11%

- USMLE Step 2 (CK)
  - Do not consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 11%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 44%
  - Require target score: 11%

- USMLE Step 3
  - Do not consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 11%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 33%
  - Require target score: 22%

- COMLEX-USA Level 1
  - Do not consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 11%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 33%
  - Require target score: 22%

- COMLEX-USA Level 2 (CE)
  - Do not consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 11%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 33%
  - Require target score: 11%

- COMLEX-USA Level 3
  - Do not consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 11%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 22%
  - Require target score: 22%

¹DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually

- 25% or fewer: 0%
- 26-50%: 0%
- 51-75%: 0%
- 76-99%: 8%
- 100%: 92%

N= 12

Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format

- ERAS Interview Scheduler: 25%
- Thalamus Interview Management Solution: 25%
- Interview Broker: 0%
- Internal process developed for and by my program: 42%
- Other: 8%

N= 12
Figure PD_PS-8
Plastic Surgery (Integrated)
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022¹

Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>N= 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual &quot;Open Houses&quot; or residency fairs</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

- Program Website: 8%
- Social Media: 8%
- FREIDA or other online databases: 0%
- Virtual "Open Houses" or residency fairs: 18%
- Virtual away rotations: 0%
- Other virtual events with applicants: 13%

N= 12
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

**Figure PD_PS-10**

**Plastic Surgery (Integrated)**

**Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022**

**Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future**

- Yes: 50%
- No: 8%
- Do Not Know: 42%

N= 12

**Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process**

- Non-clinical “first-look” opportunities: 50%
- Interview itself: 67%
- Second visits: 0%
- I don’t know yet: 33%

N= 6
Virtual Recruitment Circumstance

- Creating new web-based info materials about program: 42% Mod/Sig Adv, 33% Slight Adv, 25% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 17% Slight Disadv, 17% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- More applications to cull through: 17% Mod/Sig Adv, 33% Slight Adv, 25% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 17% Slight Disadv, 17% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- Fewer applications to cull through: 8% Mod/Sig Adv, 33% Slight Adv, 50% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 17% Slight Disadv, 17% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform: 17% Mod/Sig Adv, 33% Slight Adv, 50% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 8% Slight Disadv, 8% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary: 33% Mod/Sig Adv, 33% Slight Adv, 8% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 8% Slight Disadv, 8% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- Time to train staff to use online mtg software: 8% Mod/Sig Adv, 8% Slight Adv, 50% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 25% Slight Disadv, 25% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute: 8% Mod/Sig Adv, 8% Slight Adv, 50% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 25% Slight Disadv, 25% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- Tech issues during interviews: 17% Mod/Sig Adv, 25% Slight Adv, 58% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 25% Slight Disadv, 25% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- Ensuring confidentiality of interviews: 17% Mod/Sig Adv, 25% Slight Adv, 50% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 50% Slight Disadv, 25% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- Assessment of applicant competency: 17% Mod/Sig Adv, 25% Slight Adv, 50% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 50% Slight Disadv, 25% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program: 17% Mod/Sig Adv, 25% Slight Adv, 50% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 50% Slight Disadv, 25% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- Assessment of applicant interpersonal skills, alignment with interview team: 17% Mod/Sig Adv, 25% Slight Adv, 50% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 50% Slight Disadv, 25% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- Assessment of whether program showcased adequately: 17% Mod/Sig Adv, 25% Slight Adv, 50% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 50% Slight Disadv, 25% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses: 8% Mod/Sig Adv, 17% Slight Adv, 8% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 56% Slight Disadv, 25% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- Fewer cancelled interviews: 8% Mod/Sig Adv, 17% Slight Adv, 50% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 8% Slight Disadv, 58% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- More efficiency of interview process: 8% Mod/Sig Adv, 17% Slight Adv, 33% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 33% Slight Disadv, 33% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- More flexibility for interview dates: 8% Mod/Sig Adv, 17% Slight Adv, 33% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 50% Slight Disadv, 58% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.: 8% Mod/Sig Adv, 17% Slight Adv, 33% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 50% Slight Disadv, 58% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.: 8% Mod/Sig Adv, 17% Slight Adv, 33% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 50% Slight Disadv, 58% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process: 8% Mod/Sig Adv, 33% Slight Adv, 58% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 67% Slight Disadv, 8% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A
- Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants: 8% Mod/Sig Adv, 33% Slight Adv, 58% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 67% Slight Disadv, 8% Mod/Sig Disadv, 8% N/A

N=12

¹ Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review</th>
<th>Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review**
  - Yes: 64%
  - No: 36%

- **Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications**
  - Slightly: 25%
  - Moderately: 25%
  - Considerably: 25%
  - A great deal: 25%
  - Not at all: 25%

- **Reliance on another holistic review model**
  - Yes: 14%
  - No: 86%

- **Source of non-EACM holistic review model**
  - 100%

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review) , 2022

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Psychiatry
Total N = 93
Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022

