

1 **In Holistic Admissions, a Combination of Non-Academic Explanatory Variables Has**  
2 **Significant Predictive Value for Applicant Ranking**

3 Andrew D. Bergemann<sup>1\*</sup>, PhD, Stephen R. Smith<sup>2</sup>, PhD and Joel A. Daboub<sup>2</sup>, MBA.  
4

5 <sup>1</sup>Department of Education, Innovation, and Technology, Baylor College of Medicine in Houston,  
6 Texas, USA.  
7

8 <sup>2</sup> Department of Medical Education at Dell Medical School, at the University of Texas at Austin,  
9 Austin, Texas, USA.  
10

11 \* Dr. Bergemann was an Associate Professor in the Department of Medical Education at the Dell  
12 Medical School, at the University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, USA during the concept  
13 development, data collection, and analysis phases of the study. Manuscript preparation was  
14 performed after Dr. Bergemann moved to Baylor College of Medicine.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

## 21 **Abstract**

22           A medical school with a focus on community engagement has innovated its admissions  
23 process to include three different interview formats and one novel task format. Each component  
24 is designed to assess specific attributes of applicants, including teamwork skills, cultural  
25 competence, and service orientation. Correlations between these components are low, consistent  
26 with the original purpose that each should assess different attributes. To understand the use of the  
27 data by the members of the committee that ranks applicants, the authors created a model of seven  
28 explanatory variables, comprised of the three interview ratings and one task rating, a review of  
29 the written applications, and two measures of past academic performance. With regression  
30 analysis, the model significantly predicted applicant rankings, with most of the predictive  
31 capacity retained after omission of academic metrics. The results display that the school has  
32 developed innovations that allow for a reduced dependence upon academic history, and instead  
33 uses a truly holistic approach that is tailored to its mission. Most importantly, the work  
34 establishes that the admissions committee uses all the diverse forms of data provided to make  
35 decisions, which until this point has been an open question in holistic admissions.

36

37 *Key Words:* Medical; Admissions; Holistic; Community-oriented; Teamwork; Applicant  
38 Rankings

39

40

41

42

43

## 44 **Introduction**

45

46           Holistic review allows for the evaluation of potential candidates based on the totality of  
47 their activities, characteristics, and lived experiences as demonstrated up to the point of their  
48 application for admission. This type of review provides evidence of a candidate's commitment to  
49 the practice of medicine and to caring for those who are ill, as well as how they themselves  
50 overcome adversity or barriers in their own lives and how they learn from such experiences.

51           The benefits of healthcare professionals reflecting the demographic and cultural  
52 composition of the communities that they serve are well established [1–3]. In the Southern  
53 United States, a clear example of the need for better demographic representation is the  
54 geographic under-representation of rural communities amongst clinicians, contributing to these  
55 communities being under-served for healthcare [4–8].

56           Greater inclusion of many under-represented groups begins with their acceptance into  
57 health-related professional schools. Society has decided that this cannot happen through race-  
58 based admissions processes, presenting a challenge as communities of color are often amongst  
59 the most under-represented in the healthcare professions and experiencing the most barriers to  
60 healthcare access. Ample evidence demonstrates that the use of holistic admissions allows for the  
61 recruitment of candidates with desirable qualities, alters the demographic composition of  
62 matriculating classes (frequently increasing diversity without race-based affirmative action), and  
63 can also at least sometimes exceed past academic performance as a predictor of future academic  
64 or career success [9–12]. Holistic admissions, therefore, has the capacity to enable the entry into  
65 professional schools of more applicants from under-represented groups, without that

66 demographic change being the goal of the process, but rather by recognizing individual  
67 candidates for their non-academic strengths.

68 A school's admissions processes should be tailored to fit its mission and teaching  
69 philosophies [13]. We report here on an admissions process at a Southern United States medical  
70 school that emphasizes innovation, leadership and community service and that teaches using  
71 teamwork environments [14–16]. To facilitate the search to identify applicants who prioritize the  
72 school's mission values, and who will excel in the school's learning environment, the school  
73 initiated a number of innovative approaches to rate applicants. Most notably, the school initiated  
74 a task-based assessment, which the applicants accomplish in teams. During the performance of  
75 the task, applicants are assessed for their teamwork skills [14].

76 The school also uses written application reviews, asynchronous video interviews,  
77 multiple mini-interviews (MMIs), and classical interviews, all of which requires a significant  
78 commitment of staff and faculty time [14]. The video interviews include questions tailored to  
79 address an applicant's past history of innovation, community impact, and experiences relevant to  
80 teamwork and leadership. The MMIs focus on the capacity of each applicant to address complex  
81 situations with empathy for stakeholders with conflicting interests. Interviewers in the classical  
82 interview format are trained to focus on each applicant's communication skills and their  
83 experiences, particularly those reflecting cultural competence. Due to the extensive nature of the  
84 process, considerable resources are required to complete all the components. Some importance  
85 therefore must be placed on whether the final rankers of the applicants, the members of the  
86 Admission Selection Committee (ASC), use the data from all the rating mechanisms.

87 While many studies establish that holistic admissions has positive outcomes, relatively  
88 few professional schools have sought to identify the relative impact of the components of their

89 admissions processes, with two notable exceptions [17,18]. For those two studies, the authors use  
90 broader categories of explanatory variables. Hence, our research begins to fill a gap in the  
91 existing literature that is central to holistic admissions, at a time when it is spreading widely  
92 through higher education.

93 Specifically, in this research, we establish that all of the school’s ratings contribute  
94 significantly to a predictive, multiple linear regression (MLR) model of applicant ranking,  
95 consistent with a holistic process, in which final rankers use all the applicant data provided to  
96 them.

97

## 98 **Materials and Methods**

99

100 Data was collected for the 2018 (recruiting the 2019 matriculating class) and the 2019  
101 (recruiting the 2020 matriculating class) admissions seasons. These two years were chosen as the  
102 admissions process was consistent across these two years. Data collection began 5/1/2018 and  
103 continued through to 2/1/2020. This data collection was the normal collection that occurred for  
104 the purposes of admissions, including applicant selection and program assessment and  
105 development. Once we had decided to publicly share the conclusions, data was accessed for the  
106 purpose of analysis for the study in this report on 6/3/2022.

