

Using Simulated Encounters with Standardized Patients to Teach Medical Students to Address Implicit Biases and Microaggressions in the Clinical Setting

Authors:

Rachel Thommen, MD*, Harli Weber, MD*, Katherine Lo, MD, Deelan Ayhan, MD MS¹, John Vellek, MD, Lior Levy, MD, Sarah Smith, MD MS¹, Christopher Hoke, MD MS¹, Redab Alnifaidy, MD MS¹, Danielle Vargas, BA¹, Katharine Yamulla, MA¹, Penny Liberatos, PhD², Mill Etienne, MD MPH¹, and Pamela Ludmer, MD MMEL¹

¹School of Medicine, New York Medical College, Valhalla, NY USA

²School of Health Sciences and Practice, New York Medical College, Valhalla, NY USA

*Rachel Thommen and Harli Weber contributed equally to this study as co-first authors.

1 **Abstract**

2 **Purpose:** Structural obstacles in healthcare related to social, economic, and political factors contribute to
3 inequities in patient care. Combined didactic and experiential learning may be more effective to teach medical
4 students how to address implicit bias and microaggression in the clinical setting. **Methods:** Rising third year
5 medical students at New York Medical College participated in a student-led implicit bias and microaggression
6 training program, including experiential learning through standardized patient (SP) encounters and self-reflection
7 via student-led debrief sessions. The SP encounters simulated instances of xenophobia and perceived language
8 barriers in a hospital setting, in which students were expected to address microaggressions in real time utilizing the
9 VITALS (Validate, Inquire, Take time, Assume the best, Leave opportunities, Speak up for others) framework.
10 **Results:** 200 students participated in the program. Survey responses on attitudes regarding implicit bias and
11 microaggressions were collected prior to participating in the program (T1), after the VITALS video presentation
12 (T2), and after the SP encounter and debrief sessions (T3). Students felt more likely to interrupt a microaggression
13 from T1 to T3. **Conclusions:** Our implicit bias training, equipped students with the tools and practice needed to
14 interrupt microaggressions in the clinical setting.

15
16 **Keywords:** Implicit Bias, unconscious bias, medical education, experiential learning

17
18 **Practice Points:**

- 19
- 20 • Combined didactic and experiential learning may be more effective than didactics alone for teaching
21 medical students how to address implicit bias and microaggression in the clinical setting.
 - 22 • Students overestimated their comfort level to interrupt a microaggression after watching the training
23 video alone, underscoring the importance of experiential learning.
 - 24 • Students valued the opportunity to practice interrupting microaggressions in a safe space with the SPs.
 - 25 • The SP encounter positively impacted students' likelihood to interrupt a microaggression in the future.
 - 26 • Students felt more comfortable interrupting a microaggression from a peer than from a person in power.

27 Introduction

28 Implicit bias is defined as subconscious attitudes and thoughts that can influence one’s behavior toward,
29 and treatment of, individuals from stereotyped groups.¹ Such bias, particularly when present among healthcare
30 providers, contributes to disparities in care, health status, and mortality for minoritized patients.² Previous studies
31 have indicated that implicit bias exists across all levels of the healthcare system, including medical school.³ Medical
32 educators have the critical task of implementing anti-racism and anti-bias training in medical education, with the
33 ultimate goal of mitigating the negative effects of these biases on patient care. The American Association of
34 Medical Colleges (AAMC) has published competencies for diversity, equity and inclusion aimed at helping
35 educators develop curricula across the medical education continuum, some of which specifically identify the need
36 to mitigate bias in the healthcare system.⁴ Furthermore, the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME)
37 specifically requests information from medical schools regarding education experiences aimed at helping medical
38 students recognize and address bias.⁵ Garnering awareness and understanding of implicit prejudice in healthcare
39 early in medical education is an important initial step towards meeting the goal of mitigating the negative effects
40 of biases on patient care. However, previous studies have underscored the need for equipping students with
41 actionable skills and communication strategies to address bias.⁶ Learners may feel discomfort and assume avoidant
42 behaviors to prevent patient care situations that may result in biased behavior.⁶ Anti-bias education in medical
43 training should encourage learners to acknowledge internalized biases and their effects on patient care, as well as
44 empower students with frameworks and communication tools for addressing such biases in clinical environments.

