

Sehdev M, Schnapp B, Dubosh NM. Measuring and predicting faculty consensus rankings of standardized letters of evaluation. *J Grad Med Educ.* 2024;16(1):51-58. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-22-00901.1>

Supplementary Data

FIGURE 1

Emergency Medicine Standardized Letter of Evaluation (2021-2022)

OFFICIAL CORD STANDARDIZED LETTER OF EVALUATION (SLOE)

Emergency Medicine Faculty ONLY

I have read this year's instructions @ www.cordem.org Yes No

| | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|---|
| Applicant's Name: | <input type="text"/> | AAMC ERAS ID No. | <input type="text"/> |
| Institution: | <input type="text"/> | Email: | <input type="text"/> |
| Reference Provided By: | <input type="text"/> | Telephone: | <input type="text"/> |
| | | Present Position: | <input type="text" value="Select One"/> |

A. Background Information

1. How long have you known the applicant?

2. Nature of contact with applicant: (Check all that apply)

- Know indirectly through others/evaluations Extended, direct observation in the ED
 Clinical contact outside the ED Advisor
 Occasional contact (<10 hours) in the ED Other:

3. a. Did this candidate rotate in your ED? Yes No

b. If so, what grade was given?

- Honors High Pass Pass Low Pass Fail

4. Is this the student's first, second or third EM rotation?

What date(s) did this student rotate at your institution? (mm/yy)

5. Indicate what % of students rotating in your Emergency Department received the following grades last academic year:

| | | |
|-------------|----------------------|--|
| Honors % | <input type="text"/> | Total # students last year: <input type="text"/> |
| High Pass % | <input type="text"/> | |
| Pass % | <input type="text"/> | |
| Low Pass % | <input type="text"/> | |
| Fail % | <input type="text"/> | |
| 100 % Total | | |

EM is a required rotation for all students at our institution? Yes No

B. Qualifications for EM. Compare the applicant to other EM applicants/peers.

1. Commitment to Emergency Medicine. Has carefully thought out this career choice.
 Above Peers (Top 1/3) At level of peers (Middle 1/3) Below peers (Lower 1/3)
2. Work ethic, willingness to assume responsibility.
 Above Peers (Top 1/3) At level of peers (Middle 1/3) Below peers (Lower 1/3)
3. Ability to develop and justify an appropriate differential and a cohesive treatment plan.
 Above Peers (Top 1/3) At level of peers (Middle 1/3) Below peers (Lower 1/3)
4. Ability to work with a team.
 Above Peers (Top 1/3) At level of peers (Middle 1/3) Below peers (Lower 1/3)
5. Ability to communicate a caring nature to patients.
 Above Peers (Top 1/3) At level of peers (Middle 1/3) Below peers (Lower 1/3)
6. How much guidance do you predict this applicant will need during residency?
 Less than peers The same as peers More than peers
7. Given the necessary guidance, what is your prediction of success for the applicant?
 Outstanding Excellent Good

C. Global Assessment

1. Compared to other EM residency candidates you have recommended in the last academic year, this candidate is in the:

| Ranking | # Recommended in each category last academic year |
|----------------------------------|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Top 10% | <input type="text"/> |
| <input type="radio"/> Top 1/3 | <input type="text"/> |
| <input type="radio"/> Middle 1/3 | <input type="text"/> |
| <input type="radio"/> Lower 1/3 | <input type="text"/> |

Total Number of letters you wrote last year:

2. a. Are you currently on the committee that determines the final rank list? Yes No
- b. How highly would you estimate the candidate will reside on your rank list? (see instructions if questions)
 Top 10%
 Top 1/3
 Middle 1/3
 Lower 1/3
 Unlikely to be on our rank list

Sehdev M, Schnapp B, Dubosh NM. Measuring and predicting faculty consensus rankings of standardized letters of evaluation. *J Grad Med Educ.* 2024;16(1):51-58. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-22-00901.1>