- Quota: 8
- Applications received: 977
- Applications rejected based on standardized: 393
- Applications receiving holistic review: 452
- Interview invitations sent: 105
- Applicants interviewed: 92
- Applicants ranked: 82
### Psychiatry

**Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities**

(Total N = 72)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>260 NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

- **Rejected based on standardized screen**
- **Received holistic review**

---

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_PSY-3
Psychiatry
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_PSY-5
Psychiatry
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

US MD Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USMLE Step 1</th>
<th>USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)</th>
<th>USMLE Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Consider</td>
<td>Require pass only</td>
<td>Prefer but do not require target score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMG Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USMLE Step 1</th>
<th>USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)</th>
<th>USMLE Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Consider</td>
<td>Require pass only</td>
<td>Prefer but do not require target score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

N= 71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examination</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 1</td>
<td>Do not consider: 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 (CK)</td>
<td>Require pass only: 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 3</td>
<td>Prefer but do not require target score: 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 1</td>
<td>Require target score: 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 2 (CE)</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 3</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they “seldom” or “often” consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually

- 0% or fewer: 0%
- 26-50%: 0%
- 51-75%: 0%
- 76-99%: 1%
- 100%: 99%

N= 78

Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format

- ERAS Interview Scheduler: 47%
- Thalamus Interview Management Solution: 17%
- Interview Broker: 4%
- Internal process developed for and by my program: 29%
- Other: 3%

N= 78
Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy

Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

- Program Website: 6%
- Social Media: 32%
- FREIDA or other online databases: 5%
- Virtual "Open Houses" or residency fairs: 19%
- Virtual away rotations: 13%
- Other virtual events with applicants: 21%

N= 77
Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- Yes: 56%
- No: 5%
- Do Not Know: 39%

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- Non-clinical “first-look” opportunities: 60%
- Interview itself: 86%
- Second visits: 12%
- I don’t know yet: 17%

N= 75
N= 42
Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022¹

Virtual Recruitment Circumstance

- Creating new web-based info materials about program
- More applications to cull through
- Fewer applications to cull through
- Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform
- Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary
- Time to train staff to use online mtg software
- Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute
- Tech issues during interviews
- Ensuring confidentiality of interviews
- Assessment of applicant competency
- Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program
- Assessment of applicant interpersonal skills, alignment with interview team
- Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses
- Fewer cancelled interviews
- More efficiency of interview process
- More flexibility for interview dates
- More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.
- Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.
- More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process
- Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants

N= 76

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review</th>
<th>Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Considerably</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliance on another holistic review model</th>
<th>Source of non-EACM holistic review model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Reliance on another holistic review model" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Source of non-EACM holistic review model" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty designed one</th>
<th>Institution designed one</th>
<th>Program created one on its own</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_PSY-13
Psychiatry
Summary of Program Holistic Review

Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

- Increase resident diversity: 78%
- Identify promising applicants: 69%
- Improve applicant program alignment: 69%
- Support institution mission better: 68%
- Other factor(s): 9%

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

- Applicant personal attributes: 82%, Mean Rating: 4.4
- Applicant interests: 86%, Mean Rating: 4.1
- Applicant interpersonal skills, ethics, and professionalism: 77%, Mean Rating: 4.8
- Applicant personal experiences: 80%, Mean Rating: 3.9
- Applicant geographic preferences: 68%, Mean Rating: 4.4
- Other component or components: 15%, Mean Rating: 4.6

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Radiation Oncology
Total N = 23
Radiation Oncology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 22 )

Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022
Figure PD_RO-2
Radiation Oncology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 22)

Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications
- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_RO-3
Radiation Oncology
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021

- Applications received: N=21

- Applications rejected based on standardized screen: N=20

- Applications receiving holistic review: N=19

- Interview invitations sent: N=20

- Interview invitations cancelled by applicants: N=19

- Applicants interviewed: N=20

- Applicants ranked: N=20

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

Interviewing

- **US MD Sr**: 100% Often, 0% Seldom, 0% Never
- **US DO Sr**: 60% Often, 30% Seldom, 10% Never
- **US MD Grad**: 30% Often, 60% Seldom, 10% Never
- **US DO Grad**: 20% Often, 20% Seldom, 60% Never
- **US IMG**: 20% Often, 10% Seldom, 70% Never
- **Non-US IMG**: 15% Often, 15% Seldom, 70% Never

Ranking

- **US MD Sr**: 100% Often, 0% Seldom, 0% Never
- **US DO Sr**: 65% Often, 25% Seldom, 10% Never
- **US MD Grad**: 40% Often, 50% Seldom, 10% Never
- **US DO Grad**: 25% Often, 50% Seldom, 25% Never
- **US IMG**: 30% Often, 55% Seldom, 15% Never
- **Non-US IMG**: 20% Often, 60% Seldom, 20% Never

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

**US MD Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**
  - Do Not Consider: 5%
  - Require pass only: 42%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 37%
  - Require target score: 16%

- **USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)**
  - Do Not Consider: 16%
  - Require pass only: 21%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 53%
  - Require target score: 11%