45 Several medical schools and medical training programs have implemented initiatives that encourage
46 students to identify personal biases and provide strategies for addressing biases commonly encountered in clinical
47 settings.⁷⁻¹⁰ Many workshops and training sessions have emphasized skill development through didactic lectures,
48 case-based learning, and role play between learners. Implicit association tests before and after trainings are often
49 used to gauge training efficacy, however the utility of such tests to assess likelihood of behavior change has been
50 criticized.¹¹ Rather than aiming to reduce implicit association test scores, some researchers suggest that implicit
51 bias training could instead focus on enforcing positive communication behaviors through relevant opportunities to
52 practice.¹² However, few published curricula provide students with opportunities for experiential learning and skill
53 development in a controlled clinical setting with peer observers and post-session discussion.

54 Standardized patient (SP) encounters are simulated clinical environments in which students can exercise
55 patient care and communication strategies with trained professionals that accurately and repeatedly portray
56 patients. Previous work has discussed the utility of SP encounters in enabling learners to practice skills such as
57 gender-affirming care, inclusive language, and LGBTQ-inclusive sexual history taking, among others.¹³⁻¹⁵ Student
58 survey evaluations in one such study demonstrated improvement in comfort with students' ability to obtain a
59 sexual history.¹³ The addition of peer-led discussion offers valuable opportunity for students to reflect upon the
60 experience of applying skills and learn best practices from fellow learners. Researchers using peer-led debriefing
61 found students to report increased comfort in discussing difficult topics and increased reassurance that
62 conversations would remain confidential.¹⁶

63 Various models aim to provide guidance on approaching clinical situations in which the medical provider
64 is the recipient of discriminatory remarks from patients and/or family members.^{17,18} Researchers at UCLA
65 developed an educational tool called VITALS (Validate, Inquire, Take time, Assume the best, Leave opportunities,
66 Speak up for others) as a framework for confronting biased statements and microaggressions that may be
67 encountered in health care settings.⁸ Their training consisted of a workshop with didactic presentation and
68 interactive discussion-based exercises, utilizing pre- and post-surveys to assess changes in knowledge and attitudes
69 about microaggression intervention. In comparing pre- and post-workshop survey responses, they found that
70 participants experienced increased comfort in broaching difficult conversations and higher likelihood of
71 challenging microaggressions.

72 The goal of our curriculum was to expand upon the UCLA team's work and develop an implicit bias
73 training for third year medical students (MS3) at New York Medical College School of Medicine (NYMC SOM) that
74 incorporates both traditional didactic lectures and experiential learning through SP encounters, in order to teach
75 students how to address microaggressions in the clinical setting. To our knowledge, our study is the first to provide
76 medical students with an opportunity to address implicit bias in the clinical setting through SP encounters followed
77 by peer-led debrief sessions.

78

79

80

81 **Materials and Methods**

82 All rising MS3 students in the NYMC SOM Class of 2024 participated in this mandatory educational
83 experience, which was part of the Transition to Clerkship (TTC) program at the end of the 2021-2022 academic
84 year. This study was approved by the New York Medical College Institutional Review Board, and our protocol
85 #15028 was found to be exempt. Students provided consent for participation in the survey study on the first page
86 of each Qualtrics form and the data was anonymized.

87

88 Student Facilitator Development

89 A year prior to the delivery of the program, a group of eight students were selected to participate as
90 fellows in the Transformative Educational Leadership Program (TELP), a 2-month leadership development course.
91 This program focused on topics including leading change, self-awareness and emotional intelligence, crucial
92 conversations, and team dynamics. The summer curriculum, occurring 2-3 times per week, varied in style between
93 lectures from professors, flipped-classroom sessions, and group discussions. Following the summer lecture series,
94 the team met throughout the year to develop and implement implicit bias training for rising MS3 peers. TELP
95 students collaborated with faculty from the Office of Undergraduate Medical Education, the Office of Diversity and
96 Inclusion, and the Clinical Skills Center to write the SP encounter scripts, design and compile pre- and post-session
97 surveys, and prepare session debrief guides.

98

99 Workshop Surveys

100 To measure the impact of our curriculum, we administered surveys at three distinct time points: prior to
101 participating in the program (T1), after the VITALS video presentation (T2), and after the SP encounter and debrief
102 sessions (T3) (**Appendices A-C**). QR codes for accessing the surveys were provided at the clinical skills center
103 before and after watching the video and after the SP encounter and debrief session.

