

# Programmatic Review of PGY1 Residency Selection Process

**Frank Paloucek**  
**Director, Residency Program**  
**Department of Pharmacy Practice**



# Postgraduate Training

- **PGY1 Residency (in all its varied names)**
  - ◆ Continuously since 1973 at UIC
  - ◆ Range of positions 6-18 over those years
  - ◆ Currently 11 annually (on occasion has been increased)
- **Director since 4/99, first recruited class 2000-2001**
  - ◆ Previously member of Residency Advisory Committee (1989-1999) chaired by Dr. Linda Bressler



# Residency Selection Process

## ■ Required

- ◆ 3 letters of recommendation (using ASHP template form)
- ◆ Current curriculum vitae
- ◆ Current transcript
- ◆ Completed application
- ◆ On-Site interview
  - ★ Consists of one group activity
  - ★ 4 one on one interviews with preceptors using behaviorally based structured interview format



# Ranking

- Each item was assigned a numerical score ranging from -1.0 – +1.0 (started with candidates for class of 2002)
  - ◆ For letters by the Director
  - ◆ For gpa- by Director
  - ◆ For group activity and interviews by the individual preceptor
- Highest score possible +9.0, lowest -9.0
- Scores compiled in spreadsheet and candidates are ranked by scores
- Interview Committee convened and discusses list rankings, following discussion list maybe be modified. Revised list submitted to Match



# Recruiting

- 70 or 90 applications a year
- Interviews are offered until the average 52 available slots are filled
- An average of 48 interviews conducted
- Not all candidates interviewed are ranked.
- Overall 94 residents in classes of 2001-2008.
  - ◆ One did not receive a certificate for performance
  - ◆ One terminated early for personal reasons



# Year End Awards

- At the end of each year, two residents are selected to receive awards acknowledging significant achievements for the year.
- Core activity teams (Medicine, Critical Care, Pediatrics, DI, Amb Care, Administration) are asked to submit 3 ranked names for consideration
- Additionally, summative evaluations are reviewed for quantity and timing for both “Achieved” and “Needs Improvement” assessments



# Is the selection process matching outcomes?

- It was decided to compare the numerical score used to generate the NMS rank list to the end of year “rankings” that were used to determine awards winner/s for the classes of 2002-2007
- And.....
  - ◆ 4 of the 6 highest match ranked candidates finished as one of bottom 2 ranked for awards
  - ◆ 5 of 6 lowest match ranked candidates were chosen for rewards.
- Why?



# Letters of recommendation review (n=1013)

- Reviewed all letters of recommendation that completed the template form
- Tally of upper 10%, upper 25%, upper 50%, lower 50% and No Basis scores for each of the 22 criteria.
- Lower 50% never chosen.
- Upper 50% used for all items, but >3% for Written and oral communication skills, Leadership and Assertiveness
- 51% had No Basis scores for Research Skills
- 21% had No Basis scores for Ability to work with patients



# Letters of recommendation review cont.

- Upper 10% selected for > 80% of candidates for Work quality, Perseverance, Take criticism, Emotional stability, Initiative, Cooperativeness, Ability to work with Boss and Peers, Dependability, Appearance/Demeanor, Commitment, Enthusiasm, and Integrity
- Criteria with closest frequencies for 10% and 25% scores; Leadership (53/36), Written communication (58/30) and Academic ability (60/32)



# Letters of recommendation review

## ■ Dropping Research Ability and the “90%’ers” leaves

- ★ Academic ability
- ★ Written communication
- ★ Oral communication
- ★ Leadership
- ★ Assertiveness
- ★ Time management
- ★ Work with peers
- ★ Work with patients
- ★ Resourcefulness



# Final observation

- The residents share a communal office, each being assigned a cubicle that is adjacent to a partner
- Seats are assigned but a method for the assignment was desired.
- All residents were asked to complete a “mini” Myers-Briggs Inventory (n=54 item survey)
- This assignment method didn't really work out but...



National norms (US)

<u><b>ISTJ</b></u> 11.6%	<u><b>ISFJ</b></u> 13.8%	<u><b>INFJ</b></u> 1.5%	<u><b>INTJ</b></u> 2.1%	29%	
<u><b>ISTP</b></u> 5.4%	<u><b>ISFP</b></u> 8.8%	<u><b>INFP</b></u> 4.4%	<u><b>INTP</b></u> 3.3%		
<u><b>ESTP</b></u> 4.3%	<u><b>ESFP</b></u> 8.5%	<u><b>ENFP</b></u> 8.1%	<u><b>ENTP</b></u> 3.2%		24%
<u><b>ESTJ</b></u> 8.7%	<u><b>ESFJ</b></u> 12.3%	<u><b>ENFJ</b></u> 2.5%	<u><b>ENTJ</b></u> 1.8%		25%

30%

43%

16.5%

10.4%



National norms (US)

<b><u>ISTJ</u></b>	<b><u>ISFJ</u></b>	<b><u>INFJ</u></b>	<b><u>INTJ</u></b>	29%
11.6% 9.6%	13.8% 7%	1.5% 2%	2.1% 0.5	19%
<b><u>ISTP</u></b>	<b><u>ISFP</u></b>	<b><u>INFP</u></b>	<b><u>INTP</u></b>	22%
5.4% 3.4%	8.8% 0.5	4.4% 1.7%	3.3% 0%	5.5%
<b><u>ESTP</u></b>	<b><u>ESFP</u></b>	<b><u>ENFP</u></b>	<b><u>ENTP</u></b>	24%
4.3% 15%	8.5% 14%	8.1% 10%	3.2% 11%	50.5%
<b><u>ESTJ</u></b>	<b><u>ESFJ</u></b>	<b><u>ENFJ</u></b>	<b><u>ENTJ</u></b>	25%
8.7% 9%	12.3% 9%	2.5% 2%	1.8 4%	24%

30%  
37%

43%  
30%

16.5%  
16.5%

10.4%  
16%



# QUESTIONS