D. Written Comments:

Please concisely summarize this applicant's candidacy including... (1) Areas that will require attention, (2) Any low rankings from the SLOE, and (3) **Any relevant noncognitive attributes such as leadership, compassion, positive attitude, professionalism, maturity, self-motivation, likelihood to go above and beyond, altruism, recognition of limits, conscientiousness, etc.** (please limit your response to 250 words or less)

STUDENT HAS WAIVED RIGHT TO SEE THIS LETTER Yes No

Signature:

Date:

Sehdev M, Schnapp B, Dubosh NM. Measuring and predicting faculty consensus rankings of standardized letters of evaluation. *J Grad Med Educ.* 2024;16(1):51-58. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-22-00901.1>

FIGURE 2

Sample Study Standard Letter of Evaluation Based With Blueprinted Ratings, Faculty-Developed Narrative, and Coded Applicant and Author Identifiers

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Applicant Name: Student X Applicant ID: 444</p> <p>A. Qualifications for EM. Compare the applicant to other EM applicants/peers.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Commitment to Emergency Medicine. Has carefully thought out this career choice <input checked="" type="radio"/> Above <input type="radio"/> At <input type="radio"/> Below2. Work ethic, willingness to assume responsibility. <input checked="" type="radio"/> Above <input type="radio"/> At <input type="radio"/> Below3. Ability to develop and justify an appropriate differential and a cohesive treatment plan. <input checked="" type="radio"/> Above <input type="radio"/> At <input type="radio"/> Below4. Ability to work with a team. <input type="radio"/> Above <input checked="" type="radio"/> At <input type="radio"/> Below5. Ability to communicate a caring nature to patients <input checked="" type="radio"/> Above <input type="radio"/> At <input type="radio"/> Below6. How much guidance do you predict this applicant will need during residency? <input checked="" type="radio"/> 3. Less <input type="radio"/> 2. Same <input type="radio"/> 1. More7. Given the necessary guidance, what is your prediction of success for the applicant? <input checked="" type="radio"/> 3. Outstanding <input type="radio"/> 2. Excellent <input type="radio"/> 1. Good <p>B. Global Assessment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Compared to other EM residency candidates you have recommended in the last academic year, this candidate is in the: <input type="radio"/> Top 10% <input checked="" type="radio"/> Top 1/3 <input type="radio"/> Middle 1/3 <input type="radio"/> Lower 1/32. How highly would you estimate the candidate will reside on your rank list? <input type="radio"/> Top 10% <input checked="" type="radio"/> Top 1/3 <input type="radio"/> Middle 1/3 <input type="radio"/> Lower 1/3 <input type="radio"/> Unlikely to be on rank list | <p>C. Written Comments:</p> <p>Please concisely summarize this applicant's candidacy including... (1) Areas that will require attention, (2) Any low rankings from the SLOE, and (3) Any relevant noncognitive attributes such as leadership, compassion, positive attitude, professionalism, maturity, self-motivation, likelihood to go above and beyond, altruism, recognition of limits, conscientiousness, etc. (please limit your response to 250 words or less)</p> <p>Throughout Student Xs rotation multiple residents and faculty members reached out to let me know what a strong student they were. They were able to evaluate multiple patients each shift and the patients viewed Student X as their preferred contact in the ED. They were noted to be kind and empathetic when caring for patients and interacting with family members. On a few occasions Student X had challenges truly integrating into the ED team, but I anticipate that as they become more comfortable in the ED environment that this will improve. Overall, I recommend Student X for residency and anticipate that they will be a no-problem resident and a stellar clinician.</p> <p>Author: ORC</p> |
|---|---|

Sehdev M, Schnapp B, Dubosh NM. Measuring and predicting faculty consensus rankings of standardized letters of evaluation. *J Grad Med Educ.* 2024;16(1):51-58. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-22-00901.1>

TABLE 1

SLOE Blueprint

Using data from the 2021-2022 Council of Residency Directors in Emergency Medicine (CORD) SLOE database, the following Blueprints were developed to characterize the range of applicant data submitted during the given Match cycle. These Blueprints were then provided to the author assigned in column 1 to write the associated narrative and populate the rest of the SLOE document itself, as described in Box 1. This data is representative of the distribution of scoring seen in the entirety of the EM Match during 2021-2022.

