

Supplemental Materials

Voluntary Adoption of an All In Match Policy in the Medical Specialties Matching Program:
Advantages and Disadvantages
McCartney CR, Gianoukakis AG, Gopalakrishnan G, McGill JB, Roach P, Siraj ES, True MW

Table of Contents

Section	Pages
Supplemental Material A: 2015 APDEM Program Director Survey Results (Summary)	2-4
Supplemental Material B: 2015 APDEM Fellow Survey Results (Summary)	5-6
Supplemental Material C: 2016 APDEM Fellow Survey Results (Summary)	7
Supplemental Material D: Participants in APDEM Deliberations	8

Supplemental Material A: 2015 APDEM Program Director Survey Results (Summary)

Question 1. Please rate your overall experience with the MATCH.

Very good = 25/58 = 43.1%
Good = 25/58 = 43.1%
Neutral = 2/58 = 3.4%
Poor = 5/58 = 8.6%
Very poor = 0/58 = 0%
Did not participate in MATCH = 0/58 = 0%
N/A = 0/58 = 0%
No answer = 1/58 = 1.7%

Question 2. Please rate your overall experience with the MATCH as compared to your experience before the MATCH was instituted

Very good = 19/58 = 32.8%
Good = 18/58 = 31.0%
Neutral = 4/58 = 6.9%
Poor = 6/58 = 10.3%
Very poor = 2/58 = 3.4%
Did not participate in MATCH = 0/58 = 0%
N/A = 8/58 = 13.8%
No answer = 1/58 = 1.7%

Q3. How many positions did you put into the MATCH (all filled and unfilled positions)?

Median = 2
Interquartile range = 2-3
Range = 1-5

Total number of positions put into the Match (among 58 survey participants) = 127

Q4. How many positions in your program were unfilled on MATCH day?

Median = 0
Interquartile range = 0-0
Range = 0-5

Total number of positions unfilled on Match day (among 58 survey participants) = 24

Q5. How many positions did you offer prior to MATCH day?

Median = 0
Interquartile range = 0-1
Range = 0-4

Total number of positions offered prior to Match day (among 58 survey participants) = 36

Supplemental Material A: 2015 APDEM Program Director Survey Results (Summary)

[continued]

Q6. How many positions were filled prior to MATCH day?

Median = 0

Interquartile range = 0-0

Range = 0-2

Total number of positions filled prior to Match day (among 58 survey participants) = at least 10

Q7. If you offered positions outside of the MATCH, how many were for people on a research track?

Total number (among 58 programs participating in the survey) = 4

Q8. Would you prefer having 100% of endocrine programs participate in the MATCH (and fill 100% of positions via the MATCH)?

Yes = 40/58 = 69.0%

No = 15/58 = 25.9%

Ambivalent = 2/58 = 3.4%

No answer = 1/58 = 1.7%

Q9. Would you prefer keeping the status quo (75% of endocrine programs participating in the MATCH, 75% of positions filled via MATCH)?

Yes = 19/58 = 32.8%

No = 37/58 = 63.8%

Ambivalent = 1/58 = 1.7%

No answer = 1/58 = 1.7%

Q10. Do you favor no longer participating in the MATCH?

Yes = 7/58 = 12.1%

No = 49/58 = 84.5%

Ambivalent = 1/58 = 1.7%

No answer = 1/58 = 1.7%

Q11. Would you value a system whereby positions can be offered outside of the MATCH, but are done so in a systematic, monitored manner?

Yes = 16/58 = 27.6%

No = 28/58 = 48.3%

Ambivalent = 12/58 = 20.7%

No answer = 2/58 = 3.4%

Q12. Do you think that if one subspecialty moves to 100% participation, all subspecialties should do the same?

Yes = 21/58 = 36.2%

No = 33/58 = 56.9%

Ambivalent = 3/58 = 5.2%

No answer = 1/58 = 1.7%

Supplemental Material A: 2015 APDEM Program Director Survey Results (Summary)
[continued]

Q13. If there is 100% participation in the MATCH, who (if anyone) do you think should monitor MATCH participation?

NRMP = 45/58 = 77.6%

NRMP and APDEM = 3/58 = 5.2%

APDEM = 2/58 = 3.4%

No one = 5/58 = 8.6%

Ambivalent = 2/58 = 3.4%

No answer = 1/58 = 1.7%

NOTE: Raw data and free text comments may be requested from the authors.

Supplemental Material B: 2015 APDEM Fellow Survey Results (Summary)

Q1. Please rate your overall experience with the MATCH:

Very good = 24/47 = 51.1%
Good = 10/47 = 21.3%
Neutral = 6/47 = 12.8%
Did not participate in MATCH = 4/47 = 8.5%
No answer = 3/47 = 6.4%

Q2. Are you aware that currently, only 75% of endocrine fellowship programs are required to participate in the MATCH?

Yes = 4/47 = 8.5%
No = 40/47 = 85.1%
No answer = 3/47 = 6.4%

Q3. How many programs did you visit?

Median = 7
Interquartile range = 5-8.5
Range = 1-19

Q4. How many programs did you rank?

Median = 6
Interquartile range = 5-9
Range = 1-19

Q5. Were you offered a position before MATCH day?

Yes = 8/47 = 17.0%
No = 34/47 = 72.3%
“N/A” = 1/47 = 2.1%
No answer = 4/47 = 8.5%

Q6. If you were offered a position before MATCH day, how many were you offered?

1 = 7/47 = 14.9%
4 = 1/47 = 2.1%
0 = 9/47 = 19.1%
“N/A” = 23/47 = 48.9%
No answer = 7/47 = 14.9%

Q7. If you were offered a position before MATCH day, was it for a research track position?