104 Surveys were adapted from the UCLA VITALS study to better capture demographic information and
105 qualitative data on the interventions deployed.⁸ Survey responses were collected on a 5-point Likert scale and
106 administered using Qualtrics, a third party web-based survey tool for secure data collection. Each survey
107 underwent pre-testing by ten different individuals of similar age range and educational level as our medical

108 students. Student responses were de-identified, as students generated a non-identifiable code to allow us to link
109 pre-session and post-session survey responses but not identify individuals to their surveys. We excluded surveys
110 without adequate responses and surveys completed outside of the acceptable date range for the intervention (e.g.
111 pre-intervention surveys submitted after the intervention). We analyzed the deidentified survey data using IBM
112 SPSS Statistics software Version 28.0. We grouped together survey responses of “Agree” and “Strongly agree” in
113 the analysis and in the data presented in the tables; such responses will be henceforth referred to as “Agreed.”
114 Similarly, we grouped together responses of “Disagree” and “Strongly disagree,” which will henceforth collectively
115 be referred to as “Disagreed.”

116

117 Implicit Bias Training Workshop (**Figure 1**)

118

119 Figure 1. Educational Program Design

120

121 *Pre-session Survey:* We provided all MS3s with the pre-video survey via a link in the learning management
122 system approximately 48 hours prior to the workshop.

123 *VITALS Video:* Students were required to watch a 12-minute video lecture describing the VITALS
124 framework (**Appendix D**) and complete a follow up post-video survey.

125 *Orientation:* Prior to the SP encounters, students participated in a 15-minute orientation regarding the
126 objectives and agenda of the workshop, which included ground rules to ensure safety of discussion, opportunities
127 to discuss prior experiences with microaggressions, and a review of the VITALS framework. Students who had not
128 yet watched the video or completed the surveys were given the opportunity to do so. Students were paired and
129 assigned to either the participant or observer role for each of the two cases.

130 *SP Recruitment and Training:* SPs at NYMC undergo an interview process and six months of onboarding
131 training to obtain certification. Onboarding includes workshops on bias, assessment standard setting, history
132 gathering and portrayal, feedback, and interpersonal communication skills. SPs are continuously monitored
133 through data trends, review of encounters, and assessment of interrater reliability, and also participate in an
134 annual recertification course. We developed SP scripts in collaboration with the Director of the Clinical Skills and

135 Simulation Center (CSSC), as well as the Director of the SP Program, to ensure that formatting and encounter
136 structure are consistent with those from SP training. The SPs for our study were selected based on availability and
137 were provided scripts in advance to provide adequate time to review and seek clarifications as needed.

138 *SP Encounters and Debrief Sessions:* We held SP encounters and debrief sessions at the CSSC located on
139 campus. Each session included two rounds of encounter simulations with 14 rooms operating simultaneously.
140 Seven rooms started with Case #1 (**Appendix E**) regarding xenophobia and perceived language barriers, and the
141 other seven rooms started with Case #2 (**Appendix F**) regarding foreign-trained clinicians and their medical
142 competency. Each room had two students: one student participating in the 15-minute encounter and the other
143 student observing. After the first encounter, students participated in a 20-minute group debrief session before
144 returning to their simulation rooms, switching roles, and participating in a second 15-minute encounter utilizing
145 the second case the pair had not seen. The workshop concluded with a 40-minute group debrief session.

146

147 **Results**

148 Two hundred rising MS3s at NYMC were included in this study. They completed a pre-workshop survey
149 which assessed initial attitudes on implicit bias and collected demographic information (**Table 1**). Approximately
150 50% of participants were between 25 and 26 years old, with 54.6% of students identifying as Caucasian, 30% Asian,
151 6.6% African American, and 8.1% other. The sample was equally divided between males and females, with 7.2%
152 identifying with gender and sexual minorities. Regarding language, 70.4% of respondents shared that they were
153 exposed to a language other than English in their childhood with 49.7% of those reporting always or mostly
154 speaking another language at home, and about half of participants identified that they are proficient in a language
155 other than English. The largest religion represented was Christianity at 29%, followed by Judaism at 21.5%.
156 Hinduism, Islam, Agnostic, Atheism, and other religions collectively represented 15% of respondents and another
157 34% did not specify. In terms of medical specialty of interest, 30% of participants identified interest in a primary
158 care specialty, whereas over 50% were interested in pursuit of specialty care, and 15% did not specify.

