PAEA

PA PROGRAM

ADMISSIONS RESOURCES

Table of Contents

Purpose

 The purpose of this guidebook is to provide resources for PA programs regarding accreditation *Standards*, policies, procedures, and sound practices for admissions. The information provided within this guidebook is pertinent to anyone involved in the admissions process, including admissions officers, recruitment specialists, admissions committee members, program faculty, program staff, program directors, department chairs, and medical directors. The intent of this guidebook is to help PA programs develop and evaluate admissions policies and procedures that are specific to the mission and vision of their individual program.

The primary goal of a PA program's admission process is to select students who fulfill the mission, vision, and goals of the PA program, as well as select those who will make meaningful contributions to the program, and ultimately the PA profession. Additionally, the admissions process must comply with policies of the institution and program, accreditation bodies (both the ARC-PA and the regional accreditation body of the institution), as well as state and federal laws. Furthermore, the process should ensure that admitted candidates are those that are qualified to achieve the intended learning outcomes of the program and have a high probability of success in the program.

Importantly, the guidance and related content contained within this guidebook is not legal advice. As noted in various sections of the guidebook, it is critical that each program consult with their legal counsel on all aspects of their admissions policies, procedures, and processes to ensure that they comply with applicable state and federal laws, as well as applicable institutional and accreditation policies. Finally, it is important to keep in mind that this guidebook is not intended to be prescriptive and should therefore be utilized as an educational resource to programs. Each program must develop its own admissions policies, procedures, and processes that are specific to the mission and vision of their institution and comply with all accreditation *Standards*, institutional polices, and applicable laws.

The following sections address various aspects of the admissions process and the considerations each program should address when developing, updating, and/or re-evaluating their admissions processes.

Admissions Policies

Developing a comprehensive and equitable admissions process is crucial for the successful selection of competent PA students. Admissions policies should be based on the program's mission to guide the selection of students that will enable the program to meet its goals and desired educational outcomes. Policies should be documented and transparent for the institution, the program, accrediting bodies, and applicants, and they should be reviewed on a regular basis. The admissions policies should outline mandatory requirements for applicants and clearly state preferences for selection that are specific to your program, such as a commitment to diversity or veterans, a desire to recruit candidates with leadership or community service experience, etc.

As you develop/update your admissions process, consider the following:

- Are the admissions policies clearly documented?
- Does the policy contain the requirements, processes, and preferences for selection of applicants?
- Are admissions policies published and readily available to prospective applicants?

ACCREDITATION *STANDARDS*

All accredited PA programs must be compliant with the published *Standards* of the Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant (ARC-PA). The ARC-PA *Standards* include the following admissions-related requirements:

A1.11 The sponsoring institution must demonstrate its commitment to student, faculty and staff diversity and inclusion by:

a. Supporting the program in defining its goal(s) for diversity and inclusion,
b. Supporting the program in implementing recruitment strategies,
c. Supporting the program in implementing retention strategies, and
d. Making available resources which promote diversity and inclusion.

A3.11 The sponsoring institution and program's announcements and advertising must accurately reflect the program offered.

A3.12 The program must define, publish and make readily available to enrolled and prospective students general program information to include:

a. The program's ARC-PA accreditation status as provided to the program by the ARC-PA,
b. Evidence of its effectiveness in meeting its goals,
c. The most current annual "NCCPA PANCE Exam Performance Summary Report - Last 5 Years"provided by the NCCPA through its program portal, no later than April first each year,
d. All required curricular components including required rotation disciplines,

e. Academic credit offered by the program,

f. Program required competencies for entry level practice, consistent with the competencies as defined by the PA profession,

g. Whether certain services and resources are only available to students and faculty on the main campus when the program is offered at a geographically distant campus location, and

h. The most current annual student attrition information, on the table provided by the ARC-PA, no later than April first each year.

A3.13 The program must define, publish, consistently apply and make readily available to prospective students, policies and procedures to include:

a. Admission and enrollment practices that favor specified individuals or groups (if applicable),

b. Admission requirements regarding prior education or work experience,

c. Practices for awarding or granting advanced placement,

d. Any required academic standards for enrollment, and

e. Any required technical standards for enrollment.

A3.14 The program must make student admission decisions in accordance with clearly defined and published practices of the institution and program.

A3.15 The program must define, publish, consistently apply and make readily available to students upon admission:

a. Any required academic standards,

b. Requirements and deadlines for progression in and completion of the program,

c. Policies and procedures for remediation and deceleration,

d. Policies and procedures for withdrawal and dismissal,

e. Policy for student employment while enrolled in the program,

f. Policies and procedures for allegations of student mistreatment, and

g. Policies and procedures for student grievances and appeals.

A3.16 Programs granting advanced placement must document within each student's file that those students receiving advanced placement have:

a. Met program defined criteria for such placement,

b. Met institution defined criteria for such placement, and

c. Demonstrated appropriate competencies for the curricular components in which advanced placement is given.

One of the biggest pitfalls that can occur with the process of admissions regarding accreditation is when the internal process does not match what is published on the program's website and/or recruitment materials. Generally, anything that is included in the rating rubric (whether holistic or score) should be mentioned in the published criteria on the program's website, especially if your program focuses on a specific group or type of student during admissions. Some examples of criteria that may favor a specific group or type of student includes state of residence, underrepresented in medicine status, veterans, first-generation scholars, or specified amount of healthcare experience.

As you develop/update your admissions processes, consider the following:

- Is your program compliant with current ARC-PA *Standards*?

- Is there a process to ensure continued compliance?

- What are the standards of other accrediting bodies associated with your institution?

  - Are you compliant with those standards as well?

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE ADMISSIONS POLICY

In addition to meeting the ARC-PA Accreditation *Standards* and standards of other institutional accrediting bodies, admissions policies must comply with applicable state and federal laws. Programs should work with legal counsel at their institution to review admissions policies and practices to ensure they are compliant with current laws and court decisions. Programs should also consult legal counsel on any program decisions that may have legal ramifications. For example, if an applicant challenges an admission decision citing discrimination, the program should have reliable evidence and supporting documentation to explain the decision, and legal counsel should be notified of the allegation of discrimination so that steps can be taken to reduce risk to the program.

Legal counsel can assist programs with the following:

- Clarifying institutional policies relative to admission requirements

- Ensuring that questions asked, and assessments made during and after interviews comply with applicable laws

- Reviewing policies and procedures to ensure they meet fair practice standards of the accrediting bodies

- Addressing applicant and student inquiries regarding complex accommodations that are not addressed in the published policies

- Addressing applicant inquiries regarding the admission policies and decisions

- Developing policies for retaining student admission documents

As you develop/update your admissions process, consider the following:

- Has legal counsel been consulted to ensure your admissions processes comply with state and federal laws?

- If you are in an established program, when was the last time legal counsel was consulted?

  - Do they need to be consulted again?

  - Is there a process to ensure legal counsel reviews your admissions policies and processes periodically?

- Are there any recent changes in laws or court decisions that may impact your admissions process?

MISSION ALLIANCE AND THE ADMISSIONS POLICY

Admissions policies should be consistent with the mission and goals of the PA program. Applicants should be assessed on factors that reflect the missions and goals that have been identified, in addition to factors that may indicate how the student will succeed academically and professionally. For example, if a program's mission is to provide healthcare to underserved communities, the program might consider including in their rubric, prior service in underserved communities or an interest in serving this population of patients as stated in their personal statement.

As you develop/update your admissions process, consider the following:

- Are your program's admissions policies and procedures aligned with the program's mission?

- Have you discussed these attributes and characteristics with your program faculty and leadership team?

- Where in the admissions process are these characteristics being assessed?

  - File review?

  - Interview?

  - Both?

- Does the faculty and leadership team understand how these characteristics are being assessed/measured?

