HOD ACTION: Council on Medical Education Report 3 adopted and the remainder of the report filed.

REPORT 3 OF THE COUNCIL ON MEDICAL EDUCATION (June 2021)
Optimizing Match Outcomes
(Resolution 304-I-19)
(Reference Committee C)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

For many years there have been concerns that the system for entry into U.S. residency training programs has barriers that stymie the efforts of qualified applicants to achieve their goal of practicing medicine in the U.S., often at great personal financial cost. These concerns have led to the development of American Medical Association (AMA) policy and advocacy to increase residency training positions, and policy that promotes systems and programs to guide applicants to choose specialties and apply and match to residency training programs effectively. Recent technological problems with the application service used by unmatched applicants and unfilled training programs, the Supplemental Offer and Acceptance Program® or SOAP®, have increased the apprehension of medical students and physicians concerning their ability to enter graduate medical education.

Many medical education stakeholders, most notably the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC), but also the National Resident Matching Program (NRMP) and the AMA, have developed numerous tools and informational guides to help students select a specialty and then apply to, interview with, rank, and match to programs. In addition, U.S. medical schools have dedicated staff eager to help students successfully match into residency programs, providing accessible online advice as well as personal counseling. To further improve the system, pilots are currently being tested to provide optimal matching opportunities with the intent of decreasing anxiety during the application/interview/matching season, reducing superfluous applications, and increasing transparency between applicants and programs.

In the interim, key stakeholder organizations, such as the NRMP and AAMC, can consolidate information that can assist students and their advisers to create effective application strategies. Those applicants without an adviser should also have easy access to such information. All applicants, however, will need to use this information consistently and rationally if the desire is to successfully match to a program.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL ON MEDICAL EDUCATION

CME Report 03-JUN-21

Subject: Optimizing Match Outcomes (Resolution 304-I-19)

Presented by: Liana Puscas, MD, MHS, Chair

Referred to: Reference Committee C (, MD, Chair)

INTRODUCTION

Resolution 304-I-19, "Issues with the Match, the National Residency Matching Program (NRMP)," introduced by the Indiana Delegation, asked the AMA to:

1. continue working to promote an increase in residency program positions in the U.S.;
2. study how residency programs can expand in novel ways;
3. determine what strategies can increase an applicant's ability to match into a residency program;
4. support the option of permitting those who failed to obtain a position during the Supplemental Offer and Acceptance Program® (SOAP®) in 2019 to participate in a future matching opportunity at no cost; and
5. encourage the National Resident Matching Program (NRMP) and the Electronic Residency Application Service (ERAS) to conduct an audit to identify opportunities for lowering the financial burden on applicants and to promote and disseminate strategies to mitigate issues that interfere with successfully matching. The full resolution is in the Appendix.

Online and in-person testimony during the 2019 Interim Meeting suggested that this resolution, which calls for a broad investigation into several different aspects of the resident match, has already been addressed in the recent past by the Council on Medical Education (CME Report 3-A-16, "Addressing the Increasing Number of Unmatched Medical Students"). It was noted that the AMA has extensive policy on expanding graduate medical education (see for example D-305.967, "The Preservation, Stability and Expansion of Full Funding for Graduate Medical Education"). Testimony also noted that the NRMP and the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) release yearly authoritative reports on match outcomes with granular data for medical students to aid in their decision making. Others, however, expressed concern that current efforts to address this issue have been insufficient. The reference committee initially considered reaffirmation of existing policy in lieu of Resolves 1 and 2, and deletion of Resolve 3, but ultimately recommended referral of the entire resolution. The House of Delegates (HOD) subsequently agreed; this report is in response to that referral.

BACKGROUND

For many years there have been concerns that the system for entry into U.S. residency training programs has barriers that stymie the efforts of qualified applicants to achieve their goal of practicing medicine in the U.S., often at great personal financial cost. These concerns have led to

many resolutions presented to the AMA HOD and subsequent reports and policies generated to address those concerns. This report: a) summarizes the AMA's recent efforts to increase residency training positions and assist applicants in applying to residency programs; b) describes the technological problems of SOAP in 2019 and what has been done to prevent future problems; and c) describes resources for applicants on effective program application and matching.