159 Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Study Sample (n=200).

Variable	N	%
Age (years)	177	88.5

<25	42	23.7
25-26	88	49.7
27-29	16	9.0
30+	31	17.5
Race/Ethnicity	196	98.0
Asian	60	30.6
Black/African American	13	6.6
White/Caucasian	107	54.6
Hispanic/Latino (any race)	22	11.3
Other	16	8.1
Gender	196	97.5
Cisgender female	98	50.0
Cisgender male	97	49.5
Other	1	0.5
Sexual Orientation	196	98.0
Heterosexual	183	93.4
Gay/Lesbian	6	3.1
Bisexual/Pansexual/Queer	7	3.6
Exposed to language other than English in childhood (yes)	138	70.4
Frequency of other languages spoken	155	77.1
Always/Most	77	49.7
Sometimes	34	21.9
Rarely/Occasionally	44	28.4
Proficiency/Fluency in other language (yes)	99	49.3
Religious Tradition	200	100
Christianity	58	29.0
Hinduism	11	5.5
Islam	10	5.0
Judaism	43	21.5
Agnostic/Atheism	4	2.0
Other	6	3.0
Not Specified	68	34.0
Adherence to Religious Tradition	167	83.5
No (0)	24	14.4
Low (1-2)	60	35.9
Moderate (3)	30	18.0
Strict (4-5)	53	31.7
Medical Specialty Interest	196	98.0
Primary Care	59	30.1
Internal Medicine	31	15.8
Family Medicine	3	1.5
Ob/Gyn	10	5.1
Pediatrics	15	7.7
Specialty Care	107	54.6
Anesthesiology	18	9.2
Emergency Medicine	18	9.2
General Surgery	9	4.6
Neurology	4	2.0

Psychiatry	8	4.1
Radiology	14	7.1
Surgical Subspecialty	36	18.4
Other/Not Specified	30	15.3

160
 161 Survey responses on attitudes regarding implicit bias and microaggressions prior to the training (T1), after
 162 the VITALS video presentation (T2), and after the in-person SP encounter and debrief (T3) were collected (**Table 2**).
 163 Response rate for T1 was 100%, for T2 was 89.5%, and T3 was 99%. At T1, 58% of respondents reported that they
 164 would challenge someone who engages in a microaggression. When further inquiring about level of comfort
 165 interrupting microaggression depending upon the setting, students were least likely (27% Agreed) to challenge a
 166 microaggression if it were to come from an individual in a position of power, and most likely (75% Agreed) to
 167 challenge a microaggression if it were made by a peer in a social setting. At T2, these reported percentages
 168 increased, with 68.2% of students reporting that they are likely to interrupt a microaggression, 83.8% indicating
 169 that they would be comfortable interrupting a microaggression made by a peer in a social setting, and 48%
 170 indicating that they would be comfortable interrupting a microaggression involving a power dynamic. At T3, 73.2%
 171 of students (increased from 58% at baseline) indicated that they would be likely to challenge someone to interrupt
 172 a microaggression. Additionally, 90.9% of students felt comfortable broaching this conversation with peers, and
 173 40.9% felt comfortable broaching this conversation with those in power in a professional setting.

174
 175 Table 2. Percent Agreement with Survey Items at Pre-Survey 'Pre' (N=200), Post-VITALS Video 'PostVid' (N=179),
 176 Post-SP 'PostSP' (N=198).
 177

Question	% Strongly Agree/Agree			% Neither Agree nor Disagree			% Strongly Disagree/Disagree		
	Pre	PostVid	PostSP	Pre	PostVid	PostSP	Pre	PostVid	PostSP
1. I recognize I may have my own implicit biases and stereotypical beliefs about social identity groups.	88.0	88.3	93.4	10.5	9.5	5.6	1.5	2.2	1.0
2. When I learn about the injustice that people from other social identity groups have experienced, I tend to feel some of the anger that they do too.	79.5	86.6	89.4	17.0	10.1	9.1	3.5	3.4	1.5