Admissions Process

While the admissions policy guides the admissions committee at a high level, the admissions process details the series of steps to be followed for consistent application of the policies. An equitable and thorough admissions process allows for the selection of applicants that not only meet the program's mission and values, but also have the intellectual ability and physical and emotional competence to successfully complete the program, pass the PANCE, and contribute to the profession. Each program should develop an individualized set of requirements and selection criteria. The admissions process should define all procedures related to recruitment, requirements, application, review of candidates, interviews, selection, communications, and matriculation of students.

A key component of the admissions process is the timelines. Programs participating in the Centralized Application Service for Physician Assistants (CASPA) should be aware that the configuration portal for each cycle opens mid-January and closes mid-March. Any changes to the admissions process should be determined prior to opening the configuration portal to ensure the program information in CASPA is up to date. Additionally, the application cycle opens the last Thursday in April each year, and remains open through April 1 of the following year.

Application deadlines will vary from program to program and will be dependent on several factors, including: potential number of applications, the time it takes to review applications, whether interviews will be in-person or virtual, workload of faculty and staff, and institutional policies and processes.

If interviews require travel to the campus, climate and weather may also play a role in the decision timeline. Additionally, admission invitations should allow ample time for students to make the arrangements necessary to matriculate into the program, such as moving, submitting financial aid applications, and completion of other institutional requirements.

On the next page is the CASPA Cycle Timeline with major milestones noted.

CASPA CYCLE TIMELINE

OCTOBER

Final action decisions due in WebAdMIT

NOVEMBER

New Cycle CASPA User Agreement distributed

Report final action decisions in WebAdMIT, if not already done

DECEMBER

CASPA User Agreement Due

Report all final action decisions in WebAdMIT, if not already done

JANUARY

Program Directory Survey Distributed

CASPA Enhancements & Configuration Portal Best Practices Webinar

Last day to submit final action decisions for the previous cycle

FEBRUARY

Program Directory Survey Due

New CASPA Configuration Portal opens

MARCH

CASPA Configuration Portal closes

APRIL

Previous year CASPA Cycle closes

New CASPA Cycle opens

MAY

Applicant data populates in WebAdMIT

JUNE

Report all final actions for the previous cycle in WebAdMIT

JULY

Report all final actions for the previous cycle in WebAdMIT

AUGUST

Report all final actions for the previous cycle in WebAdMIT

SEPTEMBER

Report all final actions for the previous cycle in WebAdMIT

https://paeaonline.org/resources/member-resources/caspa

As you develop/update your admissions process, consider the following:

- What is the timeline to gather applications, evaluate applicants, and extend admission invitations?

- Can your process be reliably reproduced across applicants and application cycles?

STANDARD VERSUS POOLED ADMISSIONS

In a standard application process, the program gathers all applications and makes decisions to extend interview or admissions invitations based on the entire pool. Some programs using this process will begin evaluating applicant files as soon as they arrive, though decisions on moving applicants to the next level occur only once all qualified applications have been reviewed.

In a rolling process, applications are evaluated, and decisions are made on a first-come, first-served basis. Applicants may be offered an invitation for interview, acceptance, or denial, as applications are received and evaluated. Other forms of rolling-type systems may include an additional category to hold a decision on an applicant until other applicants (who may be stronger) are evaluated.

When determining which system is right for your program, consider faculty/staff workload, program curriculum and teaching needs, availability of admissions committee members, recruitment of students by competing programs, and timelines of feeder institutions.

ADMISSIONS CRITERIA

Admissions criteria should be based on successful achievement of program outcomes. The balance of cognitive (GPA, standardized test scores, etc.) and noncognitive (leadership, self-awareness, nontraditional knowledge acquirement, etc.) criteria used to screen, interview, and select applicants should be intentional and justified by the program's mission, vision, and goals.

MINIMUM ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Requirements should be clearly defined for applicants, and the method for reviewing criteria must be considered. Cognitive benchmarks for prospective students should be based on analysis of the academic profiles of successful students who have graduated from your program and passed the PANCE. If the program publishes specific cutoff criteria such as minimum overall GPA, science GPA, or standardized test scores (such as GRE or MCAT), then applicants with scores below these thresholds should not be considered for admission.

The importance of aligning applicant qualities with your program's mission statement and program values cannot be overstated. Minimum requirements for acceptable healthcare experience and community or volunteer service can be a supportive tool for fulfilling the mission statement. If healthcare experience is required or recommended, the program should develop a list of clinical activities that are deemed acceptable by your admissions committee. Some programs require that the experience be direct patient care, while some programs

accept other types of healthcare related experience.

In considering admissions criteria, it is important to consider whether the criteria creates barriers for some applicants. Additional prerequisites, experiences, or specific requirements may have an adverse effect on the diversity of applicants. For example, requiring that courses can only be completed at four- year institutions may create barriers for students completing coursework at two-year institutions due to cost or location. Not accepting online coursework may place limitations on applicants from the military or those working full-time. The cost of standardized tests such as the GRE may also disadvantage certain populations. Therefore, it is imperative that admissions criteria are based on analysis of outcomes and/or literature review related to student success. Additionally, institutional policies may also play a significant role in defining these criteria.

As you develop/update your admissions process, consider the following:

- What is the minimum GPA required to apply to the program?

- Is that the minimum for total GPA, science GPA or both

- Is a standardized test required?

    - Examples: GRE, CASPer, MCAT

- Is there a minimum score on the standardized test required to apply to the program?

- Is there preferential consideration for subgroups of applicants (e.g., based on residency, undergraduate institution, or background factors)?

- What are the minimum credit hours and grades that must be earned in prerequisite courses?

- What standards must prerequisite courses meet? (e.g., science courses for majors)?

- Will you accept AP, CLEP, or pass/fail courses?

- Must the course be completed at a specific type of institution (e.g., regionally accredited colleges or universities, four-year institutions versus community colleges)?

- Must all prerequisites be completed at the time of application?

    - If not, how many prerequisites or credit hours can be outstanding at the time of application?

    - When must prerequisites be completed (e.g., three months before matriculation)?

- Is health care, shadowing, or community service experience required?

    - If so, what are the criteria for this requirement (e.g., types of experiences, number of hours, level of responsibility, etc.)?

    - What evidence of shadowing is required (e.g., timesheets, letters, other documentation)?

- Are letters of recommendation required?
  - If so, how many?
  - Do these letters need to be from specific types of people (e.g., a professor, supervisor, or healthcare professional)?
- Is there evidence that the criteria specified by the program as requirements affect student success or other program outcomes?

Special Considerations

INTERNATIONAL APPLICANTS

International applicants may include:

- Undergraduate students who are currently attending a U.S. institution on a student visa

- Prospective students who have previously attended a U.S. institution under a student visa, and are applying from within the United States or from abroad

- Prospective students who are applying from abroad without previous experience in a U.S. institution

- Prospective students who are currently living in the United States with or without permanent residency or citizenship status, who possess either a U.S. degree or a foreign degree, and who consider themselves "international" based on their prior international student or immigration status

Each institution should have policies regarding the evaluation of the credentials of international applicants for U.S. equivalency and other eligibility requirements for acceptance to the institution. Individual PA programs may or may not be permitted to adapt these policies based on program requirements and/or preferences for matriculates. Common credentialing services include:

1. World Education Services, Inc.
   P. O. Box 5087
   New York, New York 10274-5087 (800) 361-3106
   www.wes.org

2. Foreign Credentials Services of America
   1910 Justin Lane
   Austin, Texas 78757
   (877) 553-4285
   www.foreigncredentials.org

3. International Education Research Foundation, Inc.
   PO Box 3665
   Culver City, California 90231-3665
   (310) 258-9451
   www.ierf.org

4. Educational Credential Evaluators, Inc.
   101 W. Pleasant St., Suite 200
   Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53212-3963
   (414) 289-3400
   www.ece.org

5. Josef Silny & Associates, Inc.
   7101 SW 102 Avenue
   Miami Florida 33173
   (305) 273-1616
   www.jsilny.com

Programs will need to determine whether foreign coursework will be accepted as prerequisite coursework. Additionally, healthcare experience requirements may need to be adjusted for international applicants as students attending a U.S. institution with a student visa are generally not permitted to work. Programs will also have to decide whether the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) or International English Language Testing System (IELTS) exams will be required.