107 During the review of applicant’s applications, evaluators were trained to review each  
108 written application for evidence of attributes that align with mission. These attributes included  
109 “Integrity and Ethics”, “Social and Interpersonal Skills”, “Resilience and Adaptability”, and  
110 “Cultural Competence”. The raters were further asked to evaluate candidate’s applications for

111 experiences that were aligned to the mission, including evidence of “Teamwork Experiences”,  
112 “Service Orientation”, and the “Development and Implementation of Innovative Solutions”.  
113 Evidence of these attributes and experiences was discernible in each applicant’s essays, awards,  
114 and lists of experiences. It is important to note that this evaluation of written applications was  
115 completed in the absence of academic credentials and letters of recommendation.

116 Candidates under consideration for interview, based on reviews of their written  
117 applications, were invited to an asynchronous video interview. The asynchronous video  
118 interview has many parallels to MMIs, and seeks to specifically assess applicants for past  
119 activities demonstrating leadership, teamwork, community actions, and innovation. Data from  
120 the video interview, combined with the ratings of the written application, determined whether a  
121 candidate would be invited to visit the school for an interview day. Interview days included one  
122 classical interview, similar to the interviews that have been the mainstay of medical school  
123 admissions for decades, and five MMIs [19,20]. Additionally, interview days included a group  
124 task, in which applicants were assessed for teamwork skills [14]. Numeric scores were assigned  
125 to various aspects of performance for each of the interviews and tasks by trained raters. Raters of  
126 the group task and the classical-format interviewers were faculty, and mostly not members of the  
127 ASC. MMIs were conducted by medical students, faculty, or staff members, again most of whom  
128 were not members of the ASC. Data was collected for all 752 applicants who were interviewed  
129 over the two years. The data for 729 of the applicants was used for this research as 23 applicants  
130 experienced parallel processes, in some cases because they chose to not do the asynchronous  
131 video interview (and instead did a written secondary essay). All research reported here was  
132 approved by the UT Austin Institutional Review Board (IRB) (STUDY00002235). Informed  
133 consent was not deemed necessary for this retrospective study of data collected as part of the

134 normal educational process. Due to the sensitive nature of admissions data, the underlying data  
135 for this article cannot be made publicly available. Data was collected and de-identified by one  
136 author, and then analyzed by a second author who was blinded to participant identities.

137 Rankings of candidates were performed by members of the ASC. The committee of  
138 twelve to twenty members evaluated the files of every interviewed candidate. The total applicant  
139 evaluation process resulted in over sixty points of evaluation for each candidate, each of which  
140 was associated back to an aspect of the mission or curriculum. To manage consistency of the  
141 selection process, the data for each interviewed candidate was presented to the committee in an  
142 aggregated heatmap that facilitated an overall comparison of candidate evaluations (Fig 1). Each  
143 of the structured evaluations were grouped in categories: “Desirable Attributes”, “Experiences”,  
144 “Mission Alignment”, and “Communications”. This evaluation was further enhanced by the  
145 color gradient that aligned with performance on the rubric and that provided ASC members  
146 additional clarity and depth to the metric's presentation. By associating specific colors with  
147 different levels of performance, the information was more visually intuitive and accessible.  
148 Adding a visual representation enhanced understanding and allowed committee members to  
149 quickly grasp each applicant’s performance across various criteria.

150 **Figure 1. Schematic form for presentation of an applicant to ASC members.** This figure  
151 displays the typical format for presenting an applicant’s information as a heat map to ASC  
152 members. The heat map is coded red to yellow to green equating to poor to reasonable to strong  
153 performance in a rating. This format, or only very minor variations on this format, has been used  
154 for all interviewed applicants since 2016. Ratings are grouped as being relevant to attributes (A),  
155 communication skills (C), experiences (E), and mission fit (M). “1 Review” refers to the ratings  
156 of the written application. “2 Video secondary” refers to the asynchronous video interviews. “3  
157 Interview B” refers to the classical one-on-one interviews. “4 Group” refers to the ratings of the  
158 group task. “5 MMI” refers to the average ratings across five multiple, mini-interviews. In  
159 addition to the heat map, for each candidate the ASC members are also presented with the  
160 complete original written application (including letters of recommendation), and any narrative  
161 comments provided by application, interview, or task raters.

162

163 For each applicant, three ASC members were assigned the role of being primary  
164 reviewers, and reviewed in detail all aspects of the candidate's application and interview  
165 performances, and assigned an initial rating of reject, accept tier three, accept tier two, or accept  
166 tier one. For applicants with a unanimous rating, independently determined by all three primary  
167 reviewers, the rating was automatically confirmed by vote without further discussion. For the  
168 majority of applicants, with primary reviewer scores that were not unanimous, the three primary  
169 reviewers presented each candidate to the committee for discussion, with at least eleven  
170 committee members present. After the discussion, all present members of the committee voted  
171 on the candidate. Committee members also voted reject, accept tier three, accept tier two or  
172 accept tier one. These votes were then translated to scores: reject: 0; accept tier three: 1; accept  
173 tier two: 2; accept tier one: 3. For each candidate the scores from all ASC members were  
174 averaged to derive the admissions ranking score used in the following analyses. The choice of  
175 this average as the outcome variable of our modelling reflected the fact that this metric also  
176 determined a candidate's selection for an invite to matriculate at the school.

177 In order to determine the contribution of different components of the process to final  
178 applicant ratings, correlational analyses and multiple linear regressions (MLRs) were conducted  
179 in R, using the functions *ggpairs* (in *ggplot2* package), *lm* and *summary.lm* (both in *stats*  
180 package), broadly as has been described elsewhere [21]. Explanatory variables for past academic  
181 history were the GPA and MCAT of each applicant, expressed as standard deviations from the  
182 mean in the interviewed cohort. Explanatory variables for non-academic components of the data  
183 were the average ratings for each mechanism of the process (written application ratings, video  
184 interview ratings, classical interview ratings, MMI ratings, and group task ratings).  
185 Appropriateness of the use of multiple linear regression (MLR) was assessed using the R



186 functions *plot* and *augment* (in *broom* package), and *coefest* and *bptest* (both in *lmtest* package),  
187 with results reproduced in *ggplot* (in *ggplot2* package) for publication. Hierarchical MLR was  
188 performed using *anova* in R, as described elsewhere [22].

