1	In Holistic Admissions, a Combination of Non-Academic Explanatory Variables Has
2	Significant Predictive Value for Applicant Ranking
3	Andrew D. Bergemann ^{1*} , PhD, Stephen R. Smith ² , PhD and Joel A. Daboub ² , MBA.
4	
5	¹ Department of Education, Innovation, and Technology, Baylor College of Medicine in Houston,
6	Texas, USA.
7	
8	² 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	
10	
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	
л 0	
+1 /2	
+2 43	
ъJ	

44 Introduction

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
63 64	can also at least sometimes exceed past academic performance as a predictor of future academic or career success [9–12]. Holistic admissions, therefore, has the capacity to enable the entry into

demographic change being the goal of the process, but rather by recognizing individualcandidates 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.

While many studies establish that holistic admissions has positive outcomes, relatively
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 color gradient that aligned with performance on the rubric and that provided ASC members 145 146 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 Interview B" refers to the classical one-on-one interviews. "4 Group" refers to the ratings of the 157 group task. "5 MMI" refers to the average ratings across five multiple, mini-interviews. In 158 159 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

For each applicant, three ASC members were assigned the role of being primary 163 164 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	<i>plot</i> and <i>a</i>	ugment (in <i>broom</i> j	package),	and coe	ftest and <i>k</i>	ptest (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

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

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).

Figure 2. Correlation (R) of explanatory variables with each other and with the dependent variable. Table shows correlations of the seven explanatory variables with each other and with the dependent variable. The seven explanatory variables are the average rater evaluation of each student's written application, video interviews, classical interview, group task performance, MMI performance (all scored on a range of 1 to 6), the MCAT score and the GPA (both reported as z-score within the interviewed cohort). The dependent variable is the final committee ranking 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	
Intercept	-4.889	0.276	-17.711	< 2e-16		1	
Written App. Review	0.311	0.034	9.034	< 2e-16	0.569	0.235	
Video Interview Rating	0.164	0.024	6.972	7e-12	0.837	0.182	
Classical Interview Rating	0.216	0.022	9.714	< 2e-16	0.903	0.259	
Group Task Rating	0.231	0.023	10.144	< 2e-16	0.86	0.264	
MMI Rating	0.556	0.038	14.626	< 2e-16	0.52	0.388	
MCAT z-score	0.137	0.02	6.864	1.1e-11	1	0.181	
GPA z-score	0.104	0.02	5.196	2.65 e-7	1	0.138	
Model Rsquare	0.523						
Adjusted Rsquare	0.518			1	1	1	
	Model Two						
			Mode	el Two			
	Estimate	Std. Error	Mode t value	el Two Pr(> t)	Stdev. of Variable	Effect Size	
Intercept	Estimate -4.935	Std. Error	Mode t value -20.779	el Two Pr(> t) < 2e-16	Stdev. of Variable	Effect Size	
Intercept Written App. Review	Estimate -4.935 0.31	Std. Error 0.238 0.029	Mode t value -20.779 10.579	el Two Pr(> t) < 2e-16 < 2e-16	Stdev. of Variable 0.569	Effect Size	
Intercept Written App. Review Video Interview Rating	Estimate -4.935 0.31 0.19	Std. Error 0.238 0.029 0.02	Mode t value -20.779 10.579 9.348	Pr(> t) < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16	Stdev. of Variable 0.569 0.817	Effect Size 0.256 0.255	
Intercept Written App. Review Video Interview Rating Classical Interview Rating	Estimate -4.935 0.31 0.19 0.234	Std. Error 0.238 0.029 0.02 0.02	Mode t value -20.779 10.579 9.348 11.919	Pr(> t) < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16	Stdev. of Variable 0.569 0.817 0.871	Effect Size 0.256 0.255 0.295	
Intercept Written App. Review Video Interview Rating Classical Interview Rating Group Task Rating	Estimate -4.935 0.31 0.19 0.234 0.233	Std. Error 0.238 0.029 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02	Mode t value -20.779 10.579 9.348 11.919 11.541	Pr(> t) < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16	Stdev. of Variable 0.569 0.817 0.871 0.823	Effect Size 0.256 0.255 0.295 0.278	
Intercept Written App. Review Video Interview Rating Classical Interview Rating Group Task Rating MMI Rating	Estimate -4.935 0.31 0.19 0.234 0.233 0.521	Std. Error 0.238 0.029 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02	Mode t value -20.779 10.579 9.348 11.919 11.541 16.08	Pr(> t) < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16	Stdev. of Variable 0.569 0.817 0.871 0.823 0.526	Effect Size 0.256 0.255 0.295 0.278 0.397	
Intercept Written App. Review Video Interview Rating Classical Interview Rating Group Task Rating MMI Rating MCAT z-score	Estimate -4.935 0.31 0.19 0.234 0.233 0.521 0.127	Std. Error 0.238 0.029 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.032 0.017	Mode t value -20.779 10.579 9.348 11.919 11.541 16.08 7.458	Pr(> t) < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16 3e-13	Stdev. of Variable 0.569 0.817 0.871 0.823 0.526 0.99	Effect Size 0.256 0.255 0.295 0.278 0.397 0.182	
Intercept Written App. Review Video Interview Rating Classical Interview Rating Group Task Rating MMI Rating MCAT z-score GPA z-score	Estimate -4.935 0.31 0.19 0.234 0.233 0.521 0.127 0.124	Std. Error 0.238 0.029 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.017 0.018	Mode t value -20.779 10.579 9.348 11.919 11.541 16.08 7.458 7.105	Pr(> t) < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16 3e-13 3.06-12	Stdev. of Variable 0.569 0.817 0.871 0.823 0.526 0.99 0.975	Effect Size 0.256 0.295 0.295 0.278 0.397 0.182 0.175	
Intercept Written App. Review Video Interview Rating Classical Interview Rating Group Task Rating MMI Rating MCAT z-score GPA z-score Model Rsquare	Estimate -4.935 0.31 0.19 0.234 0.233 0.521 0.127 0.124 0.614	Std. Error 0.238 0.029 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.032 0.017 0.018	Mode t value -20.779 10.579 9.348 11.919 11.541 16.08 7.458 7.105	Pr(> t) < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16 < 2e-16 3e-13 3.06-12	Stdev. of Variable 0.569 0.817 0.871 0.823 0.526 0.99 0.975	Effect Size 0.256 0.295 0.295 0.278 0.397 0.182 0.175	