- **USMLE Step 3**
  - Do Not Consider: 41%
  - Require pass only: 18%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 35%
  - Require target score: 6%

**IMG Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 44%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 39%
  - Require target score: 17%

- **USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)**
  - Do Not Consider: 11%
  - Require pass only: 22%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 56%
  - Require target score: 11%

- **USMLE Step 3**
  - Do Not Consider: 33%
  - Require pass only: 22%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 39%
  - Require target score: 6%

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Do not consider</th>
<th>Require pass only</th>
<th>Prefer but do not require target score</th>
<th>Require target score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 (CK)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 2 (CE)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually

Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022¹

Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy

Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_RO-9
Radiation Oncology
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

- Program Website: 0%
- Social Media: 11%
- FREIDA or other online databases: 6%
- Virtual "Open Houses" or residency fairs: 12%
- Virtual away rotations: 19%
- Other virtual events with applicants: 6%

N= 21
Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- Yes: 40%
- No: 10%
- Do Not Know: 50%

N= 20

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- Non-clinical "first-look" opportunities: 25%
- Interview itself: 75%
- Second visits: 0%
- I don't know yet: 38%

N= 8
Virtual Recruitment Circumstance

- Creating new web-based info materials about program: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 11% Slight Disadv, 32% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 32% Slight Advantage, 32% Mod/Sig Adv, 21% N/A
- More applications to cull through: 16% Mod/Sig Disadv, 53% Slight Disadv, 6% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 5% Slight Advantage, 5% Mod/Sig Adv, 16% N/A
- Fewer applications to cull through: 11% Mod/Sig Disadv, 21% Slight Disadv, 61% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 5% Slight Advantage, 5% Mod/Sig Adv, 26% N/A
- Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform: 11% Mod/Sig Disadv, 22% Slight Disadv, 61% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 6% Slight Advantage, 6% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary: 22% Mod/Sig Disadv, 22% Slight Disadv, 61% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 6% Slight Advantage, 6% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- Time to train staff to use online mtg software: 6% Mod/Sig Disadv, 39% Slight Disadv, 56% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 6% Slight Advantage, 6% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute: 6% Mod/Sig Disadv, 39% Slight Disadv, 50% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 6% Slight Advantage, 6% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- Tech issues during interviews: 22% Mod/Sig Disadv, 22% Slight Disadv, 72% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 6% Slight Advantage, 6% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- Ensuring confidentiality of interviews: 6% Mod/Sig Disadv, 22% Slight Disadv, 61% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 6% Slight Advantage, 6% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- Assessment of applicant competency: 6% Mod/Sig Disadv, 33% Slight Disadv, 28% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 33% Slight Advantage, 33% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program: 6% Mod/Sig Disadv, 33% Slight Disadv, 28% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 33% Slight Advantage, 33% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- Assessment of applicant interpersonal skills, alignment with interview team: 6% Mod/Sig Disadv, 33% Slight Disadv, 28% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 33% Slight Advantage, 33% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- Assessment of whether program showcased adequately: 6% Mod/Sig Disadv, 33% Slight Disadv, 28% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 33% Slight Advantage, 33% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses: 6% Mod/Sig Disadv, 11% Slight Disadv, 28% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 28% Slight Advantage, 28% Mod/Sig Adv, 11% N/A
- Fewer cancelled interviews: 11% Mod/Sig Disadv, 17% Slight Disadv, 44% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 28% Slight Advantage, 17% Mod/Sig Adv, 11% N/A
- More efficiency of interview process: 39% Mod/Sig Disadv, 50% Slight Disadv, 39% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 39% Slight Advantage, 39% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- More flexibility for interview dates: 6% Mod/Sig Disadv, 6% Slight Disadv, 56% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 6% Slight Advantage, 6% Mod/Sig Adv, 26% N/A
- More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.: 6% Mod/Sig Disadv, 50% Slight Disadv, 17% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 17% Slight Advantage, 17% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.: 6% Mod/Sig Disadv, 50% Slight Disadv, 17% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 17% Slight Advantage, 17% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process: 6% Mod/Sig Disadv, 6% Slight Disadv, 61% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 17% Slight Advantage, 17% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A
- Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants: 6% Mod/Sig Disadv, 6% Slight Disadv, 56% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 17% Slight Advantage, 17% Mod/Sig Adv, 6% N/A

N= 19

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022¹

Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review

- Yes: 29%
- No: 71%

N = 21

Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications

- Slightly: 50%
- Moderately: 17%
- Considerably: 33%

N = 6

Reliance on another holistic review model

- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%

N = 15

Source of non-EACM holistic review model

- Specialty designed one
- Institution designed one
- Program created one on its own

N = 0

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

- Increase resident diversity: 76%
- Identify promising applicants: 100%
- Improve applicant program alignment: 67%
- Support institution mission better: 67%
- Other factor(s): 5%