189

190

## 191 **Results**

192

193 As a first step to identifying explanatory variables for use in a regression analysis, we  
194 tested a series of seven potential predictors of admissions outcomes through determining the  
195 correlation of each predictor with the final admissions ranking score (Fig 2). In correlational  
196 analyses, each predictor (that is independent or explanatory variable) yielded a positive  
197 correlation with the dependent variable between 0.17 and 0.502 (Fig 2).

198 **Figure 2. Correlation (R) of explanatory variables with each other and with the dependent**  
199 **variable.** Table shows correlations of the seven explanatory variables with each other and with  
200 the dependent variable. The seven explanatory variables are the average rater evaluation of each  
201 student's written application, video interviews, classical interview, group task performance,  
202 MMI performance (all scored on a range of 1 to 6), the MCAT score and the GPA (both reported  
203 as z-score within the interviewed cohort). The dependent variable is the final committee ranking  
204 score, calculated as described in the methods section.  
205

206 MLR revealed that a model (described here as model one) based on the seven predictors  
207 yields an R square of 0.52, with a strong likelihood of significance ( $p < 10^{-15}$  for the model as a  
208 whole) (Table 1). The least supported individual explanatory variable was the applicants grade  
209 point average (GPA), which was still highly significant ( $p < 10^{-6}$ ) and still displayed a strong  
210 effect size (expressed as a standardized regression coefficient). Model refinement based upon an  
211 adjusted R square approach supported retention of all explanatory variables (data not shown).

212

213 **Table 1. Multiple linear regression predictive models of admissions outcomes.**

	Model One					
	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t )	Stdev. of Variable	Effect Size
<b>Intercept</b>	-4.889	0.276	-17.711	< 2e-16		
<b>Written App. Review</b>	0.311	0.034	9.034	< 2e-16	0.569	0.235
<b>Video Interview Rating</b>	0.164	0.024	6.972	7e-12	0.837	0.182
<b>Classical Interview Rating</b>	0.216	0.022	9.714	< 2e-16	0.903	0.259
<b>Group Task Rating</b>	0.231	0.023	10.144	< 2e-16	0.86	0.264
<b>MMI Rating</b>	0.556	0.038	14.626	< 2e-16	0.52	0.388
<b>MCAT z-score</b>	0.137	0.02	6.864	1.1e-11	1	0.181
<b>GPA z-score</b>	0.104	0.02	5.196	2.65 e-7	1	0.138
<b>Model Rsquare</b>	0.523					
<b>Adjusted Rsquare</b>	0.518					
	Model Two					
	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t )	Stdev. of Variable	Effect Size
<b>Intercept</b>	-4.935	0.238	-20.779	< 2e-16		
<b>Written App. Review</b>	0.31	0.029	10.579	< 2e-16	0.569	0.256
<b>Video Interview Rating</b>	0.19	0.02	9.348	< 2e-16	0.817	0.255
<b>Classical Interview Rating</b>	0.234	0.02	11.919	< 2e-16	0.871	0.295
<b>Group Task Rating</b>	0.233	0.02	11.541	< 2e-16	0.823	0.278
<b>MMI Rating</b>	0.521	0.032	16.08	< 2e-16	0.526	0.397
<b>MCAT z-score</b>	0.127	0.017	7.458	3e-13	0.99	0.182
<b>GPA z-score</b>	0.124	0.018	7.105	3.06-12	0.975	0.175
<b>Model Rsquare</b>	0.614					
<b>Adjusted Rsquare</b>	0.61					

214

215 Model one describes the analysis of a model incorporating all seven proposed explanatory  
 216 variables applied to the full cohort of applicants. Model two, also uses all seven explanatory  
 217 variables, but applied only to the retained cohort after forty-two outliers have been removed, as  
 218 described in text. Estimate: the coefficient for each variable; Written App. Review: rating of the  
 219 written application; Stdev of Variable: standard deviation of the explanatory variable; Effect  
 220 Size: the number of standard deviations change in the outcome variable (average committee  
 221 rating) predicted as a response to a one standard deviation change in the explanatory variable.  
 222

223           The potency of the written application, task, and interview ratings upon candidate  
224 selection is substantial. The effect of each of these variables upon the committee average rating  
225 is described in Table 1 as the effect size, measured as the predicted change of the outcome  
226 variable (in standard deviations), resulting from a one standard deviation change in an  
227 explanatory variable, all else being held constant. For each of the written application, task, and  
228 interview ratings (that is asynchronous video interview, MMI, and classical interview), the effect  
229 size is in the range of 0.18 to 0.40. As an example, all else being held constant, a student  
230 increasing their group task performance by one standard deviation would be predicted by model  
231 one to improve their admissions ratings score by 0.264 standard deviations. Clearly this  
232 represents change at the level at which the interview ratings or task performance ratings can  
233 substantially change an applicant's likelihood of receiving an enrollment offer.

234           It is worth noting that each of the non-academic history metrics are equally or more  
235 potent than either of the academic history metrics (that is GPA and MCAT). Of the explanatory  
236 variables, the MMI provides the greatest contribution to predictive power, indicating potentially  
237 that it also has the most influence on ASC members. It is interesting to consider that ASC  
238 members may be making a rational choice, recognizing that the MMI scores represent data from  
239 five different encounters and five different raters for each applicant.

240           A series of tests need to be performed to determine the appropriateness of a dataset, and  
241 the inferred model, for analysis by multiple linear regression. First, is to test whether the  
242 independent variables display collinearity. While collinearity does not preclude regression  
243 analysis, it does present a significant limitation as it increases the error on the measured  
244 coefficients [23,24]. All the independent variables of the model display correlations of less than  
245 0.21 (Fig 2), implying relatively low collinearity. Of note, this result also strongly suggests that

246 our different interview formats assessed different qualities or attributes in candidates, vindicating  
247 the investment required to conduct them. We also find that the model meets established criteria  
248 for linearity, with mean residual values approximating zero across all fitted (predicted) values  
249 (Fig 3A). The data is broadly homoscedastic, with the exception of a small number of individuals  
250 at high fitted values (Fig 3E). Of greatest concern is that analysis using the Breusch-Pagan test  
251 rejects the hypothesis that the heteroscedasticity is insignificant ( $p = 0.025$ ). The danger of  
252 heteroscedasticity is that it can lead to inaccurately low standard errors, and therefore  
253 inaccurately low p value estimates of relationships. To address this concern, we performed the  
254 widely used approach of developing robust standard errors [25,26], using the functions *coefest*  
255 in R. The robust standard errors generated for all variables increased by less than 10% from the  
256 originals, except for the standard error for the group rating which increased by less than 15%.  
257 Given the very low p values generated to test the significance of the relationships (Table 1),  
258 these small changes in standard error indicate heteroscedasticity does not represent a concern for  
259 the validity of the model.