| Author | Rank List | Global | Success | Guidance | Commitment | Work Ethic | Treatment | Team | Caring |
|---------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------|---------------|
| 6 | Top 10% | Top 10% | Outstanding | Less | Above | Above | Above | Above | Above |
| 1 | Top 10% | Top 10% | Outstanding | Less | Above | Above | Above | Above | Above |
| 5 | Top 10% | Top 10% | Outstanding | Less | Above | Above | Above | Above | At |
| 2 | Top 10% | Top 10% | Outstanding | Less | Above | Above | Above | Above | Above |
| 3 | Top 10% | Top 10% | Outstanding | Less | Above | Above | Above | Above | Above |
| 7 | Top 10% | Top 10% | Outstanding | Less | Above | Above | Above | Above | Above |
| 4 | Top 10% | Top 10% | Outstanding | Less | At | Above | Above | Above | Above |
| 5 | Top 10% | Top 10% | Outstanding | Same | Above | Above | Above | Above | Above |
| 2 | Top 10% | Top 1/3 | Outstanding | Less | Above | Above | Above | Above | Above |
| 7 | Top 10% | Top 1/3 | Outstanding | Same | Above | Above | Above | Above | Above |
| 4 | Top 1/3 | Top 10% | Outstanding | Less | Above | Above | Above | Above | Above |
| 3 | Top 1/3 | Top 1/3 | Outstanding | Less | Above | Above | Above | Above | Above |
| 1 | Top 1/3 | Top 1/3 | Outstanding | Less | Above | Above | Above | Above | Above |
| 6 | Top 1/3 | Top 1/3 | Outstanding | Less | Above | Above | Above | Above | Above |
| 5 | Top 1/3 | Top 1/3 | Outstanding | Less | Above | Above | Above | At | Above |
| 7 | Top 1/3 | Top 1/3 | Outstanding | Less | Above | Above | Above | Above | Above |
| 1 | Top 1/3 | Top 1/3 | Outstanding | Less | At | Above | At | Above | At |
| 6 | Top 1/3 | Top 1/3 | Outstanding | Same | Above | Above | At | Above | Above |
| 4 | Top 1/3 | Top 1/3 | Outstanding | Same | At | Above | Above | Above | At |
| 3 | Top 1/3 | Top 1/3 | Outstanding | Same | Above | Above | Above | Above | Above |
| 2 | Top 1/3 | Top 1/3 | Excellent | Less | Above | Above | Above | Above | Above |
| 2 | Top 1/3 | Top 1/3 | Excellent | Same | Above | Above | At | At | At |
| 7 | Top 1/3 | Top 1/3 | Excellent | Same | Above | Above | At | Above | Above |
| 4 | Top 1/3 | Top 1/3 | Excellent | Same | At | At | Above | Above | Above |

Sehdev M, Schnapp B, Dubosh NM. Measuring and predicting faculty consensus rankings of standardized letters of evaluation. *J Grad Med Educ.* 2024;16(1):51-58. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-22-00901.1>

