Dermatology Standardized Letter of Recommendation: Why we need it

Jessica Kaffenberger, M.D The Ohio State University



Are letters of recommendation important?



2013 Survey of APD members, n= 108



Support for Developing SLOR

3A. Standardized Letter Template



- 2013 Survey of APD members, n=108
 - 79% of APD respondents were in support or possibly in support of developing a SLOR



WHAT IS THE SLOR?

DERMATOLOGY STANDARDIZED LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION

Applicant's Name:	This applicant
Institution:	waived his/her rights
AAMC ID No:	to view this
Your name:	standardized letter of
Your Signature:	recommendation as covered under the
Your email:	Family Educational
Your telephone:	Rights and Privacy
Your present position (choose one):	Act of 1974.
Dermatology Department Chair	Yes No
Dermatology Program Director	
Dermatology Assistant Program Director	
Dermatology Faculty	
Non-dermatology Faculty (Specialty :	
Research Faculty	
Private Practice physician	

How long have you been in your current position (or a similar position)? ______years

A. Background

- 1. How many medical students have you worked with in the past year?
 - <15</p>
 15 50
 - >50
- 2. How often do you work with dermatology residents?
 - <1 per week</p>
 - 1-3 times per week
 - >3 times per week
- How long have you known the applicant? _____months
- 4. What is your contact with the applicant? (Choose all that apply)
 - Know indirectly through others/evaluations
 - Direct observation in clinical setting
 - Direct observation writing article (case report, review article, etc)
 - Direct observation in clinical/basic science research

Advisor

- B. Assessment
 - Please assess the applicant compared to the overall <u>dermatology applicant pool</u>. If this candidate is below average in any of the areas, please include written comments in the field below.

	Below Avg for Derm applicant	Average for Derm applicant	Above Avg for Derm applicant	Outstanding for Derm applicant (Top 15%)	Exceptional for Derm applicant (Top 5%)	Best this year	Best in 10 years
Ability to work as a part of a team							
Interactions with patients							
Interactions with residents							
Clinical knowledge							
Communication ability							
Inquisitive nature							
Reliability							
Research potential							
Work ethic							
Leadership potential							
GLOBAL ASSESMENT							

- 2. This applicant's most outstanding feature is
- 3. The applicant's most likely career path will be
- 4. Indicate any additional comments in the box below (100 word limit)

Applicant Name Institution: AAMC ID:

AAMC ID

Your Name:

10 reasons to adopt the SLOR



10. Current NLOR has various problems





Fig 2. Questions posed to Association of Professors of Dermatology members regarding ambiguity, redundancy, and willingness to provide honest assessments of a weakness of an applicant. n = 129.

Kaffenberger et al. JAAD. 2014 Aug;71(2):395-6.



Some problems with NLOR cont

- Contain a complicated hierarchy of laudatory phrases
 - "..."outstanding" (or equivalent) was used in 37% and "excellent" (or equivalent) was used in 38%. Meaningful comparison to student colleagues appeared in 11%." (Fortune 2002). (Evaluated 966 NLOR for surgery positions)
 - "If I can provide any additional information, please call..." was almost uniformly identified as a strong negative comment and was most commonly found in the...lowest ranked group of letters". (Greenburg 1994) (Evaluated 80 NLOR Surgery letters)
 - Primary reason EM switched to SLOR. "Although a letter writer's intent in using terms such as "excellent" may have been to imply a specific comparative value to a given characteristic, it was confusing to many program directors what that value really was and how frequently the writer used such terms when describing (Keim et al 1999)



Some problems with NLOR cont

Code words

- 19% of 763 NLORs evaluated for ENT residency contained "doubt raisers" (Messner 2008)
 - "made an effort to be an effective team member"
 - "average fund of knowledge"
- Low reliability between interpreting faculty members
 - Low kappa (0.28) for NLOR evaluating 58 orthopedic residents (Dirschl 2000)