3. I avoid conversations with people who hold different perspectives from my own.	15.5	25.7	23.2	25.0	21.2	24.7	59.5	53.1	52.0
4. I have a clear sense of what I can do to foster mutual respect for everyone regardless of their social identity group.	75.5	87.7	91.4	18.5	10.6	8.1	6.0	1.7	0.5
5. I will treat everyone equally, regardless of their social identities.	90.0	92.7	96.0	9.0	6.1	3.5	1.0	1.1	0.5
6. I feel comfortable sharing my personal experiences with people of social identity groups other than my own.	68.0	78.8	81.3	22.0	13.4	14.6	10.0	7.8	4.0
7. This institution values employees with varied backgrounds and experiences.	65.0	72.1	80.8	24.0	18.4	14.1	11.0	9.5	5.1
9. Do you feel that you are able to communicate empathy and concern for everyone, regardless of their social identity group?	58.0	92.7	94.9	32.5	6.7	4.5	9.5	0.6	0.5
10. Do you feel comfortable broaching difficult conversations with peers and those in power to counteract microaggressions?	66.0	70.4	73.7	24.0	20.7	19.2	10.0	8.9	7.1
	% Extremely/Fairly Likely			% Neutral			% Extremely/Fairly Unlikely		
	Pre	PostVid	PostSP	Pre	PostVid	PostSP	Pre	PostVid	PostSP
8. How likely are you to challenge someone (i.e. friend, family member, employer, professor, stranger, etc.) who engages in microaggressions?	58.0	68.2	73.2	32.5	24.0	21.7	9.5	7.8	5.1
11. Just to clarify, would you feel comfortable broaching difficult conversations to	75.0	83.8	90.9	17.5	11.7	7.6	7.0	4.5	1.5

counteract microaggressions... with peers in a social setting?									
12. Just to clarify, would you feel comfortable broaching difficult conversations to counteract microaggressions... with those in power in a professional setting?	27.0	48.0	40.9	36.5	27.9	24.7	36.5	24.0	34.3

178
179

180 **Discussion**

181 Our results indicate that the SP encounters positively impacted students' likelihood to confront
 182 microaggressions. In general, nearly three quarters of the MS3 class reported that they felt more likely to interrupt
 183 a microaggression after the SP encounter than at baseline. Students reported increased comfort in their own
 184 ability to use the skills taught to interrupt a microaggression after the SP session than the video alone, except in
 185 situations where they were confronting a person in power. However, from narrative data collected during the
 186 debrief sessions, many students expressed that they experienced difficulty addressing microaggressions in the SP
 187 encounters, despite being prepared and knowing the objectives of the session. Across all debrief discussions,
 188 students reflected on how they overestimated their sense of comfort and preparedness prior to the encounters.
 189 Despite our expectation that participants would feel increasingly more comfortable with enhanced exposure to
 190 implicit bias training through simulated encounters in a safe environment, these findings highlight the importance
 191 of our multimodal approach to learning and may better reflect true participant response.

192 The positive change in participant attitudes from T1 to T2 aligns with previous studies showing the impact
 193 of traditional didactic lectures on student learning.⁸ As a whole, baseline pre-intervention agreement in our study
 194 was higher than survey responses in previous studies, which may be due to prior implicit bias training and/or the
 195 diversity of our student body. These increased baseline values may also impact the degree of change in agreement
 196 across the study.

197 Interestingly, we saw an improvement in self-reported responses in all survey question responses except
 198 for one question (Q12). After participating in the SP encounters, students responded that their level of comfort

199 decreased with regards to situations that involve a power differential in a professional setting (27% felt
200 comfortable at T1, 48% at T2, and 40.9% at T3). These results suggest that despite the baseline perception that
201 participants would be comfortable interrupting microaggressions in a professional setting involving people in
202 power, after experiencing the simulated encounter without a power dynamic at play, participants recognized
203 potential discomfort that they may not have previously recognized. This discomfort may be attributed to the
204 concern that speaking up towards someone in a position of power may negatively impact the student's grade or
205 clinical evaluation.