Because PA licensure requirements are different in each state for non-U.S. residents, PA programs accepting an international student without citizenship or permanent residency status are encouraged to refer the student to an immigration attorney to explore what is required to obtain a U.S. work visa following completion of education and certification. Most institutions have international student officers where students can get access to counsel with specific expertise on student and work visas.

As you develop/update your admissions process, consider the following:

- Does your institution or program have specific policies regarding acceptance of international students?
- Does your institution or program have different requirements for international students?
- Are resources and expertise available to support international students?

FOREIGN MEDICAL GRADUATES

Foreign medical graduates may seek admission to a PA program as an alternative to pursuing licensure as an MD in the United States for a variety of reasons. Generally, at the institutional level, foreign medical graduates are subject to the same requirements as international students. However, the program may include other requirements such as a minimum number of credits coursework taken in the U.S. or that all prerequisites must be taking at U.S. institutions.

As you develop/update your admissions process, consider the following:

- Will your program accept non-U.S. medical coursework and/or experience?
- Does your program require some level of U.S. coursework before application?
- Can you assess whether the candidate understands the role of the PA relative to the role of the physician?

SPECIAL INTERESTS

Programs are required to disclose any preferential treatment given to applicants. The admissions team will want to be sensitive when they receive inquiries about or endorsements of particular applicants from third parties, such as your school's or hospital's leadership, preceptors, alumni, friends of the program, or current students. Be sure that you maintain your stated admissions practices in these cases and that applicants with program connections

who are admitted have met the same standards required of all admitted students. Although the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) does not apply to applicants (only students), you will not want to discuss details of any application with anyone but the applicant.

APPLICATION PROCESS

Each program should clearly define how a candidate applies to the program including creating the primary and, if applicable, supplemental applications and timelines for application submission and review. More than 97% of PA programs utilize CASPA for their primary applications. Secondary or supplemental applications can either be submitted through CASPA or submitted directly to the program or institution. If a program chooses to include a supplemental application in their process, they can choose to require an additional fee. Please note, fees for supplemental applications, even if housed in CASPA, cannot be paid through WebAdmit.

The program must also determine an application deadline. The deadline should be defined based on the intended matriculation date for admitted students and the time needed for application evaluation, interview processes, decisions, communications, and other matriculation requirements. It should be clearly stated whether the deadline is for the primary application only or also for the supplemental application and any additional required materials.

Additional materials outside of the CASPA application that programs may require from the applicant could include:

- Official test scores (e.g., GRE, TOEFL, IELTS, CASPer)
- Supplemental application
- Official transcripts
- Photo

As you develop/update your admissions process, consider the following:

- Will the program use the CASPA application service?
- Will the program utilize a supplemental application?
  - What additional information will be requested in the supplemental application?
  - Will there be a fee for the supplemental application?
    - o If so, will you offer fee waivers?
    - o What will be the process for offering fee waivers?
- Has the program published all admissions and enrollment practices of both the program and the institution?
- What additional information should be published about competitive applicants to assist applicants in self-assessment of their qualifications?

Decision-Making Criteria

Developing the evaluation method for candidates is paramount in selecting the candidates that will best fulfill the program's mission, vision, and goals. Evaluation of candidates should consider not only their previous academic performance, but other qualities, experiences, and backgrounds that are valued in your program mission and outcomes, such as commitment to underserved populations. Each applicant's complete portfolio should be reviewed carefully to ensure selections ideal to the program's mission, vision, and goals.

Many PA programs have implemented holistic admissions models to assist with aligning admissions policies, processes, and criteria with institution-specific mission and goals. This model emphasizes utilizing experiences, attributes, and metrics throughout the admissions process to allow for an individualized and flexible approach to evaluating how an applicant may contribute to the educational environment and profession. Additionally, the holistic model allows the ability to build a diverse student body.

Each program needs to determine the criteria that are important for that specific program. Please note that these criteria should be evaluated on a regular basis and may change as the vision and goals of the program change. Many programs have a separate rubric for the applicant review process to determine who will be interviewed and a ranking rubric for making admissions decisions. The criteria included and/or point values on the rubric may change depending on the use of the rubric. Common evaluation criteria include GPA, GRE scores, healthcare experience, community service, leadership, personal statement, etc. After determining the criteria, the program needs to specify the optimal skills, knowledge, or behaviors specific to the goals of the program then decide the weight or value of those criteria in the rubric(s). Each criterion should have narrative performance indicators that objectively compare applicants to what is considered ideal for the program with appropriate scoring for how close the applicant is to that ideal. Scoring allows for a systematic method of objectively comparing applicants. Examples of file review and selection rubrics can be found in Appendix A. However, each program should develop its own file review and selection rubrics.

To ensure dependable scores, each evaluator needs to interpret the rubric in the same way. It is important to train the evaluators on how to apply the rubric and allow them to practice using the rubric prior to implementation. This allows for calibration of evaluators so that the scores are accurate and consistent across raters.

As you develop/update your admissions process, consider the following:

- What aspects of admissions require a rubric?
- What style of rubric works best for the program?
- What criteria are important for your program?
  - How often are these evaluated?
- What objective measures are used to select students, and what is the relative value of each?

- Is a score assigned or is an overall rating given?

- Are there criteria that are weighted in the decision process?

- Is there a method in place to evaluate the interrater reliability of the rubric?

Stages of the Admissions Process

RECRUITMENT PROCESS

The development of effective recruitment strategies should begin with a review of the mission, philosophy, vision, and goals of the program. Before implementing a recruitment strategy, you should first consider who you are trying to recruit and why. You may also need to examine the culture and reputation of your program and institution to determine if that is a barrier to attracting the types of students you want to recruit. Address faculty biases and perceptions of certain student groups with implicit bias training. Connect with diversity, equity, and inclusion representatives and accessibility services to ensure that there is support for all students.

Examine your marketing efforts to make sure they align with your mission statement. Does your website include photos that demonstrate the diversity of your student population? Utilize social media for student highlights and to showcase how your program creates a sense of belonging for all. Virtual information sessions have been shown to be more inclusive and help to reach students from broader demographics. Additionally, these virtual sessions reduce cost barriers for prospective applicants who are often applying to several schools in a cycle. While virtual sessions serve a distinct purpose, programs should also include campus visits or tour days in their recruitment efforts.

Programs should also consider developing university pipeline programs with surrounding undergraduate institutions. Building and maintaining relationships with preceptors, alumni, and other key stakeholders can also help to diversify and grow the applicant pool. Additionally, programs should not neglect recruitment strategies targeted at young students (junior high, high school, college freshmen, etc.).

While these strategies may not have immediate return in the applicant pool, in the long-term, early exposure can help to strengthen applicant readiness and success.

APPLICATION PROCESSING

For application processing, programs may use existing institutional databases, develop their own database, or use WebAdMIT as a tool for sorting, screening, and processing. For CASPA-participating programs, WebAdMIT is an admissions portal that provides web-based application and admissions management capabilities. Admissions officers and all others designated by the program have a secure site through which to help manage applicants.

A program may wish to use different levels of admissions decisions and definitions to assist in sorting, tracking, and communicating efficiently with candidates while processing admissions applications.