260 **Figure 3. Graphs testing the appropriateness of MLR to test the models.** Graphs 3A, 3C, 3E,  
261 and 3G represent the model derived from the 2019 and 2020 combined cohort. Graphs 3B, 3D,  
262 3F, and 3H represent the second model, derived from the original cohort after removal of  
263 influential and extreme outliers. Graphs 3A and 3B depict the relationship of each applicant's  
264 residual (the difference between their actual score and their fitted score) (y axis), and their fitted  
265 score (x axis). Ideally model linearity is represented by a horizontal line at a y value of 0. Both  
266 models approximate linearity well. Graphs 3C and 3D depict the relationship of each applicant's  
267 leverage score (as measured by hat matrix) (x-axis) and their standardized residual (y axis).  
268 Highly influential scores are those with both high leverage and high residual scores. Graphs 3E  
269 and 3F represent the relationship of the square root of the absolute value of each candidate's  
270 residual (y axis) to their fitted score (x axis). Ideally model homoscedasticity is represented by a  
271 horizontal line. Both models approximate homoscedasticity except at high fitted scores.  
272 Although not obvious from the graphs, the second model has less heteroscedasticity, as measured  
273 by the Breusch-Pagan test (for the second model, the test does not reject the null hypothesis,  
274 which proposes that there is no heteroscedasticity).

275           Graphs 3G and 3H depict the relationship of the distribution of each model's residuals (y  
276 axis), and a theoretical normal distribution (x axis). Ideally normality of residuals is represented  
277 by a straight line with all points on the line. Both models approximate linearity reasonably well.  
278 Graphs 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D, 3E, and 3F display lines (green) indicating a running average centered  
279 on a window of 70. Graphs 3G and 3H each show the theoretical line (green) for perfect  
280 normality. For graphs 3A, 3C, 3E, and 3G, points representing individuals omitted from the  
281 second model are indicated in red.

282

283           The residuals (deviation of individual applicant's outcome score from the model's fitted  
284 score) display reasonable normality except for a small excess of the very negative residuals (Fig  
285 3G). We have chosen to use visualization of normality in a Q-Q plot to assess normality, rather  
286 than quantitative tests of normality, as quantitative tests of normality are excessively sensitive to  
287 small aberrations with large data sets [27].

288           Finally, the model was tested for the influence of outliers. The most influential outliers  
289 can be calculated using Cooks distance (CD). Forty-one applicants exceeded the recognized  
290 standard of having a CD exceeding 4 divided by the population size (n). For this model,  $4/n$   
291  $=4/729$  or 0.00549. Using CD values exceeding  $4/n$  is not arbitrarily chosen, but rather is a  
292 widely used mechanism to identify outliers [21,24,28,29]. To test the effects of outliers on the  
293 model, we created a derived population, from which forty-one applicants with the highest CD  
294 (that is those with a CD exceeding 0.00549) have been removed, as well as one additional  
295 applicant with a very high standardized residual ( $>3$ ) (the applicants excluded from the new  
296 population are those marked in red in the relevant figures) (Figs 3A, 3C, 3E, and 3G). We  
297 created a new model using the derived population and the same seven explanatory variables. The  
298 new model (model 2) modestly out-performed the original (Table 1, and Fig 3), with an  
299 increased R square (R square equals 0.61), a non-significant Breusch-Pagan statistic ( $p=0.29$ ),  
300 and a slightly improved normality of the residuals (Fig 3H).

301           The best approach to accommodating influential outliers in regression analyses has been  
302 a constant debate in statistics, with valid arguments for both their retention and omission from  
303 analyses [30,31]. We have taken what we believe to be the most accurate and ethical approach in  
304 this research, describing our results before and after omission. However, we recognize that many  
305 researchers take the position that outliers should only be removed when there is a compelling  
306 justification. In our case, we believe the compelling justification is that the outliers do seem to  
307 represent a separate sub-population, as 16 of the 42 outliers who were excluded from the derived  
308 population were ranked as “reject” by the committee. Of the 687 applicants in the derived  
309 population, only five were ranked as reject. The result suggests that major determinants for  
310 decision of “reject” fall outside of the seven explanatory variables used in the models. Indeed,  
311 we are aware that “reject” status is frequently prompted by an applicant’s history of legal  
312 problems or academic malfeasance. We have not attempted to incorporate these potential  
313 explanatory variables as they are both hard to numerically describe and applicable to only a  
314 small fraction of applicants. Removal of the influential data points only modestly affected our  
315 model metrics (Table 1), indicating the robustness of the models. The relative constancy of the  
316 metrics also strongly suggests that the modest heteroscedasticity present in model one has little  
317 effect on the model’s predictive value. Importantly, while we consider that the results after  
318 removal of outliers are interesting, the correlations are clearly present and validated when the  
319 outliers are included. Hence, our conclusions are not dependent on the removal of the outliers.

320           Not all of the seven explanatory variables used in the models are normally distributed. In  
321 particular, the z scores of GPAs are highly left-skewed. However, most statisticians agree that  
322 skewing of explanatory variables does not represent a problem for linear regression [32,33].

323 It is interesting to consider the sources of the unaccounted variance. As none of the  
324 model's explanatory variables include an assessment of applicants' letters of recommendation  
325 (LORs), the LORs represent a source of unaccounted variance. The members of the ASC have  
326 access to the LORs, unlike any of the raters of the written applications, interviews, or tasks. It is  
327 also possible that the model deals poorly with truly exceptional experiences such as receiving a  
328 major international award for humanitarianism, or having a history of academic probation, or  
329 legal problems. These highly influential metrics likely skew the committee's decision away from  
330 the model's fitted value for an individual.

