Name of Presenter:	J. Alexander Torres
Degree of Presenter:	BS
Co-Authors and degrees:	Melody Carroll, PhD, Rachael Tan, PhD, Ian Carroll, PhD, Nichole Zehnder, MD
Division:	Other: Education and Evaluation
Presenter's Rank:	Medical Student
Research Category:	Outcomes Research
Title of Abstract:	Inter-Interviewer Index: A Novel Interviewer Bias Tool for Medical School Admissions
Please copy and paste your abstract here: (no more than 300 words):	Needs and objectives: Making the admissions process more equitable can lead to improved outcomes. Frequently, admissions committee members know little about the bias and tendencies of interviewers and the recommendations they submit. Providing real-time quantification of inter- interviewer variance to admissions committees, we aim to provide better context for interviewer recommendations providing improved equity for applicants. Setting and participants: Interviewers at the University of Colorado School of Medicine interact with applicants across different settings including a group exercise, group interview, and individual interview, then provide ratings of "fit" between the applicant and the CUSOM to the Admissions Committee. 94 interviewers and 3,930 recommendations from the '18-19 cycle were analyzed. Description: Interviews are utilized to evaluate applicants to medical schools all across the country. By design, admissions committees rely on the recommendations of interviewers. Although interviewers are given a basic framework to conduct the interview their interpretations and logic for recommendations are not standardized and can lead to

significant inter-interviewer variability. While variability promotes diversity of thought, it may also invite interviewer bias to give certain recommendations more frequently compared to other interviewers. We propose a standardized metric of real-time informativeness, and leniency/harshness.

Evaluation: Interviewers give ratings of either Strong Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neutral (N), Disagree (D), or Strong Disagree (SD). Using retrospective rater data, we calculated baseline measurements of interviewer leniency/harshness and informativeness. Recommendations were analyzed via several statistical models including mixed-effects linear, ordinal logistic regression, and unidimensional Item Response Theory models with graded responses. Estimates of interviewer ability were obtained from posterior distributions of ability for each subject. Item response curves were created to evaluate rater informativeness.

Discussion: Interviewer recommendations can vary substantially. The Interviewer Index proposes a method of quantifying inter-interviewer variance allowing admissions committees to put recommendations into better context and provide more holistic admissions decisions.