Decision codes and types should be determined by the program and may be based on institutional definitions used in admissions and student databases. For a CASPA-participating program using WebAdMIT, using the decision codes available in WebAdMIT may help the efficiency of processing.

Those decision codes are:

- Declined Offer*
- Deferred*
- Denied
- Hold
- Interview
- Matriculated*
- Offer Accepted
- Offer Made
- Received/Under Review
- Regular
- Rescinded*
- Wait List
- Withdrew*

*Indicate these statuses are required

Programs also have the option of creating local statuses that may or may not tie to these codes, to assist in sorting applicant files.

Training of Admissions Personnel

Training admissions personnel is extremely important in building a common understanding of the PA program's mission and goals. All members of the admissions team must first understand the program's mission and curriculum, and the relationship between the admissions process and the desired outcomes of the program. Depending on their role in the admissions process, training should include:

- Orientation and training documents to navigate through the admissions system (i.e., WebAdMIT)
- Review of the scoring rubric(s) and how to utilize them for applications and interviews
- Clearly define expectations regarding time commitments, the number of files to be read, interview dates, committee meetings, remuneration, etc.
- Review of standardized or suggested interview questions, including questions that cannot be asked in the process
- Process regarding how admissions decisions are made (e.g., how an applicant is chosen for interview, how an applicant is chosen for a seat in the program)
- Implicit bias training

All admissions personnel should be trained on what is appropriate and inappropriate to ask in the interview process, and/or in written comments about candidates. Additionally, the interview process should be reviewed and approved by the program's legal counsel. Interviewers are prohibited by law from asking about age, sexual orientation, gender identity, marital/family status, credit scores, disabilities, nationality, ethnicity, or race. Admissions personnel should review their institutional policies and consult legal counsel to determine whether questions concerning criminal convictions, veteran status, and religious preferences are permissible.

INITIAL SCREENING

Initial screening of applicants helps the program sort out those who have met certain program-specific requirements from those who have not. Only those applicants who have met initial criteria move onto the next level of evaluation. For example, if a program has a requirement for a minimum GPA of 3.0, only applicants with a 3.0 or higher should be reviewed to determine if they merit an interview.

FILE REVIEW

After initial screening of applicants to determine who has met the program's requirements, applicants should be reviewed for selection for interview utilizing a pre-determined rubric. Selection for an interview should be based on the applicant's perceived ability to meet the desired goals and educational learning outcomes defined by the program.

INTERVIEW

The purpose of interviewing is to observe the applicant and evaluate personal attributes and communication skills. It offers candidates the opportunity to clarify their experience and express their thoughts to the committee beyond what was included in their initial application. It also allows the candidate to better understand the PA program and how well-suited they are for its environment, culture, and mission. Finally, "Interview Day" allows for evaluation of the applicant's interaction with students, faculty, staff, committee members, and other program or institution personnel.

Types of interviews include traditional (one-on-one), panel interviews (one applicant to several interviewers), and group interviews (several interviewers and applicants). If traditional interviews are used, standardized questions are recommended to increase reliability. Another style of interviewing, from a more holistic approach, is the behavioral interview, which evaluates an applicant's experiences and behaviors to determine their potential for success. The multiple mini-interview (MMI) is structured to rotate the applicant through several mini stations to assess responses to certain scenarios in terms of characteristics like reliability, responsibility, compassion, willingness to work hard, teamwork, and altruism.

Each type of interview has its pros and cons, and the program will need to determine what interview type would work best in regard to their mission/goals, logistics, timing, size of interview pool, location, etc. A summary of the pros and cons of common interview types as well as sample schedules can be found in Appendix B.

Some programs also utilize situational judgment tests either prior to or during the interview day. These tests present the applicant with scenarios they might encounter in educational and clinical settings and assess how the applicant might approach each one. Topics possibly covered within these aptitude tests include communication, teamwork, and relationship building. The situational judgement tests can be administered by admissions personnel at the program, or the program can contract this service out to several companies that provide these types of tests.

SELECTION OF CANDIDATES

Similar to the process of selecting applicants for interview, selection of candidates for a seat in the program should be based on the applicant's perceived ability to meet the desired goals and educational learning outcomes defined by the program. Many programs use a ranking rubric that considers the interview scores and other subjective and objective criteria that align with the program's goals, to determine which candidates are admitted, wait-listed, or denied. A sample selection ranking rubric can be found in Appendix C. However, each program should develop its own ranking rubric.

NOTIFICATION OF ADMISSION DECISIONS

Conveying admissions decisions to applicants should be done in a timely and sensitive manner. Some programs are responsible for communicating admissions decisions directly to applicants, while others may have centralized offices to do this. This process should be clearly defined prior to beginning interviews. Programs should determine prior to the selection process how and when applications will be notified of their admissions status and who will communicate that decision to the applicant.

Defining when and how a program will communicate with applicants is also important. Some programs use electronic communications, while others may notify applicants of decisions by paper letter or even personally call them to convey admissions decisions. The timing of communications should be clearly defined for applicants.

A rolling system may allow for admissions decisions to be conveyed immediately, while a pooled system or quasi-rolling system may require admissions decisions to be held until more or all applicants have been evaluated. Some programs choose to notify admitted students immediately while holding waitlist placements and rejections until the end of the admissions cycle.

Most programs establish an alternate or wait list in case a student gives up his or her slot in the class. It is helpful to continue frequent communication with those individuals to ensure that open seats are easily filled prior to the beginning of class. If an applicant is denied, the program may wish to convey the decision early to allow the individual to apply to or accept a position at other PA programs.

As you develop/update your admissions process, consider the following:

- Is the initial screening done within the program or in a central admissions office at the institution?
- What requirements are screened for during the initial screening process?
- Are these requirements weighted in the initial screening process?
  - If so, how?
- What interview type would work best for the program?
- Will the program use other members of the community, alumni, or students in the interview process?
- How will you train and control for bias in the evaluation and interview process?
- How will candidates be notified and scheduled for interviews?
- What decision types should the program utilize?
- Who will communicate admissions decisions to the applicants?
- How and when will applicants be notified of their admissions status?

CANDIDATES WITH OUTSTANDING REQUIREMENTS

If candidates may be admitted with outstanding requirements, it is advisable to have them sign a form acknowledging what requirements are pending and when those requirements must be completed. Items may include:

- Outstanding bachelor's degree
- Prerequisite course(s)
- Health care certifications such as Basic Life Support
- Experiential requirements
- Background checks
- Health screening requirements
- Receipt of official transcripts, if required by the institution

Formal communication of outstanding requirements also avoids errors or miscommunications. This may be done prior to the interview invitation, at the time of interview, or the time an admission offer is extended.

As you develop/update your admissions process, consider the following:

- What conditional acceptance situations are appropriate for the program?
- How and when will outstanding requirements be communicated to candidates?

DEFERRED ADMISSION

Programs may consider allowing deferred admission for such reasons as military deployment, personal or family hardship, or medical issues. Programs granting a deferral request may wish to consider requiring the candidate to sign a deferment letter outlining specific terms of deferral. Regular communication with the candidate, particularly when the next class is accepted, will ensure receipt of updated materials to be collected, such as a background check, updated acceptance letter, and an additional deposit to hold one's seat.

Any time a deferral has been granted, programs are required to notify PAEA so that accurate applicant and matriculant data from a given cycle may be reported. CASPA participants are required to enter deferred students in the WebAdMIT admissions management portal.

As you develop/update your admissions process, consider the following:

- Under what circumstances will your program grant deferral?
- Who makes the deferral decision?
  - Program Director?
  - Admissions committee?
  - Director of Admissions or Chair of Admissions Committee?
- Who will communicate with the deferred applicant?

COUNSELING UNSUCCESSFUL APPLICANTS

Many applicants who are denied admission will want additional information or counseling to improve their chances of admission for the next cycle. It is at the discretion of the program to determine if counseling of unsuccessful applicants will be offered.