206 Previous literature focusing on the healthcare system shows pervasive adverse effects of implicit bias and
207 systemic racism in the US healthcare system.^{4,5} Existing literature describes efforts to mitigate bias in the medical
208 profession with education at the medical school level. To our knowledge, however, this is the first program to
209 create an immersive experience where medical students were tasked with confronting a bias in real time with live
210 SPs.⁸⁻¹¹ Our data shows an improvement in student preparedness and comfort in confronting microaggressions in
211 the clinical setting. The simulated clinical encounter allowed students to assess their own confidence in addressing
212 microaggressions. Our data demonstrated a respondent shift bias highlighting the discrepancy between student
213 perceived comfort with addressing microaggressions after a standard lecture, as compared to their actual level of
214 comfort during a simulated encounter, underscoring the need for simulated encounters in medical education
215 focusing on implicit bias management.

216

217 Limitations

218 Since our primary outcomes were based on surveys that evaluated self-reported change in attitudes, we
219 relied on students' self-awareness and did not have an external measure of behavior change. Quantitative survey
220 data collected at multiple time points are susceptible to shift bias. This may explain the overconfidence in comfort
221 and ability at T2 and its deflation at T3. Electronic survey data can also have erroneous response selection,
222 respondents submitting an answer choice they had not intended. We also do not have data to assess impact of the
223 intervention beyond the immediate short term. Furthermore, our SP encounters did not include a grading rubric
224 or checklist, which could have provided opportunity for formalized student and SP feedback after the encounter.
225 This determination was partly at the request of the SPs who did not feel like they had adequate expertise to

226 provide such feedback. Lastly, the design of our workshop, due to logistical constraints, was such that one student
227 observed an encounter before participating in their own encounter may have impacted the experience and
228 behavior of the student who engaged in the encounter secondarily.

229

230 **Future Directions**

231 Given the importance of continued training in diversity, equity, and inclusion, we aim to expand this
232 training to engage students in more challenging scenarios where the implicit bias or microaggression is directed at
233 the student, or where the act is committed by an attending physician or supervisor. Introducing a personal
234 component and power dynamic would help to further prepare students for difficult situations that they may
235 encounter, and, as conveyed by students, would be more challenging than a microaggression alone.

236 Future directions also include providing additional implicit bias training specifically for the SPs to enable
237 them to provide more structured formal feedback to students after the simulated encounters. By training the SPs,
238 students would be able to receive real time feedback on the interaction.

239 Additionally, we plan to conduct focus groups with students to assess the impact of the curriculum on
240 their clinical experiences and actions. Specifically, we would like to find out if they experienced or witnessed a
241 microaggression and whether they addressed the microaggression in real time. Further expansion of this program
242 to include training sessions more frequently throughout the school year may promote enhanced longitudinal
243 education and greater commitment to core themes of the training.

244

245 **Acknowledgements**

246 We want to acknowledge the Standardized Patients (SPs) of New York Medical College for bringing our simulation
247 curriculum to life.

248

249 **Declaration of Interest Statement**

250 None of the authors have any conflicts of interest to disclose.

251

252

253

254 **Funding/Support**

255 The curriculum development was funded by the Medical Student Service Leadership grant from the Alpha Omega
256 Alpha (AOA) Honor Medical society. The grant was awarded to Redab Alnifaidy, Lior Levy, Katharine Yamulla, Dr.
257 Mill Etienne, and Dr. Pamela Ludmer in 2021 for developing the project entitled “The Transformational Education
258 Leadership Program: Combating Systemic Racism and Implicit Bias through Medical Education at NYMC.”

259

260 **Appendices**

261 A. Pre-Survey (T1)

262 B. Post-VITALS Video Survey (T2)

263 C. Post-SP Encounter and Debrief Survey (T3)

264 D. VITALS 12-minute Video Presentation

265 E. Case #1 Script

266 F. Case #2 Script

267

268 **References**

- 269 1. Saluja B, Bryant Z. How Implicit Bias Contributes to Racial Disparities in Maternal Morbidity and Mortality in
270 the United States. *J Womens Health*. 2021;30(2):270-273. doi:10.1089/jwh.2020.8874
- 271 2. Maina IW, Belton TD, Ginzberg S, Singh A, Johnson TJ. A decade of studying implicit racial/ethnic bias in
272 healthcare providers using the implicit association test. *Soc Sci Med*. 2018;199:219-229.
273 doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.05.009
- 274 3. White-Means S, Zhiyong Dong, Hufstader M, Brown LT. Cultural Competency, Race, and Skin Tone Bias Among
275 Pharmacy, Nursing, and Medical Students: Implications for Addressing Health Disparities. *Med Care Res Rev*.
276 2009;66(4):436-455. doi:10.1177/1077558709333995
- 277 4. AAMC. *Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Competencies Across the Learning Continuum*. AAMC; 2022.
278 https://store.aamc.org/downloadable/download/sample/sample_id/512/
- 279 5. LCME. *Functions and Structure of a Medical School*. Association of American Medical Colleges and American