331 It is notable that a more limited model that includes only our task, interview (all three  
332 formats), and written application assessments as explanatory variables still retained significant  
333 predictive value, with an R square of 0.46. As task, interview, and written application raters  
334 never saw the student's MCAT, GPA, or letters of recommendation, the more-restrictive model  
335 establishes that ASC members are influenced by factors external to academic history. In other  
336 words, this result is a validation that the process is holistic. In fact, using a hierarchical approach  
337 to the regression analysis, beginning with a model including just academic metrics, and then  
338 adding in non-academic metrics, the substantial effect of the non-academic metrics is made clear.  
339 A model with just MCAT and GPA as variables yields an R square of 0.05, compared to the R  
340 square of 0.52 once the non-academic metrics are added. The change in R square from  
341 introducing the non-academic ratings is 0.47 and is statistically significant by F-test ( $F(5, 721)=$   
342  $140.3; p<10^{-15}$ ).

343 The null hypothesis for this study is that admissions committee ratings, and therefore,  
344 offers for admission, are solely correlated with past academic performance, and do not correlate  
345 with application, interview, or task ratings. Clearly, the results reject the null hypothesis.

346 A limitation of our study is that it is correlational and does not directly address causation.  
347 Although we believe it is highly unlikely, we acknowledge the possibility that the predictive  
348 value of ratings such as the MMI rating and the group task rating may not be due to ASC  
349 members using these ratings, but rather due to confounding variables that correlate with these  
350 ratings. We acknowledge that the results are very consistent with ASC members using all the  
351 data provided to them, rather than a proof of a causative relationship. While establishing a  
352 causative relationship would be preferable, study designs that would allow for a determination of  
353 causation would be both ethically and practically very challenging.

354 One might propose that one possible confounding variable could be the letters of  
355 recommendation (LORs), if the quality of LORs correlated with the explanatory variables of the  
356 models. However, this proposal has limited applicability, as the model variables do not strongly  
357 correlate with each other, and hence the LORs cannot confound for multiple components.  
358 Indeed, the lack of collinearity among the explanatory variables strongly contributes to our  
359 assertion that it is unlikely that any single confounding variable could account for much of the  
360 observed predictive value of the models.

361 A further consideration regarding this work is that each of the authors have at times  
362 served as interview raters and as ASC members. However, this research project was  
363 retrospective, and the approach was devised after the data construction and collection period.  
364 Hence, the authors were effectively blinded to any influence of the research goals.

365

366

## Discussion

367 The ability for the committee to reflect on the candidate's past behavior and experiences  
368 gave them a window into how the candidate may respond to future adversity, care for others no



369 matter the patient's station in society and innovate and lead in the future as they navigate their  
370 training. Similar to an employer inferring the potential of a future employee based on their  
371 previous work experience, holistic admissions allows the admission committee to consider not  
372 only the candidate's academic competencies, but also their passions and interests as evidenced  
373 by past activities.

374 To that end, a structured applicant evaluation process that is aligned with the institutional  
375 mission can in fact identify those candidates who have a higher likelihood of sharing values and  
376 attributes with that mission. At its inception, the school sought to identify students who aligned  
377 with the institution's mission of improving the quality of, and access to, care for the community  
378 it served. Through each step of the evaluation process candidates were evaluated not only on  
379 their academic metrics, but their attributes, characteristics, and experiences as demonstrated by  
380 their past behaviors and the interview day experience.

381 Holistic admissions seeks to assess and rank applicants for both their academic record  
382 (and inferentially, their academic capabilities) and for attributes broadly termed non-cognitive  
383 skills. Non-cognitive skills can broadly be described by the social science constructs of self-  
384 directed learning (SDL) [34,35], grit [36], and emotional intelligence (EI) [37], combined with  
385 both an applicant's capacity to innovate and their motivation towards community engagement.  
386 Grit has been described as a combination of perseverance and a passion for long term goals [36].  
387 A useful description of EI characterizes it as a combination of self-awareness, self-regulation,  
388 motivation, empathy, and social skills [37]. Within the social skills category of EI are skills  
389 highly valued by the school in the study, including communication, leadership, and teamwork  
390 skills. At least in some settings, these social constructs are predictors of academic or vocational  
391 success [38].

392 As we have indicated, this diverse set of attributes that include SDL, grit, EI, community  
393 engagement, and innovation are sometimes called “non-cognitive” or “soft skills” [38]. While we  
394 recognize that “non-cognitive skills” is the current widely-used term for all metrics other than  
395 academic history, we have strong reservations about the implication that these attributes are not  
396 intellectual. The fact that they can be both taught and learned, and that they can impact academic  
397 success [38,39], strongly implies that they are cognitive. Nonetheless, in recognition of current  
398 terminology, we are using non-cognitive in this discussion to describe these attributes that the  
399 school values.

400 While the medical education community has broadly adopted holistic admissions in order  
401 to better identify candidates with these desired non-cognitive attributes, testing of the efficacy of  
402 holistic admissions has been recognized as critical [13]. This need stems from both the large  
403 commitment of resources required for holistic admissions and from the current legal questions  
404 surrounding admissions processes [13]. In particular, optimization of the metrics assessed in  
405 holistic admissions processes is considered a research priority [40]. The extent of such research  
406 is currently limited, with notable examples at the University of Michigan Medical School  
407 [17,18]. While these examples used approaches with some similarities to ours, neither study  
408 looked at the relative influence or predictive value of different forms of interviews. Our work  
409 presents strong correlations that necessarily constitute a foundational cornerstone of holistic  
410 admissions research – namely that decision maker’s choices do correlate with all the data  
411 presented to them, and that they do not revert to an over-dependence on the applicants’ academic  
412 histories.

413 However, our research raises serious questions. In particular, what should be the optimal  
414 mix of influence of academic history and non-cognitive assessments on rankers of applicants for

415 admissions? A school might be content with the observations reported here of this program, but a  
416 more research-derived answer should surely be better. The research to answer such a question  
417 represents a novel major endeavor beyond the scope of this study. The answer lies ultimately in  
418 the performance of a school's graduates as doctors, and correlating those performance metrics  
419 against the admissions metrics supporting their original admission. However, the complexity of  
420 such research is revealed simply through asking the question, what is the appropriate measure of  
421 a clinician's performance? The answer to this question clearly changes depending upon the  
422 priorities of the individual (or institution) asking the question. For a medical school that  
423 prioritizes community engagement, presumably this requires metrics of the on-going engagement  
424 of its graduates.