The PAEA CASPA Advisory Steering Committee developed a Reapplication Document that can be a useful resource for both admissions personnel and applicants. This document covers key ways that reapplicants can improve their applications:

(https://paeaonline.org/how-we-can-help/advisors/caspa-reapplicant-checklist)

Those needing to reapply should be encouraged to improve their credentials before the next application cycle even if that means they may need to skip an application cycle. If the applicant did not meet the program prerequisites or minimum requirements, sharing that information with the applicant would be helpful even if further evaluation of the application is not offered.

As you develop/update your admissions process, consider the following:

- Who will communicate with unsuccessful applications to discuss questions or concerns?
- Will you provide evaluation of their application or generalized improvement tips?
- What is the best timing to communicate with applicants in helping them to improve their chances at reapplication?
- Will you automatically send feedback to all unsuccessful applicants or only those that contact you?
- Does your program communicate information regarding successful applicant profiles to help candidates determine their competitiveness for the program?

Onboarding and Other Requirements

When onboarding new students, there are often many things that need to occur prior to matriculation to follow institutional policies and orientation requirements. Admissions leadership will need to work with institutional offices to develop and maintain a clearly defined process for the requirements and the roles of program and institutional personnel. While these requirements may vary from program to program and institution to institution, below is a list of common requirements.

- Student application data entered into the student information system (if not already done during the initial screening process)
- Permanent student record received
- Student IDs and security access
- Student background check
- Access to the institutional system (e.g., institutional email)
- Tracking of required coursework/training that must be completed prior to matriculation
- Final degree conferral transcripts received
- Health screening, health insurance, and immunization requirements
- Review of the technical *Standards* and student handbook
- Pre-matriculation study or reading requirements
- Required institutional training (e.g., HIPAA, safety, etc.)

It is also important to determine which personnel and offices are going to be involved in communicating with applicants and incoming students to maintain a cohesive and consistent message. The consequences of failing to complete any of the onboarding requirements should be clearly communicated to the incoming students as well. These consequences could range from retraction of admission to delaying of financial aid to delayed access to course information, financial aid, etc. depending upon the institutional and program policies.

BACKGROUND CHECKS AND DRUG SCREENINGS

Many programs may require a background check and alcohol and drug screening prior to matriculation to comply with institutional policies and/or clinical affiliation agreements. Most universities have strict guidelines regarding whether and when these screens should take place. Each program must refer to the guidelines at their institution and address them in their admissions policies.

As you develop/update your admissions process, consider the following:

- Are background checks required?
  - If so, when must they be completed?
- Is the institution or the program responsible for completing the background checks?

- Does failure of background screening affect the admission decisions?
    - Is that a program or institutional policy?
- If the program is participating in CASPA, will they use the background check feature available through WebAdMIT?

ADMISSIONS RECORDS

Admissions records include all submitted application materials as well as any materials utilized during the screening, review, interview, and selection process. Programs should check with legal counsel regarding the institution's requirements for how long records are retained and what offices in the institution and/or program are responsible for maintaining those records. Most institutions maintain student applications for three to five cycles. Matriculant records must be maintained permanently regardless of whether the matriculate completes the program.

Personnel Involved in the Admissions Process

While there may be a dedicated director of admissions or admissions committee chair, there will likely be many others involved in the admissions process including the admissions committee, administrative personnel, and other institutional offices. PA programs should define the personnel involved in the admissions process and their assigned tasks. In the subsequent sections, we will discuss some of the groups of personnel that may be involved in the admissions process and possible tasks associated with each group. Each PA program will need to determine the best structure for their needs.

STAFF

Each program will determine the number of staff needed to manage an efficient and effective admissions process. Often, staff are the first people to interact with potential applicants and therefore, should have a strong understanding of the admissions requirements, process, and policies.

Some institutions may have a centralized admissions office that handles recruitment, applicant communications, collection or evaluation of application materials, and matriculation requirements for all programs at the institution, while other programs may be responsible for these processes internally. Additionally, some programs may have dedicated admissions staff whose responsibilities are solely supporting admissions functions while other programs may have staff who have additional responsibilities beyond admissions. Depending upon the structure at your institution, staff may be involved in recruitment, applicant communications, collection and screening of applicant materials, etc.

FACULTY

Faculty can be incorporated into the admissions process in a variety of ways, including the following:

- Reviewing and scoring applicant files
- Interviewing candidates
- Notifying selected candidates of their acceptance
- Serving on the admissions committee

INSTITUTIONAL OFFICES

Every institution has many offices that work cooperatively with PA program admissions personnel. These offices may include legal counsel, financial aid, information technology, disability services, enrollment services, and student affairs. The roles and responsibilities of the institutional offices and program admissions personnel, and the relationship between them, should be clearly defined.

LEGAL COUNSEL

As mentioned previously, legal counsel can help ensure all policies and procedures that have legal implications for the program and institution are clear and in compliance with relevant state and federal laws.

ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

The admissions committee establishes the process and criteria by which candidates will be evaluated and makes admissions decisions. The committee members are responsible for ensuring the application and admissions policies are consistent with legal, institutional, and Accreditation *Standards*. Programs may take a variety of approaches to the composition of the committee, but the committee members should represent the philosophies and culture of the program and institution. The diversity of the committee should reflect the program's faculty and staff, the students they wish to admit to the program, and the communities they wish to serve.

All committee members should be trained on what the program looks for in applicants and how the admissions process works. The time commitment expected for training, meetings, and applicant evaluation should also be defined. A program may want to set a minimum participation requirement for members of the admissions committee (e.g., attend 75% of interview sessions).

Examples of potential admissions committee members include:

- All or selected principal faculty
- Medical director
- Part-time faculty
- Preceptors
- Community PAs
- Institutional representatives (e.g., diversity officer)
- Alumni
- Current students
- Program advisory council members
- Admissions staff
- Faculty of other healthcare disciplines

Admissions committee functions will vary from program to program; however, the following are some examples:

- Application review
- Developing/editing scoring rubrics

- Interviewing

- Making admissions selection decisions

- Leading campus tours

- Recruitment

- Communicating with prospective students

- Counseling unsuccessful applicants

- Making recommendations for admissions practices and selection criteria

- Making decisions on waivers, deferments, etc.

As you develop/update your admissions process, consider the following:

- How will staff be utilized in the admissions process to provide support and efficiency?

- Who should address general inquiries by phone and email, and how should those responses be structured and documented?

- Who collects and screens application materials?

- How should the program recruit new applicants (locally, regionally, and nationally), and who will recruit for the program?

- Who will establish admissions criteria and make recommendations for admissions decisions?

- How are institutional offices involved in the admissions process?

- How will the program communicate with institutional offices and personnel?

- Will the admissions committee have members who are not principal faculty?

- Who will select the admissions committee members?

- Who will make decisions on admissions policies?

- Who will make decisions on applicant selection?

- What is the expected time commitment of admissions committee members?

- What is the desired composition of the admissions committee related to the program's diversity initiatives?

- Will external admissions committee members be compensated or receive other benefits for their services?

Evaluation of the Admissions Process

Admissions is part of a continuum consisting of recruitment, admissions, program of study, graduation, and practice. Evaluation of the admissions process through the program's self-study process keeps it strong and reliable, and contributes to the program's overall mission, goals, and outcomes.

It is important to regularly review what criteria define an ideal applicant and how this impacts the applicant evaluation and admissions process. Evaluating student success rates, national board performance, and graduate and employer surveys based on outcomes, and then aligning the findings with indicators of success, will help determine how best to assess applicants. This continuous assessment process "closes the loop" of the admissions process.