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

- Applicant personal attributes: 100% (4.5)
- Applicant interests: 100% (4.2)
- Applicant interpersonal skills, ethics, and professionalism: 76% (4.4)
- Applicant personal experiences: 86% (4.0)
- Applicant geographic preferences: 43% (3.7)
- Other component or components: 5% (5.0)

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Radiology-Diagnostic
Total N = 61
Figure PD_RD-1
Radiology-Diagnostic
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 49)

Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022

- Applications received: 786
- Applications rejected based on standardized: 304
- Applications receiving holistic review: 431
- Interview invitations sent: 116
- Applicants interviewed: 106
- Applicants ranked: 101
Figure PD_RD-2
Radiology-Diagnostic
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 46)

Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications
- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review
Figure PD_RD-3
Radiology-Diagnostic
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021

Applications received

- More than 25% fewer: 0%
- 10-25% fewer: 0%
- About the same (+/-10%): 22%
- 10-25% more: 61%
- More than 25% more: 17%

Applications rejected based on standardized screen

- More than 25% fewer: 0%
- 10-25% fewer: 2%
- About the same (+/-10%): 76%
- 10-25% more: 20%
- More than 25% more: 2%

Applications receiving holistic review

- More than 25% fewer: 0%
- 10-25% fewer: 0%
- About the same (+/-10%): 68%
- 10-25% more: 25%
- More than 25% more: 7%

Interview invitations sent

- More than 25% fewer: 0%
- 10-25% fewer: 13%
- About the same (+/-10%): 70%
- 10-25% more: 15%
- More than 25% more: 2%

Interview invitations cancelled by applicants

- More than 25% fewer: 0%
- 10-25% fewer: 11%
- About the same (+/-10%): 22%
- 10-25% more: 62%
- More than 25% more: 4%

Applicants interviewed

- More than 25% fewer: 4%
- 10-25% fewer: 0%
- About the same (+/-10%): 67%
- 10-25% more: 18%
- More than 25% more: 2%

Applicants ranked

- More than 25% fewer: 0%
- 10-25% fewer: 11%
- About the same (+/-10%): 71%
- 10-25% more: 16%
- More than 25% more: 2%
Figure PD_RD-4
Radiology-Diagnostic
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities

Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

**Interviewing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ranking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US MD Sr</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Sr</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US MD Grad</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DO Grad</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US IMG</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US IMG</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022

**US MD Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 10%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 2%
  - Require target score: 60%

- **USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)**
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 10%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 62%
  - Require target score: 0%

- **USMLE Step 3**
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 25%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 70%
  - Require target score: 5%

**IMG Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 8%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 29%
  - Require target score: 63%

- **USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)**
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 53%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 39%
  - Require target score: 5%

- **USMLE Step 3**
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 32%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 63%
  - Require target score: 5%

---

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_RD-6
Radiology-Diagnostic
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examination</th>
<th>Do not consider</th>
<th>Require pass only</th>
<th>Prefer but do not require target score</th>
<th>Require target score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 (CK)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 3</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 2 (CE)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMLEX-USA Level 3</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually

Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format
Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022¹

Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>No Reliance</th>
<th>Modest Reliance</th>
<th>Moderate Reliance</th>
<th>Significant Reliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual &quot;Open Houses&quot; or residency fairs</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Not Beneficial</th>
<th>Somewhat Beneficial</th>
<th>Moderately Beneficial</th>
<th>Significantly Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual &quot;Open Houses&quot; or residency fairs</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

- Program Website: 2%
- Social Media: 5%
- FREIDA or other online databases: 2%
- Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs: 13%
- Virtual away rotations: 6%
- Other virtual events with applicants: 11%

N= 47
Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- Yes: 59%
- No: 10%
- Do Not Know: 32%

N= 41

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- Non-clinical “first-look” opportunities: 46%
- Interview itself: 92%
- Second visits: 25%
- I don’t know yet: 21%