- 280 Medical Association; 2022.
- 281 6. Burgess D, van Ryn M, Dovidio J, Saha S. Reducing Racial Bias Among Health Care Providers: Lessons from
282 Social-Cognitive Psychology. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2007;22(6):882-887. doi:10.1007/s11606-007-0160-1
- 283 7. Sandoval RS, Afolabi T, Said J, Dunleavy S, Chatterjee A, Ölveczky D. Building a Tool Kit for Medical and Dental
284 Students: Addressing Microaggressions and Discrimination on the Wards. *MedEdPORTAL.* Published online
285 April 3, 2020:10893. doi:10.15766/mep_2374-8265.10893
- 286 8. Walker VP, Hodges L, Perkins M, Sim M, Harris C. Taking the VITALS to Interrupt Microaggressions.
287 *MedEdPORTAL.* Published online January 19, 2022:11202. doi:10.15766/mep_2374-8265.11202
- 288 9. Brooks KC, Rougas S, George P. When Race Matters on the Wards: Talking About Racial Health Disparities and
289 Racism in the Clinical Setting. *MedEdPORTAL.* Published online December 28, 2016:10523.
290 doi:10.15766/mep_2374-8265.10523
- 291 10. Gonzalez CM, Walker SA, Rodriguez N, Noah YS, Marantz PR. Implicit Bias Recognition and Management in
292 Interpersonal Encounters and the Learning Environment: A Skills-Based Curriculum for Medical Students.
293 *MedEdPORTAL.* Published online July 13, 2021:11168. doi:10.15766/mep_2374-8265.11168
- 294 11. Forscher PS, Lai CK, Axt JR, et al. A meta-analysis of procedures to change implicit measures. *J Pers Soc*
295 *Psychol.* 2019;117(3):522-559. doi:10.1037/pspa0000160
- 296 12. Hagiwara N, Kron FW, Scerbo MW, Watson GS. A call for grounding implicit bias training in clinical and
297 translational frameworks. *The Lancet.* 2020;395(10234):1457-1460. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30846-1
- 298 13. Mayfield JJ, Ball EM, Tillery KA, et al. Beyond Men, Women, or Both: A Comprehensive, LGBTQ-Inclusive,
299 Implicit-Bias-Aware, Standardized-Patient-Based Sexual History Taking Curriculum. *MedEdPORTAL.* Published
300 online September 28, 2017:10634. doi:10.15766/mep_2374-8265.10634
- 301 14. Underman K, Giffort D, Hyderi A, Hirshfield LE. Transgender Health: A Standardized Patient Case for Advanced
302 Clerkship Students. *MedEdPORTAL.* Published online December 23, 2016:10518. doi:10.15766/mep_2374-
303 8265.10518
- 304 15. Weingartner L, Noonan EJ, Bohnert C, Potter J, Shaw MA, Holthouser A. Gender-Affirming Care With
305 Transgender and Genderqueer Patients: A Standardized Patient Case. *MedEdPORTAL.* Published online May
306 20, 2022:11249. doi:10.15766/mep_2374-8265.11249

- 307 16. Randolph MN, Erb EC, Garg PS, Thompson R, Cohen-Osher M. Training Medical Students as Peer-Facilitators to
308 Identify Medical Student Mistreatment in the Clerkship Year. *MedEdPORTAL*. Published online September 27,
309 2021:11185. doi:10.15766/mep_2374-8265.11185
- 310 17. Whitgob EE, Blankenburg RL, Bogetz AL. The Discriminatory Patient and Family: Strategies to Address
311 Discrimination Towards Trainees. *Acad Med*. 2016;91:S64-S69. doi:10.1097/ACM.0000000000001357
- 312 18. Paul-Emile K, Smith AK, Lo B, Fernández A. Dealing with Racist Patients. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;374(8):708-711.
313 doi:10.1056/NEJMp1514939
- 314 19. Project Implicit. Published 2011. <https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/takeatest.html>




Figure 1. Educational program design.