It is also important to evaluate how applicants move through your process, to determine its fairness and equity. Be sure to complete this evaluation process with sensitivity, both to protect the anonymity of the participants and to ensure that the admission decision-making process is not influenced by the evaluation process. The best practice would be to complete the evaluation once all admissions decisions have been made.

Once students are admitted, tracking their performance will help identify trends related to remediation and attrition of students, as well as successful certification and placement of program graduates. The program may track performance in didactic courses, supervised clinical experiences, summative exams, and the PANCE. Post-graduation data collected includes data on certification, licensure, and job placement, especially as these relate to program mission and goals. Identifying overall trends and individual traits related to defined outcomes may affect qualifications and criteria used in admissions decisions for both cognitive and non-cognitive traits. This will lead to data-driven decisions regarding admissions policies and processes.

One recommendation is to use a strengths, weakness, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis. This should lead to identification of strengths and opportunities for improvement, allow the program to plan and modify admissions materials for future enhancement, increase the efficiency of the process, improve satisfaction of applicants, committee members and faculty, and allow for reassessment of measurement effectiveness.

Most institutions have an office that specializes in data collection and analysis for the regional accreditation for the institution that can help you determine the best type of data to collect and how to analyze it.

As you develop/update the evaluation of your admissions process, consider the following:

- Are there specific evaluation criteria required for reporting to your institution, accrediting bodies, grant agencies, or other relevant organizations?

- How will the data be gathered?

- How will the data be organized? (e.g., Excel, RedCap, etc.)

- Who will be gathering the data?

- Where will the data be stored?

- How will the data be evaluated?

- Are admissions decisions data- and mission-driven?

- Are there selected students who chose not to attend the program?

  - If so, what are the reasons for their decision?

- Are your retention and attrition rates like other PA programs or national averages?

  - If not, why, and what can be done about it?

Additional Resources

RUBRIC DEVELOPMENT

1. University of South Florida, College of Public Health. [Creating a rubric: tutorial.](#)

2. University of Florida Institutional Assessment. [Writing effective rubrics](#).

ADMISSIONS

1. Brotherton S, Smith CR, Boissonneault G, Wager KA, Velozo C, de Arellano M. Holistic Admissions: Strategies for Increasing Student Diversity in Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy, and Physician Assistant Studies Programs. J Allied Health. 2021;50(3):e91-e97.

2. Choi AN, Flowers SK, Heldenbrand SD. Becoming more holistic: A literature review of nonacademic factors in the admissions process of colleges and schools of pharmacy and other health professions. Curr Pharm Teach Learn. 2018;10(10):1429-1437. doi:10.1016/j.cptl.2018.07.013

3. Eva KW, Macala C, Fleming B. Twelve tips for constructing a multiple mini-interview. Med Teach. 2019;41(5):510-516. doi:10.1080/0142159X.2018.1429586

4. Jones PE, Simpkins S, Hocking JA. Imperfect physician assistant and physical therapist admissions processes in the United States. J Educ Eval Health Prof. 2014;11:11. Published 2014 May 9. doi:10.3352/jeehp.2014.11.11

5. McDaniel MJ, Thrasher A, Hiatt T. The use of noncognitive factors in physician assistant admissions. *J Physician Assist Educ.* 2013;24(1):15-23. doi:10.1097/01367895-201324010-00003

6. Pau A, Jeevaratnam K, Chen YS, Fall AA, Khoo C, Nadarajah VD. The Multiple Mini-Interview (MMI) for student selection in health professions training - a systematic review. Med Teach. 2013;35(12):1027-1041. doi:10.3109/0142159X.2013.829912

7. Rosenberg L. A Practical Guide for Implementing a Holistic Admissions Review. *J Nurs Educ.* 2019;58(11):669-673. doi:10.3928/01484834-20191021-11

8. Jones EP, Forister GJ. A comparison of behavioral and multiple mini-interview formats in physician assistant program admissions. *J Physician Assist Educ.* 22(1):36-40, 2011.

9. Lievens F. Adjusting medical school admission: assessing interpersonal skills using situational judgement tests. Med Educ [serial online]. 2013;47(2):182-189.

10. Simon E, Walsh K, Paterson-Brown F, Cahill D. Does a high ranking mean success in the situational judgement test? *Clinical Teacher.* 2015; 12:42-45.

11. VanderMeulen S, Hills K, Snyder JA, et al. Reflections on a Physician Assistant Entrance Exam: Does the Profession Need One?. *J Physician Assist Educ.* 2021;32(1):20-25. doi:10.1097/JPA.0000000000000343

12. Hughes JA, Park HC, Christensen-Grant D, Fuentes DG. Achieving Enrollment Outcomes by Aligning Applicant Recruitment and Selection with Unique Organizational Niches. Am J Pharm Educ. 2021;85(4):7743. doi:10.5688/ajpe7743

13. Coplan B, Todd M, Stoehr J, Lamb G. Holistic Admissions and Underrepresented Minorities in Physician Assistant Programs. *J Physician Assist Educ.* 2021;32(1):10-19. doi:10.1097/JPA.0000000000000337

14. Buchs SR, McDaniel MJ. New Advances in Physician Assistant Admissions: The History of Situational Judgement Tests and the Development of CASPer. *J Physician Assist Educ.* 2021;32(2):87-89. doi:10.1097/JPA.0000000000000350

DIVERSITY

1. Snyder J, Hills K, Alexander L, et al. Meeting the Accreditation Standard for Diversity. *J Physician Assist Educ.* 2023;34(1):46-53. doi:10.1097/JPA.0000000000000488

2. Cuenca JP, Ganser K, Luck M, Smith NE, McCall TC. Diversity in the Physician Assistant Pipeline: Experiences and Barriers in Admissions and PA School. *J Physician Assist Educ.* 2022;33(3):171-178. doi:10.1097/JPA.0000000000000442

3. VanderMeulen S, Snyder JA, Kohlhepp W, et al. Pipeline to the Physician Assistant Profession: A Look to the Future. *J Physician Assist Educ.* 2022;33(1):e1-e10. doi:10.1097/JPA.0000000000000414

4. Luck M. Association of Preadmission Factors With Physician Assistant Student Diversity. *J Physician Assist Educ.* 2022;33(2):101-106. doi:10.1097/JPA.0000000000000422

5. Ackerman-Barger K, London M, Yi A, Wilson M, Fine J, Kayingo G. Understanding Early Admission Processes: Implications for Physician Assistant Workforce Diversity and Healthcare Equity. *J Physician Assist Educ.* 2022;33(2):119-121. doi:10.1097/JPA.0000000000000424

6. Luo Q, Erikson CE, Chitwood R, Yuen CX. Does Community College Attendance Affect Matriculation to a Physician Assistant Program? A Pathway to Increase Diversity in the Health Professions. Acad Med. 2022;97(1):121-128. doi:10.1097/ACM.0000000000003860

7. Yuen CX, Honda TJ. Predicting Physician Assistant Program Matriculation Among Diverse Applicants: The Influences of Underrepresented Minority Status, Age, and Gender. Acad Med. 2019;94(8):1237-1243. doi:10.1097/ACM.0000000000002717

8. Pomeranz H, Bailey JR, Bradley-Guidry C. Primary care and diversity in the physician assistant profession. *J Physician Assist Educ.* 2014;25(4):47-51.

9. Coplan B, Cawley J, Stoehr J. Physician assistants in primary care: trends and characteristics. *Ann Fam Med.* 2013;11(1):75-79. doi:10.1370/afm.1432.

10. Sullivan LW, Mittman IS. The state of diversity in the health professions a century after Flexner. Acad Med. 2010;85(2):246-253.

11. Felix H, Laird J, Ennulat C, et al. Holistic admissions process: an initiative to support diversity in medical education. *J Physician Assist Educ.* 2012;23(3):21-27.