N= 24
Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022

Virtual Recruitment Circumstance

- Creating new web-based info materials about program: 7% Mod/Sig Disadv, 17% Slight Disadv, 39% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 20% Slight Advantage, 7% Mod/Sig Adv, 15% N/A.
- More applications to cull through: 23% Mod/Sig Disadv, 23% Slight Disadv, 28% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 20% Slight Advantage, 15% Mod/Sig Adv, 5% N/A.
- Fewer applications to cull through: 7% Mod/Sig Disadv, 22% Slight Disadv, 22% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 15% Slight Advantage, 7% Mod/Sig Adv, 5% N/A.
- Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 10% Slight Disadv, 23% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 44% Slight Advantage, 56% Mod/Sig Adv, 3% N/A.
- Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary: 10% Mod/Sig Disadv, 18% Slight Disadv, 60% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 41% Slight Advantage, 3% Mod/Sig Adv, 21% N/A.
- Time to train staff to use online mtg software: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 10% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 41% Slight Advantage, 3% Mod/Sig Adv, 21% N/A.
- Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 10% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 60% Slight Advantage, 15% Mod/Sig Adv, 21% N/A.
- Tech issues during interviews: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 10% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 60% Slight Advantage, 15% Mod/Sig Adv, 21% N/A.
- Ensuring confidentiality of interviews: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 10% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 60% Slight Advantage, 15% Mod/Sig Adv, 21% N/A.
- Assessment of applicant competency: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 10% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 60% Slight Advantage, 15% Mod/Sig Adv, 21% N/A.
- Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 10% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 60% Slight Advantage, 15% Mod/Sig Adv, 21% N/A.
- Assessment of applicant interpersonal skills, alignment with interview team: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 10% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 60% Slight Advantage, 15% Mod/Sig Adv, 21% N/A.
- Assessment of whether program showcased adequately: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 10% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 60% Slight Advantage, 15% Mod/Sig Adv, 21% N/A.
- Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 10% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 60% Slight Advantage, 15% Mod/Sig Adv, 21% N/A.
- Fewer cancelled interviews: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 10% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 60% Slight Advantage, 15% Mod/Sig Adv, 21% N/A.
- More efficiency of interview process: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 10% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 60% Slight Advantage, 15% Mod/Sig Adv, 21% N/A.
- More flexibility for interview dates: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 10% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 60% Slight Advantage, 15% Mod/Sig Adv, 21% N/A.
- More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 10% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 60% Slight Advantage, 15% Mod/Sig Adv, 21% N/A.
- Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 10% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 60% Slight Advantage, 15% Mod/Sig Adv, 21% N/A.
- More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 10% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 60% Slight Advantage, 15% Mod/Sig Adv, 21% N/A.
- Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants: 5% Mod/Sig Disadv, 10% Slight Disadv, 18% Neither Adv Nor Disadv, 60% Slight Advantage, 15% Mod/Sig Adv, 21% N/A.

N= 41

¹ Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022¹

- **Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review**
  - Yes: 24%
  - No: 76%

- **Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications**
  - Slightly: 20%
  - Moderately: 20%
  - Considerably: 30%
  - A great deal: 30%
  - Not at all: 20%

- **Reliance on another holistic review model**
  - Yes: 19%
  - No: 81%

- **Source of non-EACM holistic review model**
  - Specialty designed one: 17%
  - Institution designed one: 83%

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

- Increase resident diversity: 63%
- Identify promising applicants: 80%
- Improve applicant program alignment: 68%
- Support institution mission better: 59%
- Other factor(s): 2%

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Cited (%)</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant personal attributes</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant interests</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant interpersonal skills, ethics, and professionalism</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant personal experiences</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant geographic preferences</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other component or components</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Surgery-General
Total N = 103
Figure PD_GS-1
Surgery-General
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 89)

Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022

- Quota: 6
- Applications received: 1,064
- Applications rejected based on standardized: 614
- Applications receiving holistic review: 399
- Interview invitations sent: 100
- Applicants interviewed: 85
- Applicants ranked: 73

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications

- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review
Figure PD_GS-3
Surgery-General
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021

Applications received

Applications rejected based on standardized screen

Applications receiving holistic review

Interview invitations sent

Interview invitations cancelled by applicants

Applicants interviewed

Applicants ranked

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_GS-4
Surgery-General
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities

Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

*N= 88

*Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_GS-5
Surgery-General
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022

US MD Applicants

- USMLE Step 1
  - Do Not Consider: 53%
  - Require pass only: 25%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 19%
  - Require target score: 2%

- USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)
  - Do Not Consider: 46%
  - Require pass only: 37%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 6%
  - Require target score: 10%

- USMLE Step 3
  - Do Not Consider: 67%
  - Require pass only: 17%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 6%
  - Require target score: 10%

IMG Applicants

- USMLE Step 1
  - Do Not Consider: 54%
  - Require pass only: 25%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 15%
  - Require target score: 6%

- USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)
  - Do Not Consider: 47%
  - Require pass only: 33%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 33%
  - Require target score: 14%

- USMLE Step 3
  - Do Not Consider: 26%
  - Require pass only: 8%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 26%
  - Require target score: 8%

N= 88

N= 72

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

305 NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.

Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.

Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually

- 93% of interviews were conducted virtually.

Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format

- 47% were scheduled using ERAS Interview Scheduler.
- 24% were scheduled using Thalamus Interview Management Solution.
- 7% were scheduled using Other methods.
- 2% were scheduled using Interview Broker.
- 20% were scheduled using an internal process developed for and by the program.
Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022¹

**Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy**

- **Program Website**: 31% Significant, 23% Moderate, 47% Modest, 4% No
- **Social Media**: 9% Significant, 25% Moderate, 9% Modest, 10% No
- **FREIDA or other online databases**: 7% Significant, 25% Moderate, 20% Modest, 10% No
- **Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs**: 16% Significant, 47% Moderate, 23% Modest, 13% No
- **Virtual away rotations**: 1% Significant, 47% Moderate, 86% Modest, 14% No
- **Other virtual events with applicants**: 7% Significant, 20% Moderate, 58% Modest, 14% No

**Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy**

- **Program Website**: 26% Significantly Beneficial, 16% Moderately Beneficial, 43% Somewhat Beneficial, 30% Not Beneficial
- **Social Media**: 1% Significant, 24% Moderately Beneficial, 35% Somewhat Beneficial, 37% Not Beneficial
- **FREIDA or other online databases**: 2% Significant, 24% Moderately Beneficial, 37% Somewhat Beneficial, 48% Not Beneficial
- **Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs**: 12% Significant, 16% Moderately Beneficial, 24% Somewhat Beneficial, 81% Not Beneficial
- **Virtual away rotations**: 4% Significant, 15% Moderately Beneficial, 81% Somewhat Beneficial, 11% Not Beneficial
- **Other virtual events with applicants**: 11% Significant, 20% Moderately Beneficial, 57% Somewhat Beneficial, 16% Not Beneficial

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

- Program Website: 4%
- Social Media: 14%
- FREIDA or other online databases: 5%
- Virtual "Open Houses" or residency fairs: 22%
- Virtual away rotations: 20%
- Other virtual events with applicants: 12%

N= 90
Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- Yes: 64%
- No: 8%
- Do Not Know: 28%

N= 88

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- Non-clinical “first-look” opportunities: 43%
- Interview itself: 80%
- Second visits: 7%
- I don’t know yet: 30%

N= 56
### Virtual Recruitment Circumstance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mod/Sig Disadv</th>
<th>Slight Disadv</th>
<th>Neither Adv Nor Disadv</th>
<th>Slight Advantage</th>
<th>Mod/Sig Adv</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage/Disadvantage</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating new web-based info materials about program</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More applications to cull through</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer applications to cull through</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to train staff to use online mtg software</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech issues during interviews</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring confidentiality of interviews</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant competency</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant interpersonal skills, alignment with interview team</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More efficiency of interview process</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More flexibility for interview dates</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_GS-12
Surgery-General
Summary of Program Holistic Review

Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review</th>
<th>Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considerably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A great deal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N= 84                                      | N= 34                                      |
| 40%                                        | 41%                                        |
| 60%                                        | 29%                                        |
| 18%                                        | 3%                                         |
| 9%                                         | 9%                                         |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliance on another holistic review model</th>
<th>Source of non-EACM holistic review model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Specialty designed one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Institution designed one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program created one on its own</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N= 48                                     | N= 17                                      |
| 35%                                       | 6%                                         |
| 65%                                       | 94%                                        |

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Transitional Year
Total N = 38
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities (Total N = 35)

Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022

- Quota: 10
- Applications received: 744
- Applications rejected based on standardized: 388
- Applications receiving holistic review: 265
- Interview invitations sent: 112
- Applicants interviewed: 102
- Applicants ranked: 90
Figure PD_TY-2
Transitional Year
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 31)

Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications
- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Transitional Year
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021

Applications received

Applications rejected based on standardized screen

Applications receiving holistic review

Interview invitations sent

Interview invitations cancelled by applicants

Applicants interviewed

Applicants ranked

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

Interviewing

- **US MD Sr**: 6% Often, 19% Seldom, 94% Never
- **US DO Sr**: 19% Often, 81% Seldom, 1% Never
- **US MD Grad**: 6% Often, 31% Seldom, 75% Never
- **US DO Grad**: 47% Often, 53% Seldom, 0% Never
- **US IMG**: 25% Often, 50% Seldom, 22% Never
- **Non-US IMG**: 50% Often, 47% Seldom, 3% Never

Ranking

- **US MD Sr**: 3% Often, 13% Seldom, 97% Never
- **US DO Sr**: 10% Often, 3% Seldom, 87% Never
- **US MD Grad**: 19% Often, 23% Seldom, 59% Never
- **US DO Grad**: 28% Often, 52% Seldom, 26% Never
- **US IMG**: 28% Often, 53% Seldom, 19% Never
- **Non-US IMG**: 3% Often, 56% Seldom, 41% Never

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Figure PD_TY-5
Transitional Year
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

**US MD Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 13%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 0%
  - Require target score: 45%
  - Total: 30%

- **USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)**
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 45%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 45%
  - Require target score: 3%
  - Total: 57%

- **USMLE Step 3**
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 77%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 13%
  - Require target score: 6%
  - Total: 86%

**IMG Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 17%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 0%
  - Require target score: 26%
  - Total: 57%

- **USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)**
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 35%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 35%
  - Require target score: 22%
  - Total: 92%

- **USMLE Step 3**
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 65%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 4%
  - Require target score: 9%
  - Total: 84%

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

US DO Applicants

N= 31

¹DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually

- 0% 25% or fewer
- 3% 26-50%
- 0% 51-75%
- 6% 76-99%
- 91% 100%

Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format

- 53% ERAS Interview Scheduler
- 24% Thalamus Interview Management Solution
- 0% Interview Broker
- 21% Internal process developed for and by my program
- 3% Other

N= 34

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Transitional Year
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022¹

**Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Significant Reliance</th>
<th>Moderate Reliance</th>
<th>Modest Reliance</th>
<th>No Reliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Significantly Beneficial</th>
<th>Moderately Beneficial</th>
<th>Somewhat Beneficial</th>
<th>Not Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

- Program Website: 15%
- Social Media: 36%
- FREIDA or other online databases: 19%
- Virtual "Open Houses" or residency fairs: 44%
- Virtual away rotations: 33%
- Other virtual events with applicants: 41%

N= 34
Figure PD_TY-10
Transitional Year
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future

- Yes: 73%
- No: 7%
- Do Not Know: 20%

N = 30

Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process

- Non-clinical “first-look” opportunities: 41%
- Interview itself: 77%
- Second visits: 5%
- I don’t know yet: 18%

N = 22
Figure PD_TY-11
Transitional Year
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022¹

Virtual Recruitment Circumstance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Advantage/Disadvantage</th>
<th>Percentage Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating new web-based info materials about program</td>
<td>16% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More applications to cull through</td>
<td>16% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer applications to cull through</td>
<td>39% Neither Adv Nor Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform</td>
<td>6% Slight Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary</td>
<td>30% Mod/Sig Adv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to train staff to use online mtg software</td>
<td>3% N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute</td>
<td>10% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech issues during interviews</td>
<td>13% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring confidentiality of interviews</td>
<td>10% Neither Adv Nor Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant competency</td>
<td>7% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program</td>
<td>7% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of applicant interpersonal skills, alignment with interview team</td>
<td>3% Neither Adv Nor Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of whether program showcased adequately</td>
<td>3% Slight Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses</td>
<td>20% Mod/Sig Adv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer cancelled interviews</td>
<td>10% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More efficiency of interview process</td>
<td>13% Neither Adv Nor Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More flexibility for interview dates</td>
<td>3% Slight Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.</td>
<td>40% Mod/Sig Adv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.</td>
<td>3% Slight Disadv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process</td>
<td>31% Slight Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants</td>
<td>7% Mod/Sig Disadv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022

1Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

- Increase resident diversity: 79%
- Identify promising applicants: 67%
- Improve applicant program alignment: 45%
- Support institution mission better: 64%
- Other factor(s): 9%

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

- Applicant personal attributes: 85% (mean rating 4.2)
- Applicant interests: 85% (mean rating 3.6)
- Applicant interpersonal skills, ethics, and professionalism: 85% (mean rating 4.4)
- Applicant personal experiences: 79% (mean rating 4.0)
- Applicant geographic preferences: 64% (mean rating 4.0)
- Other component or components: 9% (mean rating 4.3)

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).
Vascular Surgery
Total N = 11
 figure PD_VS-1

Vascular Surgery
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 10 )

Mean Numbers of Applications Received, Interview Invitations, Interviews, and Applicants Ranked, 2022

- Quota: 1
- Applications received: 119
- Applications rejected based on standardized: 31
- Applications receiving holistic review: 105
- Interview invitations sent: 44
- Applicants interviewed: 39
- Applicants ranked: 35
Figure PD_VS-2
Vascular Surgery
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities
(Total N = 10 )

Average Percentage of Applications Rejected and Reviewed, 2022

Percentages of Applications
- Rejected based on standardized screen
- Received holistic review

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_VS-3
Vascular Surgery
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities Compared to 2021

Applications received

Applications rejected based on standardized screen

Applications receiving holistic review

Interview invitations sent

Interview invitations cancelled by applicants

Applicants interviewed

Applicants ranked

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Figure PD_VS-4
Vascular Surgery
Summary of Program Interviewing and Ranking Activities

Percentages of Programs Interviewing and Ranking Candidates by Applicant Type, 2022¹

Interviewing

US MD Sr: 100%
US DO Sr: 44%
US MD Grad: 78%
US DO Grad: 44%
US IMG: 67%
Non-US IMG: 33%

US MD Sr: 22%
US DO Sr: 33%
US MD Grad: 56%
US DO Grad: 33%
US IMG: 56%
Non-US IMG: 33%

Ranking

US MD Sr: 100%
US DO Sr: 44%
US MD Grad: 56%
US DO Grad: 56%
US IMG: 33%
Non-US IMG: 44%

US MD Sr: 22%
US DO Sr: 33%
US MD Grad: 33%
US DO Grad: 11%
US IMG: 56%
Non-US IMG: 33%

N= 9

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Vascular Surgery

Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE to Select US MD and IMG Applicants for Interview, 2022¹ ² ³

**US MD Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**:
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 22%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 44%
  - Require target score: 0%

- **USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)**:
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 11%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 44%
  - Require target score: 22%

- **USMLE Step 3**:
  - Do Not Consider: 0%
  - Require pass only: 0%
  - Prefer but do not require target score: 44%
  - Require target score: 0%

**IMG Applicants**

- **USMLE Step 1**: 0%
- **USMLE Step 2 Clinical Knowledge (CK)**: 0%
- **USMLE Step 3**: 33%