9. SLORs exist in other specialties, and are successful



Programs who have adopted SLORs

- Emergency Medicine
- = ENT
- Orthopedics
- Plastics



- "You are on the right track to start using standardized letters....They are more helpful to separate applicants. We all use the standardized form."
 - Sorabh Khandelwal M.D., Emergency Med Program Director at OSU
- "We have been using the standardized letter of recommendation for the past 3 years. I feel that we all like it. It is basically a scoring sheet that allows us to be a bit more objective when comparing applicants."
 - Brad DeSilva, MD ENT Program Director at OSU



8. SLORs provide a framework for letter interpretation



How reliable is a letter coming from each of the following groups?



How reliable is a letter coming from each of the following groups?



15 (Kaffenberger et al 2014)

Information about writer's background/writer-applicant relationship (unpublished data)

- NLOR 2.3 pieces of info
- SLOR 6 pieces of info

Your present position (choose one):
Dermatology Department Chair
Dermatology Program Director
Dermatology Assistant Program Director
Dermatology Faculty
Non-dermatology Faculty (Specialty :)
Research Faculty
Private Practice physician
How long have you been in your current position (or a similar position)?years

- A. Background
 - 1. How many medical students have you worked with in the past year?
 - <15 15 - 50 >50
 - 2. How often do you work with dermatology residents?
 - <1 per week</pre>
 - 1-3 times per week
 - >3 times per week
 - 3. How long have you known the applicant? _____ months
 - 4. What is your contact with the applicant? (Choose all that apply)
 - Know indirectly through others/evaluations
 - Direct observation in clinical setting
 - Direct observation writing article (case report, review article, etc)
 - Direct observation in clinical/basic science research
 - Advisor



7. SLOR incorporates qualities which are deemed important by APD



2013: APD surveyed on what they found important in a LOR (n=108). Most impt:

- Personality
- Reliability
- Work Ethic



		Below Avg for Derm applicant	Average for Derm applicant	Above Avg for Derm applicant	Outstanding for Derm applicant (Top 15%)	Exceptional for Derm applicant (Top 5%)	Best this year	Best in 10 years
	Ability to work as a part of a team							
≻	Interactions with patients							
≻	Interactions with residents							
	Clinical knowledge							
≯	Communication ability							
	Inquisitive nature							
	Reliability							
	Research potential							
	Work ethic							
≻	Leadership potential							
	GLOBAL ASSESMENT							

- 2. This applicant's most outstanding feature is
- 3. The applicant's most likely career path will be



6. All applicants evaluated via same benchmarks



- 763 LORs evaluated for ENT residency
 - Female letter writers more likely to comment on applicant being a team player, or compassionate. Males more likely to write a letter of "minimal assurance" (Messner et al 2008)







5. Less potential for applicant "glamorization"



2014-2015 interviews: NLOR for applicant #1 written by physician A

 "I am writing to <u>highly recommend</u>" [] in application for a position in your residency program in Dermatology.

"[] demonstrated an ability to learn quickly and her turnaround on the paper was under
 RESEARCH eeks, which impressed me....Our frequent meetings always demonstrated to me []'s
 work ethic, determination, and ability to receive and respond to constructive criticism,
 incorporating them seamlessly into the finished research project.... developed a
 detailed knowledge base of our subject matter..."

COMMUNICATION ssed her assessment and plans with great articulation, enthusiasm and organization..."

GOOD INTERACTIONS "..."



SLOR for SAME applicant #1 written by the SAME physician A

Research Communication Good interaction	ons	Below Avg for Derm applicant	Average for Derm applicant	Above Avg for Derm applicant	Outstanding for Derm applicant (Top 15%)	Exceptional for Derm applicant (Top 5%)	Best this year	Best in 10 years
	k as a part of a team			\checkmark				
\subset	Interactions with patients				\checkmark	\mathbf{D}		
	Interactions with residents		\checkmark					
	Clinical knowledge		Π	1				
\langle	Communication ability				\checkmark			
	Inquisitive nature					1		
	Reliability						1	
\triangleleft	Research potential							
	Work ethic						$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$	
-	Leadership potential							
	GLOBAL ASSESMENT							

- 2. This applicant's most outstanding feature is Lively
- 3. The applicant's most likely career path will be Private practice

E UNIVERSITY

ITER

2014-2015 interviews: NLOR for applicant #2 written by physician B

"It is with great pleasure that I write this letter of recommendation..."