12. DiBaise M, Salisbury H, Hertelendy A, Muma RD. Strategies and perceived barriers to recruitment of underrepresented minority students in physician assistant programs. *J Physician Assist Educ*. 2015;26(1):19-27. doi:10.1097/JPA.0000000000000005

13. Honda T, Henry TD, Mandel ED, et al. Maximizing Black applicant matriculation in U.S. PA programs: associations between the number of submitted applications and likelihood of matriculation. BMC Med Educ. 2021;21(1):127. Published 2021 Feb 23. doi:10.1186/s12909-021- 02563-5

OTHER

AAPA Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Resource Center
https://www.aapa.org/about/dei-resource-center/#tabs-5-internal-aapa-dei-resources

Harvard Project Implicit Bias Training
https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/

AACRAO Employing Noncognitive Variables to Improve Admissions and Increase Student Retention
https://www.aacrao.org/docs/default-source/white- papers/noncognitivevariables.pdf?sfvrsn=1e4e8822_0

"Measuring Noncognitive Variables: Improving Admissions, Success and Retention for Underrepresented Students" By: William Sedlacek

https://www.amazon.com/Measuring-Noncognitive-Variables-Admissions- Underrepresented/dp/1620362562

The PA Program Admissions Resource was written by the following PAEA members:

- **Erika Brooks, CSPO, CSM,** PA Education Association
- **Veronica L. Coleman, MPAS, PA-C**, University of Texas Southwestern
- **Elizabeth P. Elliott, MS, PA-C, DFAAPA**, Baylor College of Medicine
- **M. Tosi Gilford, MD, PA-C**, University of Alabama at Birmingham
- **Ashley N. Guillory, PhD**, University of Texas Medical Branch-Galveston
- **Jonathan Kilstrom, MPAS, PA-C**, Yale University PA Online Program
- **Corey Smith, MBA**, MEDEX Northwest, University of Washington

This resource was adapted from the PA Admissions Handbook written by the following PAEA members:

- **Christina Robohm, MS, PA-C**, Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center
- **Jacqui Comshaw, MPA**, Yale University School of Medicine
- **Doris Dalton, MPA**, University of Utah
- **Gia DiGiacobbe, BS**, Northwestern University
- **Jeanie McHugo, PhD, PA-C**, University of North Dakota
- **Audra Perrino, MS**, Stony Brook University
- **Sherrie Spear, MHS, PA-C**, Duke University

Appendix

APPENDIX A: EXAMPLES OF FILE REVIEW RUBRICS

Applicant Evaluation Form *(Example)*

Directions: Using corresponding scale, pleaase rate this applicant in each category:

1= Unsatisfactory	2= Improvement Needed	3= Meets Expectations	4= Exceeds Expectations	5= Exceptional

Capacity to Succeed

- *Able to succeed* based on personal strengths and despite difficult circumstances;
- Is *resouresful, resilient,* and able to *overcome obstacles* with demonstrated self-improvement.

1	2	3	4	5

Written Communication

- Able to *communicate appropriately* and *effectively* in written format.

1	2	3	4	5

Character Development - Entrinsic Attributes

- Represents self as *professional* through respect and responsibility;
- Demonstrates *compassion/empathy* with appropriate response to others' feelings; able to see several sides of a difficult situation;
- Demonstrates *humility* and shows *teamwork* by working well with others regardless of interests, easily collaborates to achieve common goal.

1	2	3	4	5

Character Development - Intrinsic Attributes

- Shows *critical thinking skills* and insight through objective analysis of a situation to form judgement;
- Demonstrates *self-awareness, maturity* through patterns of self-regulation, acceptance of responsibility for own actions, autonomous decision-making, or positive response to critique.

1	2	3	4	5

Commitment and Motivation

- *Commitment to pursuits* inside and/or outside the classroom through employment, extracurricular, and/or volunteer experiences.

1	2	3	4	5

Mission-Aligned Attributes

- History of *unique life experience*s such as: military, underserved populations, financial hardship, second career applicants, collegiate athletes;
- *Exceptional personal accomplishments seen as significant achievements* atypical to many applicants (excluding academic merit-based on GPA alone) and/or *exceptional leadership* in career or extracurricular situations.

1	2	3	4	5

PAEA Workshop: Holistic Admissions 2020

APPENDIX A: EXAMPLES OF FILE REVIEW RUBRICS

Traditional Applicant File Review Rubric (Example)

			Indicators					
			Not Qualified	**Poor**	**Fair**	**Good**	**Very Good**	**Superior**
		SCORE	**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
GPA	Overall		<3.0	3.0 - 3.2	3.21 - 3.4	3.41 - 3.6	3.61 - 3.8	> 3.81
	Science GPA		<3.0	3.0 - 3.2	3.21 - 3.4	3.41 - 3.6	3.61 - 3.8	> 3.81
GRE	Verbal				< 30	40 - 49	50 - 59	60 - 69	≥ 70
	Quantitative			< 30	40 - 49	50 - 59	60 - 69	≥ 70
Clinical Experience Volunteering Shadowing	Total Patient Care Experience		0	1- 500 hrs	501 - 1499 hrs	1500 - 2499 hrs	2500 - 3999 hrs	≥ 4000 hrs
	Total Health Related Experience		0	1 - 500 hrs	501 - 1499 hrs	1500 - 2499 hrs	2500 - 3999 hrs	≥ 4000 hrs
	Total Volunteer		0	1 - 249 hrs	250 - 1499 hrs	1500 - 2499 hrs	2500 - 3999 hrs	≥ 4000 hrs
	Total Shadowing		0	1 - 49 hrs	50 - 99 hrs	100 - 249 hrs	250 - 499 hrs	≥ 500 hrs
Personal Statement	Grammar and Motivation			Grammatical errors distract or confuse the reader and/or use of "physician's assistant" and/or poor narrative	>10 grammatical mistakes and/or monotonous narrative	>5 grammatical mistakes and typical narrative	>5 grammatical mistakes and compelling narrative	Compelling narrative and interest in serving rural and underserved communities
Evaluations	Consider all recommendation letters when scoring			Poor ratings, recommend with reservation or do not recommend	Average - Below Average ratings, recommend with reservation or do not recommend	Good- Average and/or ≥ 4 N/A ratings, recommend	Excellent - Good ratings, recommend, non-specific recommendation letters	Excellent - Good ratings, specific/detailed recommendation letters	Excellent - Good ratings, recommended without reservation, specific/detailed recommendation letters, **AND at least one reference from a clinician**

APPENDIX B:
PROS/CONS OF COMMON INTERVIEW TYPES AND SAMPLE INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

Summary of Interview Pros & Cons

TRADITIONAL: One applicant and one interviewer	• Focuses on only one applicant • Allows applicant to shine	• Time-consuming • Only one interviewer provides input
PANEL OR GROUP: One applicant and multiple interviewers	• Time-efficient • Provides multiple perspectives	• Most challenging for applicant • Needs organized approach
BEHAVIORAL: Experience/behaviors as indicators of success	• Eliminates misunderstandings of past experiences • Promotes applicant authenticity	• Lack of interrater reliability • Introduction of bias
MULTIPLE MINI INTERVIEW: Rotate through mini stations of various scenarios	• Assesses non-cognitive qualities • Encourages impromptu responses	• Schedule-intensive • Requires many resources
ALTERNATIVE: Hybrid combination or advanced technological methods	• Is a creative combination • Designed with resources in mind	• Complex schedules • Multiple aspects of consideration inplanning

APPENDIX B:
PROS/CONS OF COMMON INTERVIEW TYPES AND SAMPLE INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

Traditional Interview (one interviewer-one applicant) Sample Schedule
7:30 a.m. Welcome & Introduction to the Program
8:05 a.m. Interviews   **11:50 a.m.** Closing Session & Next Steps