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|------------|-------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 3 | Top 1/3 | Top 1/3 | Excellent | Same | Above | Above | At | Above | Above |
| 1 | Top 1/3 | Top 1/3 | Excellent | Same | At | Above | Above | Above | At |
| 5 | Top 1/3 | Middle 1/3 | Outstanding | Same | Above | Above | At | Above | Above |
| 6 | Top 1/3 | Middle 1/3 | Excellent | Same | Above | Above | At | Above | Above |
| 3 | Top 1/3 | Middle 1/3 | Excellent | Same | At | At | At | At | At |
| 5 | Middle 1/3 | Top 1/3 | Outstanding | Same | Above | Above | At | Above | Above |
| 1 | Middle 1/3 | Top 1/3 | Excellent | Same | Above | Above | At | Above | Above |
| 6 | Middle 1/3 | Middle 1/3 | Outstanding | Same | Above | Above | At | Above | At |
| 2 | Middle 1/3 | Middle 1/3 | Excellent | Same | Above | Above | At | Above | Above |
| 4 | Middle 1/3 | Middle 1/3 | Excellent | Same | At | At | At | Above | At |
| 7 | Middle 1/3 | Middle 1/3 | Excellent | Same | Above | At | Above | At | At |
| 6 | Middle 1/3 | Middle 1/3 | Excellent | Same | At | At | At | At | Above |
| 7 | Middle 1/3 | Middle 1/3 | Excellent | Same | At | At | At | At | At |
| 4 | Middle 1/3 | Middle 1/3 | Excellent | Same | Above | Above | At | At | Above |
| 1 | Middle 1/3 | Middle 1/3 | Excellent | Same | At | Above | At | At | Above |
| 3 | Middle 1/3 | Middle 1/3 | Excellent | Same | Above | Above | At | Above | At |
| 5 | Middle 1/3 | Middle 1/3 | Excellent | Same | At | At | At | Above | At |
| 2 | Middle 1/3 | Middle 1/3 | Excellent | Same | At | At | At | At | At |
| 1 | Middle 1/3 | Middle 1/3 | Excellent | More | At | At | At | At | At |
| 4 | Middle 1/3 | Middle 1/3 | Good | Same | At | At | At | At | At |
| 2 | Middle 1/3 | Lower 1/3 | Excellent | Same | At | At | At | At | At |

Sehdev M, Schnapp B, Dubosh NM. Measuring and predicting faculty consensus rankings of standardized letters of evaluation. *J Grad Med Educ.* 2024;16(1):51-58. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-22-00901.1>

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|---------------|-----------|------|----|-------|-------|----|----|
| 5 | Lower 1/3 | Middle 1/3 | Excellent | Same | At | At | At | At | At |
| 6 | Lower 1/3 | Lower 1/3 | Excellent | More | At | At | Below | At | At |
| 3 | Lower 1/3 | Lower 1/3 | Good | Same | At | At | At | At | At |
| 7 | Lower 1/3 | Lower 1/3 | Good | More | At | At | Below | At | At |
| 1 | Lower 1/3 | Lower 1/3 | Good | More | At | Below | Below | At | At |

Abbreviations: SLOE, standardized letter of evaluation; EM, emergency medicine.

Sehdev M, Schnapp B, Dubosh NM. Measuring and predicting faculty consensus rankings of standardized letters of evaluation. *J Grad Med Educ.* 2024;16(1):51-58. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-22-00901.1>

TABLE 2

Point System

Using a senior author’s experience both writing and reading SLOEs, this group utilized a point-system to “score” each SLOE used in the study. This point system was developed prior to receiving the CORD 2021-2022 Match Data and prior to the development of any blueprints for the simulated SLOEs.

Weighted points were ascribed to the pieces of information found to be more or less useful in determining an applicant’s competitiveness, again from one senior author’s experience on recruitment committees.

Each blueprint was then scored accordingly using these agreed upon values.

| | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| | Above | At | Below | |
| Commitment | +5 | 0 | -10 | |
| Work ethic | +5 | 0 | -15 | |
| Treatment | +10 | 0 | -10 | |
| Team | +5 | 0 | -15 | |
| Caring | +5 | 0 | -15 | |
| | Less | Same | More | |
| Guidance | +5 | 0 | -15 | |
| | Outstanding | Excellent | Good | |
| Success | +5 | 0 | -15 | |
| | Top 10% | Top 1/3 | Mid 1/3 | Lower 1/3 |
| Global | +25 | +10 | 0 | -25 |
| | Top 10% | Top 1/3 | Mid 1/3 | Lower 1/3 |
| Rank | +25 | +10 | 0 | -25 |

Abbreviations: SLOE, standardized letter of evaluation; CORD, Council of Residency Directors in Emergency Medicine.