¹Seniors and graduates are considered together.
²Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider MD senior and/or graduate, or IMG applicants for interview.
³Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Use of Standardized Licensure Exams to Select Applicants for Interview

Percentages of Programs Using USMLE and COMLEX-USA to Select DO Applicants for Interview, 2022

1DO seniors and DO graduates are considered together.
2Total number of respondents who indicated they "seldom" or "often" consider DO senior, DO graduate, or both types of applicants for interview.
3Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Impact of Virtual Experience on Applicants Interviewed, 2022

Average Percentage of Program Interviews conducted Virtually

- 0% of programs conducted 25% or fewer of interviews virtually
- 0% of programs conducted 26-50% of interviews virtually
- 0% of programs conducted 51-75% of interviews virtually
- 0% of programs conducted 76-99% of interviews virtually
- 100% of programs conducted 100% of interviews virtually (N=9)

Average Percentage of Program Interviews Scheduled by Discrete Scheduling Format

- 44% of programs used ERAS Interview Scheduler
- 11% of programs used Thalamus Interview Management Solution
- 0% of programs used Interview Broker
- 33% of programs used an internal process developed for and by their program
- 11% of programs used other methods (N=9)
Figure PD_VS-8
Vascular Surgery
Summary of Program Virtual Experience

Reliance on and Perceived Benefits of Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022¹

Reliance on Virtual Engagement Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Significant Reliance</th>
<th>Moderate Reliance</th>
<th>Modest Reliance</th>
<th>No Reliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual &quot;Open Houses&quot; or residency fairs</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefit of Virtual Engagement Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Significantly Beneficial</th>
<th>Moderately Beneficial</th>
<th>Somewhat Beneficial</th>
<th>Not Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual &quot;Open Houses&quot; or residency fairs</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
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First Time Reliance on Applicant Engagement Strategies, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIDA or other online databases</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual “Open Houses” or residency fairs</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual away rotations</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other virtual events with applicants</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 9
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Intention to Rely on Virtual Recruitment for Future Match Cycles, 2022

**Percentage of programs that anticipate continuing either part or all of the interview process in a virtual environment in the future**

- Yes: 25%
- No: 38%
- Do Not Know: 38%

**Percentage of programs that envision a virtual environment for discrete component of the interview process**

- Non-clinical “first-look” opportunities: 50%
- Interview itself: 100%
- Second visits: 0%
- I don’t know yet: 0%

N= 8

N= 2
Perceived Advantages/Disadvantages of Virtual Recruitment, 2022¹

Virtual Recruitment Circumstance

- Creating new web-based info materials about program: 11%
- More applications to cull through: 11%
- Fewer applications to cull through: 44%
- Time/ability to research, select online mtg platform: 44%
- Time to create virtual interview agenda/itinerary: 33%
- Time to train staff to use online mtg software: 44%
- Applicants cancelling interviews at last minute: 22%
- Tech issues during interviews: 44%
- Ensuring confidentiality of interviews: 11%
- Assessment of applicant competency: 11%
- Assessment of applicant interest in and understanding of program: 22%
- Assessment of applicant interpersonal skills, alignment with interview team: 11%
- Assessment of whether program showcased adequately: 22%
- Reduced applicant-related hosting expenses: 56%
- Fewer cancelled interviews: 22%
- More efficiency of interview process: 44%
- More flexibility for interview dates: 33%
- More difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.: 11%
- Less difficulty of scheduling interviews for applicants outside U.S.: 11%
- More access to faculty and residents to participate in interview process: 11%
- Need for more outreach to identify and capture interested applicants: 11%

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

NRMP Program Director Survey Results, 2022
Familiarity with and Use of the AAMC EACM Model of Holistic Review and Other Holistic Review Models, 2022¹

Familiar with EACM Model of Holistic Review

- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%

N= 7

Extent of EACM use in reviewing applications

- Slightly
- Moderately
- Considerably
- A great deal
- Not at all

Reliance on another holistic review model

- Yes: 14%
- No: 86%

N= 7

Source of non-EACM holistic review model

- Specialty designed one
- Institution designed one
- Program created one on its own

N= 1

¹Some percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.
Drivers for Engaging in Holistic Review (For Those Indicating that they Performed Holistic Review), 2022

- Increase resident diversity: 71%
- Identify promising applicants: 71%
- Improve applicant program alignment: 29%
- Support institution mission better: 29%
- Other factor(s): 14%

Percentage of Programs Citing Discrete Factors and Mean Importance Rating¹ of Said Factors, 2022

1. Applicant personal attributes: 86% (Rating: 4.5)
2. Applicant interests: 71% (Rating: 4.6)
3. Applicant interpersonal skills, ethics, and professionalism: 71% (Rating: 4.2)
4. Applicant personal experiences: 71% (Rating: 4.0)
5. Applicant geographic preferences: 14% (Rating: 5.0)
6. Other component or components: 14% (Rating: 5.0)

¹ Ratings on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important).