"She is a hardworking, studious young woman who has proven herself
 WORK ETHIC
 WORK ETHIC
 WORK ETHIC

GOOD INTERACTIONS energy....She has attempted to find additional projects and is quite persistent in this; however, she also has the ability to study independently and **she read a great deal while on our rotation**"



SLOR for SAME applicant #2 written by the SAME physician B

Work Ethic Good intera		Below Avg for Derm applicant	Average for Derm applicant	Above Avg for Derm applicant	Outstanding for Derm applicant (Top 15%)	Exceptional for Derm applicant (Top 5%)	Best this year	Best in 10 years
	Ability to work as		V					
	a part of a team			7				
	patients Interactions with residents		1	P				
	Clinical knowledge							
	Communication ability		\checkmark					
	Inquisitive nature			1		Contract of		
	Reliability		1					
	Research potential		1					
<	Work ethic		1					
	Leadership potential		1					
	GLOBAL ASSESMENT		7					

This applicant's most outstanding feature is Personal dedication and determination

JNIVERSITY

Less potential for applicant "glamorization" with SLOR

- Derm SLOR (unpublished data)
 - Applicants' positive traits were felt to be less exaggerated in SLOR vs NLOR (p<0.0001)





4. Higher reliability



EM comparison of standardized and narrative LOR (Girzadas et al. 1998)

- SLOR interrater reliability 0.97
- NLOR interrater reliability 0.78
- Dermatology comparison of standarized and narrative LOR (unpublished data)

Table 1							
	Narrative	Standardized					
	Letter	Letter					
Personality							
Interrater - W	0.437	0.654					
Intrarater - Averaged ρ	0.368	0.754					
١	Vork Ethic						
Interrater - W	0.481	0.720					
<u>Intrarater</u> - Average ρ	0.542	0.906					
Reliability							
Interrater - W	0.456	0.723					
<u>Intrarater</u> - Average ρ	0.511	0.882					
Perceptio	n of Letter Inflati	on					
Interrater - W	0.282	0.364					
Intrarater - Average o	0.426	0.507					
Global Score							
Interrater - W	0.578	0.704					
n trarater - Average ρ	0.643	0.764					

W = Kendall Coefficient of concordance
 ρ -Spearman Rank
 Correlation Coefficient
 (averaged among 5 repeat interpreters)



3. Ability to stratify applicants



2013 Dermatology APD survey, one of most impt criteria in a LOR









2013 Dermatology APD survey regarding NLOR, n= 108



Fig 2. Questions posed to Association of Professors of Dermatology members regarding ambiguity, redundancy, and willingness to provide honest assessments of a weakness of an applicant. n = 129.

Kaffenberger et al., 2014





1. SIMPLE and fast!



Time to interpret

EM (Girzadas et al. 1998)

- NLOR: 90 sec
- SLOR: 16 seconds
- Dermatology (unpublished data)
 - NLOR: 2 min
 - SLOR: 1 min





TAKE HOME: 10 reasons to adopt SLOR

- 10. Current NLOR has numerous problems
- 9. Similar versions are already successful
- 8. Framework for where the letter is coming from
- 7. Incorporates qualities which are deemed important by APD
- 6. All applicants evaluated via same benchmarks
- 5. Potential for less exaggeration of traits
- 4. High validity
- 3. Ability to stratify applicants
- 2. Efficient/not redundant
- 1. SIMPLE!



THANK YOU!



"Are all of these letters of recommendation from your mother?"

cartoonbank.com