214

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

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

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 coeftest
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).

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

282

The residuals (deviation of individual applicant's outcome score from the model's fitted score) display reasonable normality except for a small excess of the very negative residuals (Fig 3G). We have chosen to use visualization of normality in a Q-Q plot to assess normality, rather than quantitative tests of normality, as quantitative tests of normality are excessively sensitive to 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/n291 =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))= 140.3; p<10⁻¹⁵). 342

The null hypothesis for this study is that admissions committee ratings, and therefore, offers for admission, are solely correlated with past academic performance, and do not correlate 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 experiences368 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.

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

However, our research raises serious questions. In particular, what should be the optimal
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.

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

different attributes in the candidates, supporting the retention of each of these different 438 439 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 theses 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

that MCAT scores have previously been demonstrated to be poor predictors of post-graduationclinical 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

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://WwwRuralhealthinfoOrg/Topics/Healthcare-

- 505 Access#:~:Text=As%20of%20September%202022%2C%20656,Health%20Professional
 506 %20Shortage%20Areas%20Statistics 2022.
- 507 [5] Shipman SA, Wendling A, Jones KC, Kovar-Gough I, Orlowski 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.00000000002779.
- 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.00000000001783.

- 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.00000000001403.
- 532 [14] Daboub JA, Bergemann AD, Smith SR. Rethinking an admissions program to align with
- 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.0000000003392.
- 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.0000000002374.
- 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.00000000001188.
- 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. Hierachical 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
- 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 heterosedasticity. 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
- normality tests for statistical data. Ann Card Anaesth 2019;22:67.
- 566 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 –
- 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 Opthalmology & 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-
- 590 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.00000000005191.
- 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.00000000003866.
- 603 [41] Abrams M, Olvet DM, Ellenbogen L, Bird JB, Fazio C, Caprioglio L, et al. Comparison of
- 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.00000000005127.
- 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.0000000002446.
- 618 [46] Saguil A, Dong T, Gingerich RJ, Swygert K, LaRochelle 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://WwwDenver7Com/News/National/This-Nonprofit-Is-Using-Medical-
- 623 Students-to-Help-Americans-Deal-with-Medical-Debt 2022.
- 624 [48] Dell Medical School. Making space for connection in practice.
- 625 Https://DellmedUtexasEdu/News/Brooke-Wagen-Making-Space-for-Connection-in626 Practice 2023.
- 627 [49] Bohra N. Good apple works to get healthy food on the table for East Austin families. The628 Austin Chronicle 2020.

				Domain			Cohort
Eval Type	Question Type	A	С	E	M	Grand Total	conore
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	Communications		4.000			4.000	4.7932
Secondary	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			2	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
Grand Total		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