Yes = 2/47 = 4.3%
No = 10/47 = 21.3%
“N/A” = 26/47 = 55.3%
No answer = 9/47 = 19.1%

Supplemental Material B: 2015 APDEM Fellow Survey Results (Summary) [continued]

Q8. Did you accept a position before MATCH day?

Yes = 3/47 = 6.4%

No = 29/47 = 61.7%

“N/A” = 9/47 = 19.1%

No answer = 6/47 = 12.8%

Q9. If you accepted a position before MATCH day, was it at the program where you completed your residency?

Yes = 3/47 = 6.4%

No = 12/47 = 25.5%

“N/A” = 21/47 = 44.7%

No answer = 11/47 = 23.4%

Q10. Did you feel pressure to accept a position outside of the MATCH?

Yes = 3/47 = 6.4%

No = 34/47 = 72.3%

“N/A” = 6/47 = 12.8%

No answer = 4/47 = 8.5%

Q11. Would you prefer having 100% of endocrine programs participate in the MATCH?

Yes = 32/47 = 68.1%

No = 9/47 = 19.1%

No answer = 4/47 = 8.5%

N/A = 1/47 = 2.1%

Ambivalent = 1/47 = 2.1%

Q12. Would you prefer keeping the status quo (75% of programs participating in the MATCH) ?

Yes = 9/47 = 19.1%

No = 31/47 = 66.0%

No answer = 4/47 = 8.5%

N/A = 1/47 = 2.1%

Ambivalent = 2/47 = 4.3%

Q13. Would you prefer NOT having a MATCH for endocrinology fellowship?

Yes = 6/47 = 12.8%

No = 38/47 = 80.9%

No answer = 2/47 = 4.3%

Ambivalent = 1/47 = 2.1%

NOTE: Raw data and free text comments may be requested from the authors.

Supplemental Material C: 2016 APDEM Fellow Survey Results (Summary)

Survey

The following email was sent to APDEM members on September 1, 2016:

Dear APDEM Members,

As you likely know, APDEM leadership has been exploring the desirability of moving to an "all in" subspecialty Match via the National Residency Matching Program (NRMP). Under an all in policy, any program using the Match would be expected to fill 100% of their fellowship positions through the Match. This differs from current NRMP requirement for endocrinology, which holds that 75% of all endocrine programs must participate in the MATCH and that 75% of all endocrine positions must be filled via the Match.

We now wish to solicit additional input from current fellows, who will serve as proxies for fellowship candidates.

We request that you forward this email to your fellows with the following requests:

(1) Review the 5-page document entitled "[APDEM All In Match Working Group: Summary of Deliberations to Date](#)"

(2) Complete an anonymous one question survey at <http://www.apdem.org/fellows-survey/> by September 16th.

The one question: In light of the issues described in the referenced document, do you favor moving to an All-In policy or do you prefer the current policy?

(3) It would be very helpful for us to understand the fellow's preference and opinions on this issue. Thus, we provide a text box in which the fellow can explain her/his preference, describe important issues informing her/his preference, potentially offer other options APDEM can consider, etc.

Sincerely,

Christopher Rolland McCartney, MD
Chair, APDEM All In Match Workgroup
Secretary-Treasurer, APDEM Council
Program Director, University of Virginia Health System

Survey Results

We received 108 fellow responses:

- 70 of 108 respondents (64.8%) supported switching to All In Match
- 38 of 108 respondents (35.2%) supported the current policy

NOTE: Free text comments may be requested from the authors.

Supplemental Material D: Participants in APDEM Deliberations

Authors of the current Perspectives piece are identified by bold text.

<p>APDEM All In Match Working Group (2015-2017)</p>	<p>Andrew G. Gianoukakis, University of California, Los Angeles Geetha Gopalakrishnan, Brown University Christopher R. McCartney, University of Virginia Janet B. McGill, Washington University in St. Louis Paris Roach, Indiana University Elias S. Siraj, Temple University ^a Mark W. True, San Antonio Uniformed Services Health Education Consortium Program</p>
<p>APDEM Council (2014-present)</p>	<p>Richard J. Auchus, University of Michigan (2016-2018) Richard J. Comi, Dartmouth-Hitchcock (2017-2019) Odelia B. Cooper, Cedars-Sinai (2018-) Ann Danoff, CPL Michael J. Crescenz VA Medical Center (2014-2017) Carmel M. Fratianni, Southern Illinois University (2014-2016) Andrew G. Gianoukalis, University of California, Los Angeles (2015-) Whitney S. Goldner, University of Nebraska (2014-2017) Geetha Gopalakrishnan, Brown University (2014-2019) Kurt A. Kennel, Mayo Clinic – Rochester (2016-2019) Christopher R. McCartney, University of Virginia (2014-) Joshua D. Safer, Boston University ^b (2017-2018) Susan L. Samson, Baylor University (2018-) Debra L. Simmons, University of Utah (2017-2019) Elias S. Siraj, Temple University ^a (2014-2016) Monica C. Skarulis, National Institutes of Health ^c (2015-2017) Pamela Taxel, University of Connecticut (2014-2015)</p>
<p>APDEM All In Match Oversight Task Force (2017-present)</p>	<p>Geetha Gopalakrishnan, Brown University Andrew G. Gianoukalis, University of California, Los Angeles Matthew J. Levine, Scripps Clinic/Scripps Green Hospital Christopher R. McCartney, University of Virginia Debra L. Simmons, University of Utah Vin Tangpricha, Emory University</p>

^a Current institution: Eastern Virginia Medical School; ^b Current institution: Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai; ^c Current institution: Hamad Medical Corporation Academic Health System (Qatar)