425         Due to the innovative nature of the described program, some may question the  
426 generalizability of the research in this report to other medical schools. However, the central idea  
427 of using MLR to test the relative influences of academic and non-academic factors on admissions  
428 decisions can be applied to any medical school. The explanatory variables will change from  
429 school to school, but the core idea and its application remains relevant. Perhaps more  
430 substantively, the processes reported here for the conduct of an innovative admissions process  
431 will be valuable for any school that is considering initiating a mission-focused holistic  
432 admissions program. Although the details which change dependent of a school's mission and  
433 values, our work provides a general guide for establishing new programs, and for evaluating  
434 aspects of their success.

435         Although we have presented the lack of collinearity between explanatory variables as  
436 principally a necessary factor for optimization of MLR, the lack of collinearity is in-itself an  
437 interesting result. The lack of collinearity indicates that each of the task and interview ratings test

438 different attributes in the candidates, supporting the retention of each of these different  
439 components. Clearly, this is a strong validation of the school’s original goals in designing the  
440 process, as each component was designed to test specific attributes. In the case of the video  
441 interviews, the goal was to assess applicants for community engagement, leadership, and  
442 innovation. The group task was designed to assess their teamwork skills. The classical interview  
443 was specifically crafted to address communication and experiences relevant to cultural  
444 competence. As is often the case, the MMIs assessed applicants for comprehension of complex  
445 problems, broad-mindedness and inclusivity. These are now concepts central to the mission of  
446 many medical schools. The lack of collinearity therefore also speaks to the generalizability of  
447 this work, as it represents a significant reason for other schools to invest in this multi-prong  
448 approach. In fact, a previous study at a different institution showed low to medium correlations  
449 between traditional interview assessments and MMI scores, and inferred that that different  
450 interview techniques may more fully characterize the attributes of a candidate [41].

451         The importance of reducing the influence of standardized tests upon admissions decisions  
452 has become recognized as an essential, but not sufficient, step for promoting entry of under-  
453 represented groups to a range of disciplines and professions [12,42–44]. Currently, preliminary  
454 evidence supports the contention that holistic admissions can increase the matriculation rates for  
455 under-represented minorities (URMs) into medical schools [10,45], indicating these applicants  
456 have merits under-appreciated by traditional admissions processes. This presumably allows for  
457 recruitment of URMs through their desirable attributes and experiences, thereby meeting current  
458 legal standards pertaining to admissions. However, the efficacy of holistic admissions clearly  
459 depends on the final rankers use of data outside of the MCAT. In this report, strong evidence is  
460 provided that this is true for the particular admissions program in the study. It is of value to note

461 that MCAT scores have previously been demonstrated to be poor predictors of post-graduation  
462 clinical performance [46].

463 As mentioned earlier, survey evidence indicates that the school’s matriculants are  
464 oriented towards the school’s mission, including an orientation towards leadership, innovation,  
465 and being the drivers of social change [14]. There is also ample anecdotal evidence that the  
466 school’s students and graduates are oriented toward community services [47–49]. It is  
467 challenging to parse out whether these results represent a product of the selection process or the  
468 attraction of mission-oriented students toward a school that emphasizes community engagement.  
469 Future directions of research potentially investigate qualitatively the motivations and career  
470 paths of graduates as they move through their careers.

471 Legal decisions are pushing admissions toward merit-based assessments. This study  
472 describes a process that allows non-cognitive values to be meaningfully assessed and to carry a  
473 weight in the holistic assessment of applicants. Hence an evaluation based on “merit” alone can  
474 be influential in admissions decisions even when “merit” is assessed in “non-cognitive” but  
475 important performance-based evaluations. While merit might be misconstrued as solely  
476 academic achievement, merit should surely also be measured as the capacity to persevere in the  
477 face of adversity, to have expended time and resources in meaningful community experiences,  
478 and to have developed the empathy to understand differing perspectives.

479 In summary, we have created a MLR model of an admissions process that is significantly  
480 predictive of final applicant rankings. The model’s results are consistent with the school’s  
481 admissions process evaluating candidates through considering a wide array of information, and  
482 that the admissions process is therefore truly holistic. The described processes, both the

483 administration and the evaluation of the admission program, can act as a model for other  
484 professional schools to create their own mission-aligned admissions programs.

485

## 486 **Acknowledgements**

487 The authors would like to express our appreciation of the medical students, staff, faculty,  
488 and community members, who have engaged in reviewing applications and rating applicants. We  
489 particularly would like to thank the members of the Admissions Selection Committee for their  
490 diligence and commitment to excellence. We would also like to thank our colleagues in the Kern  
491 National Network for Caring and Character in Medicine for valuable interactions.

492

## 493 **References**

- 494 [1] Narayan MC. Strategies for implementing the national standards for culturally and  
495 linguistically appropriate services in home health care. *Home Health Care Manag Pract*  
496 2017;29:168–75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1084822317696707>.
- 497 [2] Stanford FC. The importance of diversity and inclusion in the healthcare workforce. *J Natl*  
498 *Med Assoc* 2020;112:247–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnma.2020.03.014>.
- 499 [3] Takeshita J, Wang S, Loren AW, Mitra N, Shults J, Shin DB, et al. Association of  
500 racial/ethnic and gender concordance between patients and physicians with patient  
501 experience ratings. *JAMA Netw Open* 2020;3:e2024583.  
502 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.24583>.
- 503 [4] Rural Health information Hub. Healthcare access.  
504 <https://www.ruralhealthinfo.org/topics/healthcare->