Interviewers	8:05 a.m.	8:30 a.m.	9:35 a.m.	10:00 a.m.	11:05 a.m.	11:30 a.m.
Faculty	Interview 1	Interview 2	Interview 3	Interview 4	Interview 5	Interview 6
Faculty	Interview 1	Interview 2	Interview 3	Interview 4	Interview 5	Interview 6
Faculty	Interview 1	Interview 2	Interview 3	Interview 4	Interview 5	Interview 6
Faculty	Interview 1	Interview 2	Interview 3	Interview 4	Interview 5	Interview 6
Faculty	Interview 1	Interview 2	Interview 3	Interview 4	Interview 5	Interview 6

APPENDIX B:
PROS/CONS OF COMMON INTERVIEW TYPES AND SAMPLE INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

Panel/Group Interview (multiple interviewers-one applicant) Sample Schedule

8:30-8:50 – Welcome & Introductions						
	Panel 1	**Panel 2**	**Panel 3**	**Panel 4**	**Panel 5**	**Q/A & Campus Tour**
9:00-9 :30	Tour	Applicant 2	Applicant 3	Applicant 4	Applicant 5	**Group 2**
9:30-10:00	Applicant 6	Applicant 7	Applicant 8	Applicant 9	Applicant 10	
10:00-10:15	*Break*	*Break*	*Break*	*Break*	*Break*	
10:15-10:45	Applicant 11	Applicant 12	Applicant 13	Applicant 14	Applicant 15	**Group 1**
10:45-11:15	Applicant 16	Applicant 17	Applicant 18	Applicant 19	Applicant 20	
11:15-11:30	*Break*	*Break*	*Break*	*Break*	*Break*	
11:30-12:00	Wrap-up & Roundtable w/program director					

APPENDIX B:
PROS/CONS OF COMMON INTERVIEW TYPES AND SAMPLE INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

Multiple Mini Interview: Station Examples
(Done virtually. Separate sessions are also held for applicants to get a program overview
and to meet with current students)

12:00 PM - 3:00 PM Est Time Block	
Session A **Applicants let into room for ID Check - 12:03** Interview #1: 12:07 - 12:15 Interview #2: 12:19 - 12:27 Interview #3: 12:31 - 12:39 Interview #4: 12:43 - 12:51 Interview #5: 12:55 - 1:03 Interview #6: 1:07 - 1:15 **1:15 - 1:30 - Time is up! 15 minute break for faculty**	**Session B** **Applicants let into room for ID Check - 1:33** Interview #1: 1:37 - 1:45 Interview #2: 1:49 - 1:57 Interview #3: 2:01 - 2:09 Interview #4: 2:13 - 2:21 Interview #5: 2:25 - 2:23 Interview #6: 2:37 - 2:45 **2:45 - Time is up!**

APPENDIX B:
PROS/CONS OF COMMON INTERVIEW TYPES AND SAMPLE INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

Station Focus Areas:

Grit

Reactions to Stress

Communication

Teamwork and Problem-Solving

Empathy and Interpersonal Skills

Accountability/Reliability

STATION 1: Grit

APPLICANT PROMPT:

Describe a time in your life (other than applying to PA School) when you pushed yourself to complete a personal goal that challenged you.

Interviewer Instructions:

1. Ensure the applicant has read the scenario.

2. The applicant has 8 minutes to discuss these issues with you. After 8 minutes a bell will sound and you will have 2 minutes to complete the score sheet. Do not give the applicants feedback.

3. Discuss some of the following issues with the applicant.

    a. How did you struggle or fail in that effort?

    b. How did you recover and resume your mindset to attain your goal?

    c. What did you learn from the experience?

    d. What would you do differently?

4. Use the appropriate rubric for each station to evaluate the applicant. All applicants should start at a score of 3 (average) for each question. Depending on responses, scores can remain the same, decrease, or increase. The key for each rating is as follows:

    a. 5 = Outstanding: Well thought out concise and articulate answers that contained all information expected

    b. 4 = Excellent: Acceptable and articulate answers that covered most of the expected information

    c. 3 = Average: Acceptable and articulate answers but limited in scope

d. 2 = Below Average: Partial answers that required follow-up

e. 1 = Unacceptable: Does not answer the question despite follow-up or gives short unqualified answers with little thought

SCORE RUBRIC:

Confirm applicant has read the scenario (Yes/No)

If you feel this candidate displayed a major red flag that potentially warrants ineligibility for admission, please notify Renée.

If you have a potential conflict of interest with this applicant, please notify Renée.

Please rate the applicant's performance on this station relative to the pool of all applicants you are rating.

- The applicant provided a vivid, detailed description of a challenge they faced.
- The applicant demonstrated overcoming setbacks to conquer an important challenge.
- The applicant remained focused on a specific goal for a sustained period of time.
- The applicant provided appropriate reflection about what they learned from the experience.
- The applicant demonstrated organization and interest to accomplish their goal including advanced planning.

STATION 2: Reactions to Stress

APPLICANT PROMPT:

A patient comes in with a head cold requesting an antibiotic. Antibiotics are not effective for viral illnesses. The patient becomes upset when you will not prescribe them an antibiotic. How would you handle this conversation?

Interviewer Instructions:

1. Ensure the applicant has read the scenario.

2. The applicant has 8 minutes to discuss these issues with you. After 8 minutes a bell will sound and you will have 2 minutes to complete the score sheet. Do not give the applicants feedback.

3. Discuss some of the following issues with the applicant.

    a. What if your patient threatened to speak with your supervising physician?

    b. What if the patient threatened to write a negative review on the practice's site?

    c. What if the patient tells you that your supervising physician has given them an antibiotic for this condition in the past?

d. How would you react if the patient said that they have had this condition in the past, and feel the only way their symptoms would go away is by taking an antibiotic?

4. Use the appropriate rubric for each station to evaluate the applicant. All applicants should start at a score of 3 (average) for each question. Depending on responses, scores can remain the same, decrease, or increase. The key for each rating is as follows:

a. 5 = Outstanding: Well thought out concise and articulate answers that contained all information expected

b. 4 = Excellent: Acceptable and articulate answers that covered most of the expected information

c. 3 = Average: Acceptable and articulate answers but limited in scope

d. 2 = Below Average: Partial answers that required follow-up

e. 1 = Unacceptable: Does not answer the question despite follow-up or gives short unqualified answers with little thought

SCORE RUBRIC:

Confirm applicant has read the scenario (Yes/No)

If you feel this candidate displayed a major red flag that potentially warrants ineligibility for admission, please notify Renée.

If you have a potential conflict of interest with this applicant, please notify Renée.

Please rate the applicant's performance on this station relative to the pool of all applicants you are rating.

- The applicant managed the patient interaction in a professional manner.
- The applicant provided an appropriate rationale for why they would or would not prescribe the antibiotic.
- The applicant demonstrated their thought process including the pros and cons of their reasoning.
- The applicant maintained a positive outlook on the situation.
- The applicant displayed empathy for the patient.

APPENDIX C: SAMPLE SELECTION RANKING RUBRIC (EXAMPLE)

Admissions Ranking Rubric Class Entering 2023

Rank	Last Name	First Name	CASPA #	Category	Total GPA	Math/ Sci GPA	Health Care	Patient Care	Writing Sample	Verbal GRE	Interview #1	Final Ranking Score
				Low/Hi Score	3.0 to 4.0	3.0 to 4.0	0 to 5	0 to 5	0 to 5	0 to 5	0 to 25	
				Percentage	20%	20%	7.50%	7.50%	10%	5%	30%	100
1	Smith	Jane	1234567		3.8	3.7	2	3	4.5	4	22	91.25
2	Jones	Amanda	1324354		3.1	3.1	1	1	2.5	1	14	58.9