

ERAS Application Review Rubric TEMPLATE

Supplementary handout for **Finding Fit and Fighting Filters**

CORD Academic Assembly 2020

Speakers: Mark Olaf, MD; Ben Schnapp, MD; and Anneli von Reinhart, MD

This template is adapted from the ERAS application review process and scoring rubric developed for UCSF Fresno by Dr. von Reinhart. It describes a proposed process by which applications are divvied up among reviewers who score each application according to the rubric. Reviewers enter scores directly into ERAS through the “custom scores” tab, automatically tabulating a composite score (out of 100 possible points.) We aimed to include enough clear, specific direction that a brand new faculty member who had never before seen an ERAS application could use the rubric to systematically and efficiently review applications, and arrive at the same composite scores as any other reviewer looking at the same applications. We plan for the PD to then use these composite scores and reviewers’ notes for an expedited overview of pre-screened applications. Thus the PD can more quickly make decisions about whom to invite for interview. We present this as a possible jumping-off point for developing your own program’s process and/or rubric.

Process overview:

1. Each reviewer completes bias awareness training before being assigned an allotment of applications to review in ERAS, and is briefed on programmatic core values and recruiting priorities.
2. Reviewer reads and scores applications according to rubric, making notes within ERAS.
3. Reviewer selects status for applications. Reviewer can choose to reject an application or send it to PD for possible invite to interview. Reviewer can also mark it as incomplete or raise “red flag” for special case applications that have considerable merit but also concerning components that will require careful consideration.
4. PD can sort applications by composite scores in ERAS. PD uses scores and initial reviewers’ notes to expedite deciding whom to invite for interviews, keeping in mind overall diversity of pool of invited applicants, gender balance, etc.
5. PD decides interview invite list.

Instructions for reviewers:

As you review each component of the application, please enter the score in the appropriate spot in the “Custom Score(s)” tab. These will automatically be tabulated into a composite score. You should ONLY enter scores under the “Custom Score(s).”

Please note in the Comments tab any red flags, areas of concern, or particularly salient aspects of an app. It is very helpful to jot down a brief overview of the application for future reference.

After completing your review, be sure to check the appropriate box under the “Status” tab:

- ☐Reviewed, decline ☐Reviewed, scored ☐Reviewed, incomplete (e.g., only 1 LoR)
☐Reviewed, Red Flag

As you review, please keep in mind the qualities and characteristics we value most highly:

humility, maturity, work ethic, ambition, EQ, IQ, generosity/team player, resilience, inclusion, community.

CV/Education/Experience/Publications scale 0-10, weight x2, total possible points: 20

Either service or research OK, does not need to have both

Add points for:

Activities/research related to EM/service
Degree of involvement
Length of commitment
Leadership positions

Pubs or presentations
Awards
Relevant grad work, advanced degrees

1 point				10 points
Sparse activities/research Minimal relevance to EM Superficial involvement Zero pubs or presentations No “real life” or service industry jobs No awards	←	↔	→	Longitudinal commitment to meaningful, relevant work Leadership positions Major publications or Presentations Multiple or major awards

USMLE Scores scale 0-5, weight x1, total possible points: 5

Be sure to open the USMLE transcript. There are not ! flags to notify you of failures anymore.

0 points, consider reject: Failed Step 1, Step 2 SD below the mean

1 point: MP or SD below the mean on Step 1 & 2

2 points: low step 1, Step 2 around the mean

3 points: low step 1, Step 2 above the mean

4 points: around the mean for both

5 points: well above the mean on both

Limiting Factors

Check here for red flags or reasons to reject application.

MSPE/Med School Transcript scale 0-5, weight x2, total possible points: 10

Screen for red flags, consider rejecting any application in which you find red flags. Major red flags include lapses in professionalism, failing a clinical rotation, failing more than one exam or non-clinical course. If one or more red flags is present, but it's an otherwise very strong application you think the PD should look at, please note concern in the Notes tab and check ☐Reviewed, Red Flag

If courses are all P/F, look to narrative comments (work ethic? Teamwork? Active learner? Well-liked? Procedural skill? Knowledge base?)

0 points	↔	3	↔	5 points
Failed pre-clinical course(s) No HP or Honors in clinicals Bottom quartile/quintile		Passed all pre-clinicals Mix of P, HP, and Hon Middle ranking		Top of the class Mostly Honors in clinicals

Personal Statement scale 0-5, weight x1, total possible points: 5

If any concerning remarks in an otherwise strong application, please and note your concerns in Notes tab and check ☐Reviewed, Red Flag

0 points	↔	3	↔	5 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Superficial - “Me” focus - Poorly written, full of errors 		Fine.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mature Understanding of EM - Focused on service/care/others - Beautifully written - Powerful/persuasive

Letters of Recommendation scale 0-10, weight x6, total possible points: 60

We require 2 SLOEs. Students can submit 4 letters maximum.

Please score each SLOE on a scale from 0 – 10. Enter the mean of all SLOE scores under the Custom Score(s) tab.

Screen non-EM or non-SLOE letters for red flags, or reasons to adjust SLOE score by a point in either direction.

Top candidate qualities to look for: work ethic, ability to work as a team, does not require extra guidance

- 0 – DNR letter
- 1 – Lower 1/3 and all “below level of peers”
- 2 –
- 3 –
- 4 –
- 5 – Middle 1/3, all at level of peers
- 6 –
- 7 – Top of the middle
- 8 – Strong letter but nothing outstanding, Top 1/3s from “easy grader” or very dissimilar program
- 9 – Very strong letter, Top 1/3s from similar program
- 10 – Glowing letter, Top 10% from program similar to ours

Bonus points

Bonus points can be used to boost score for achievements or qualities not already accounted for, including markers of potentially “high yield” applicants who are more likely to rank your program highly. Examples of possible categories for bonus points include:

- GHHS – has been inducted into Gold Humanism Honor Society
- AOA – selected as AOA by med school
- Disadvantaged - Overcome major hardship or disadvantaged background, first in the family to attend college
- Geography – prior life/education or documented connection to your city or region
- Demonstrated interest – requested a rotation at your program, came to a recruiting event (e.g., conference residency fair), or in some way reached out to express genuine interest in your program
- Recruiting goals and diversity– applicant comes from a demographic group your program is actively trying to recruit, or has background, skills or interests that your program is seeking
- Thumbs up – trusted colleagues, alumni, etc have reached out to say they know and like this applicant
- Pedigree – applicant comes from highly respected medical school