- 505 Access#:~:Text=As%20of%20September%202022%2C%20656,Health%20Professional  
506 %20Shortage%20Areas%20Statistics%202022.
- 507 [5] Shipman SA, Wendling A, Jones KC, Kovar-Gough I, Orłowski JM, Phillips J. The  
508 decline in rural medical students: a growing gap in geographic diversity threatens the rural  
509 physician workforce. *Health Aff* 2019;38:2011–8.  
510 <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2019.00924>.
- 511 [6] Rosenblatt RA. Physicians and rural America. *Western Journal of Medicine*  
512 2000;173:348–51. <https://doi.org/10.1136/ewjm.173.5.348>.
- 513 [7] Naylor KB, Tootoo J, Yakusheva O, Shipman SA, Bynum JPW, Davis MA. Geographic  
514 variation in spatial accessibility of U.S. healthcare providers. *PLoS One*  
515 2019;14:e0215016. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0215016>.
- 516 [8] Carver J. Why health care is still hard to access in rural towns near Texas’ bigger cities.  
517 *Texas Tribune* 2023.
- 518 [9] Artinian N 5, 6, 7, Drees B, Glazer G, Harris K, Kaufman L, Lopez N, et al. Holistic  
519 admissions in the health professions: strategies for leaders. *Coll Univ* 2017;92:65–8.
- 520 [10] Aibana O, Swails JL, Flores RJ, Love L. Bridging the gap: holistic review to increase  
521 diversity in graduate medical education. *Academic Medicine* 2019;94:1137–41.  
522 <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000002779>.
- 523 [11] Elks ML, Herbert-Carter J, Smith M, Klement B, Knight BB, Anachebe NF. Shifting the  
524 curve: fostering academic success in a diverse student body. *Academic Medicine*  
525 2018;93:66–70. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000001783>.

- 526 [12] Goghari VM. Excellence, access, and the public good: Building socially responsive  
527 admissions practices for health science programs. *Psychiatry Res* 2022;311:114497.  
528 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2022.114497>.
- 529 [13] Conrad SS, Addams AN, Young GH. Holistic review in medical school admissions and  
530 selection: A strategic, mission-driven response to shifting societal needs. *Academic*  
531 *Medicine* 2016;91:1472–4. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000001403>.
- 532 [14] Daboub JA, Bergemann AD, Smith SR. Rethinking an admissions program to align with  
533 the mission of an innovative medical school. *Med Sci Educ* 2020;30:1655–9.  
534 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40670-020-01084-y>.
- 535 [15] Nelson EA, Wilkerson L, Smith S, Cox S. Dell Medical School at the University of Texas,  
536 Austin. *Academic Medicine* 2020;95:S508–12.  
537 <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000003392>.
- 538 [16] Silverthorn DU, Lee MW, Corliss SB, Nelson EA, Bergemann AD. Words of advice:  
539 preparing to teach. *FEBS J* 2020;287:443–51. <https://doi.org/10.1111/febs.15184>.
- 540 [17] Burkhardt JC, DesJardins SL, Teener CA, Gay SE, Santen SA. Predicting medical school  
541 enrollment behavior: comparing an enrollment management model to expert human  
542 judgment. *Academic Medicine* 2018;93:S68–73.  
543 <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000002374>.
- 544 [18] Burkhardt JC, DesJardins SL, Teener CA, Gay SE, Santen SA. Enrollment Management  
545 in Medical School Admissions: A Novel Evidence-Based Approach at One Institution.  
546 *Academic Medicine* 2016;91:1561–7. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000001188>.
- 547 [19] Eva KW, Macala C, Fleming B. Twelve tips for constructing a multiple mini-interview.  
548 *Med Teach* 2019;41:510–6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2018.1429586>.



- 549 [20] Eva KW, Rosenfeld J, Reiter HI, Norman GR. An admissions OSCE: the multiple mini-  
550 interview. *Med Educ* 2004;38:314–26. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2923.2004.01776.x>.
- 551 [21] Cetinkaya M. Linear Regression and modelling. Coursera [MOOC] n.d.
- 552 [22] University of Virginia Library. Hierarchical linear regression.  
553 <https://LibraryVirginiaEdu/Data/Articles/Hierarchical-Linear-Regression> n.d.
- 554 [23] Kim JH. Multicollinearity and misleading statistical results. *Korean J Anesthesiol*  
555 2019;72:558–69. <https://doi.org/10.4097/kja.19087>.
- 556 [24] Eledum H. Leverage and influential observations on the Liu type estimator in the linear  
557 regression model with the severe collinearity. *Heliyon* 2021;7:e07792.  
558 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07792>.
- 559 [25] White H. A heteroscedasticity-consistent covariance matrix estimator and a direct test for  
560 heteroscedasticity. *Econometrica* 1980;48:817–38.
- 561 [26] Mansournia MA, Nazemipour M, Naimi AI, Collins GS, Campbell MJ. Reflection on  
562 modern methods: demystifying robust standard errors for epidemiologists. *Int J Epidemiol*  
563 2021;50:346–51. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyaa260>.
- 564 [27] Mishra P, Pandey C, Singh U, Gupta A, Sahu C, Keshri A. Descriptive statistics and  
565 normality tests for statistical data. *Ann Card Anaesth* 2019;22:67.  
566 [https://doi.org/10.4103/aca.ACA\\_157\\_18](https://doi.org/10.4103/aca.ACA_157_18).
- 567 [28] BOLLEN KA, JACKMAN RW. Regression diagnostics. *Sociol Methods Res*  
568 1985;13:510–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124185013004004>.
- 569 [29] Altman N, Krzywinski M. Analyzing outliers: influential or nuisance? *Nat Methods*  
570 2016;13:281–2. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.3812>.

- 571 [30] Motulsky HJ, Brown RE. Detecting outliers when fitting data with nonlinear regression –  
572 a new method based on robust nonlinear regression and the false discovery rate. *BMC*  
573 *Bioinformatics* 2006;7:123. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-7-123>.
- 574 [31] Rahman SMAK, Sathik MM, Kannan KS. Multiple linear regression models in outlier  
575 detection. *International Journal of Research in Computer Science* 2012;2:23–8.  
576 <https://doi.org/10.7815/ijorcs.22.2012.018>.
- 577 [32] Li X, Wong W, Lamoureux EL, Wong TY. Are linear regression techniques appropriate  
578 for analysis when the dependent (outcome) variable is not normally distributed?  
579 *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science* 2012;53:3082.  
580 <https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.12-9967>.
- 581 [33] Knief U, Forstmeier W. Violating the normality assumption may be the lesser of two  
582 evils. *Behav Res Methods* 2021;53:2576–90. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-021-01587-5>.
- 583 [34] Knowles M. *Self-directed learning: a guide for learners and teachers*. . Cambridge Book  
584 Company; 1975.
- 585 [35] Ricotta DN, Richards JB, Atkins KM, Hayes MM, McOwen K, Soffler MI, et al. Self-  
586 Directed Learning in medical education: training for a lifetime of discovery. *Teach Learn*  
587 *Med* 2022;34:530–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10401334.2021.1938074>.
- 588 [36] Duckworth AL, Peterson C, Matthews MD, Kelly DR. Grit: Perseverance and passion for  
589 long-term goals. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 2007;92:1087–101. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.6.1087)  
590 [3514.92.6.1087](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.6.1087).
- 591 [37] Goleman D. *When smart is dumb. Emotional Intelligence: why it matters more than IQ*,  
592 New York: Bantam Books; 1995.

- 593 [38] Kautz T, Heckman J, Diris R, ter Weel B, Borghans L. Fostering and Measuring Skills:  
594 Improving Cognitive and Non-Cognitive Skills to Promote Lifetime Success. Cambridge,  
595 MA: 2014. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w20749>.
- 596 [39] Papanagnou D, Corliss S, Richards JB, Artino AR, Schwartzstein R. Progression of Self-  
597 Directed Learning in health professions education: clarifying terms and processes.  
598 *Academic Medicine* 2024;99:236–236. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000005191>.
- 599 [40] Nakae S, Porfeli EJ, Davis D, Grabowski CJ, Harrison LE, Amiri L, et al. Enrollment  
600 Management in Undergraduate Medical School Admissions: A Complementary  
601 Framework to Holistic Review for Increasing Diversity in Medicine. *Academic Medicine*  
602 2021;96:501–6. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000003866>.
- 603 [41] Abrams M, Olvet DM, Ellenbogen L, Bird JB, Fazio C, Caprioglio L, et al. Comparison of  
604 the multiple mini-interview and the traditional interview in medical school admissions:  
605 lessons learned using a hybrid model at one institution. *Academic Medicine* 2023;98:606–  
606 13. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000005127>.
- 607 [42] Zimnicki KM, Aaron KS, McQuillen EP, Palma AL, Sikora G V., Carter E V. When  
608 holistic admissions review is not enough: barriers to diversity. *Journal of Nursing*  
609 *Education* 2022;61:375–82. <https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20220610-03>.
- 610 [43] Mapp A. Removing a barrier to equity. *Science (1979)* 2022;376:437–437.  
611 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abq6714>.
- 612 [44] Cunningham C, Kiezebrink K. Insights on selection of undergraduate dental students.  
613 *European Journal of Dental Education* 2023;27:505–14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eje.12834>.
- 614 [45] Grbic D, Morrison E, Sondheimer HM, Conrad SS, Milem JF. The association between a  
615 holistic review in admissions workshop and the diversity of accepted applicants and

- 616 students matriculating to medical school. *Academic Medicine* 2019;94:396–403.
- 617 <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000002446>.
- 618 [46] Saguil A, Dong T, Gingerich RJ, Swygert K, LaRoche JS, Artino AR, et al. Does the  
619 MCAT Predict Medical School and PGY-1 Performance? *Mil Med* 2015;180:4–11.
- 620 <https://doi.org/10.7205/MILMED-D-14-00550>.
- 621 [47] Conte C. This nonprofit is using medical students to help Americans deal with medical  
622 debt. [https://www.denver7.com/news/national/this-nonprofit-is-using-medical-](https://www.denver7.com/news/national/this-nonprofit-is-using-medical-students-to-help-americans-deal-with-medical-debt)  
623 [Students-to-Help-Americans-Deal-with-Medical-Debt](https://www.denver7.com/news/national/this-nonprofit-is-using-medical-students-to-help-americans-deal-with-medical-debt) 2022.
- 624 [48] Dell Medical School. Making space for connection in practice.  
625 [https://dellmed.utexas.edu/news/brooke-wagen-making-space-for-connection-in-](https://dellmed.utexas.edu/news/brooke-wagen-making-space-for-connection-in-practice)  
626 [Practice](https://dellmed.utexas.edu/news/brooke-wagen-making-space-for-connection-in-practice) 2023.
- 627 [49] Bohra N. Good apple works to get healthy food on the table for East Austin families. *The*  
628 *Austin Chronicle* 2020.
- 629

Eval Type	Question Type	Domain				Grand Total	Cohort
		A	C	E	M		
1 Review	Attributes	4.500				4.500	4.8244
	Experience			4.500		4.500	4.7564
	Mission				4.500	4.500	4.7507
	Personal Statement		4.500			4.500	4.7110
2 Video Secondary	Communications		4.000			4.000	4.7932
	Community Engage..				4.000	4.000	4.7865
	Innovation/Creativity				4.000	4.000	4.6679
	Leadership				3.000	3.000	4.6604
3 Interview B	Communicate Uniqu..				6.000	6.000	4.8694
	Communications		5.000			5.000	4.9851
	Unique Contribution				5.000	5.000	4.9963
4 Group	Collegiality	5.000				5.000	4.8731
	Contribution to Task	3.000				3.000	4.9776
	Inclusive	5.000				5.000	4.8134
	Movement to Compl..	4.000				4.000	4.7463
	Respectful	5.000				5.000	4.9515
5 MMI	Assimilate	4.400				4.400	4.4537
	Broad-Minded				4.200	4.200	4.3746
	Communications		4.600			4.600	4.4351
	Complexity	4.400				4.400	4.3746
	Interpersonal	4.600				4.600	4.4291
	Non-Verbal Commun..		4.800			4.800	4.5784
<b>Grand Total</b>		4.455	4.643	4.500	4.333	4.480	4.5787

	Written Application	Video Interv. Rating	Classic. Interv. Rating	Group Task Rating	MMI Rating	MCAT z-score	GPA z-score	Final Committee Score
Written Application	1	-0.102	0.068	0.022	0.025	0.046	0.057	0.266
Video Interv. Rating	-0.102	1	0.02	0.007	0.106	0.033	-0.062	0.204
Classic. Interv. Rating	0.068	0.02	1	0.015	0.181	0.108	-0.127	0.315
Group Task Rating	0.022	0.007	0.015	1	0.127	-0.011	0.045	0.327
MMI Rating	0.025	0.106	0.181	0.127	1	0.018	0.035	0.502
MCAT z-score	0.046	0.033	0.108	-0.011	0.018	1	0.203	0.203
GPA z-score	0.057	-0.062	-0.127	0.045	0.035	0.203	1	0.17
Final Committee Score	0.266	0.204	0.315	0.327	0.502	0.203	0.17	1