AMA REPORTS, POLICY, AND ADVOCACY

The AMA Council on Medical Education (CME) has prepared several reports for the HOD addressing the process of matching into residency programs, as well as the need to increase funding for graduate medical education (GME). For example, CME Report 3-A-18, "Expanding UME Without Concurrent GME Expansion," included three recommendations that were adopted as policy and recorded in D-305.967, "The Preservation, Stability and Expansion of Full Funding for Graduate Medical Education:"

> (32) Our AMA will: (a) encourage all existing and planned allopathic and osteopathic medical schools to thoroughly research match statistics and other career placement metrics when developing career guidance plans; (b) strongly advocate for and work with legislators, private sector partnerships, and existing and planned osteopathic and allopathic medical schools to create and fund graduate medical education (GME) programs that can accommodate the equivalent number of additional medical school graduates consistent with the workforce needs of our nation; and (c) encourage the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME), the Commission on Osteopathic College Accreditation (COCA), and other accrediting bodies, as part of accreditation of allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, to prospectively and retrospectively monitor medical school graduates' rates of placement into GME as well as GME completion.

CME Report 5-A-17, "Options for Unmatched Medical Students," outlined a number of key points related to unmatched medical students, including the long-term stability of match rates, common reasons for an unsuccessful match, options for students who do not match, and tools/initiatives from medical schools and medical organizations (including the AMA) to ensure an effective, efficient, and equitable match process that balances the interests of applicants and programs and promotes rational, strategic decision making by all parties. This report also highlighted AMA resources, including the AMA's Career Planning Resource, which includes guidance on applying for residency, choosing a specialty, interviewing for residency, writing a C.V., and finding residency programs through FREIDA™. Another tool described in this report is the AAMC's Careers in Medicine (CiM) online guide, which helps students make strategic decisions about residency training and beyond and provides self-assessment tools and specialty-specific data to inform those decisions.

CME Report 3-A-16, "Addressing the Increasing Number of Unmatched Medical Students," recommended reaffirming existing policy, namely D-305.967 (4) and (22), "The Preservation, Stability and Expansion of Full Funding for Graduate Medical Education;" H-200.954 (4) (5) (6) and (7), "US Physician Shortage," and D-310.977 (11), "National Resident Matching Program Reform." These various policies direct the AMA to advocate for increasing GME positions; encourage research and data that support the value of GME; and encourage medical schools and residency programs to consider policies to attract physicians to practice in and care for patients in underserved and rural areas. Other policy encourages the AMA to work with other major stakeholders in medical education to evaluate data and propose new research that would describe how many students graduating from U.S. medical schools each year do not enter into a U.S. residency program; how many never enter into a U.S. residency program; whether there is

disproportionate impact on individuals of minoritized racial and ethnic groups; and what careers are pursued by those with an MD or DO degree who do not enter residency programs.

The AMA has long advocated for advancing GME, including increasing funding for residency positions, developing innovative funding models, and creating residency positions that reflect patient and societal needs. The AMA launched the Reimagining Residency Initiative in 2019 with $15 million in grants to projects promoting systemic change in GME. Recently the AMA offered technical assistance in the drafting of the Health Heroes 2020 Act (H.R. 6650), which proposes to bolster the National Health Service Corps (NHSC) by providing an additional $25 billion for both the loan repayment and scholarship programs to increase the number of medical professionals in underserved communities. The Act would also increase the mandatory NHSC funding level from $310M to $690M for fiscal years 2021-2026 to increase scholarship and loan forgiveness awards. The AMA offered assistance in the drafting of the Rural America Health Corps Act (S.2406) which builds upon the existing NHSC model by proposing up to five years of loan forgiveness (versus two) to help pay down medical school debt and increase the number of individuals that can enter the NHSC.

The AMA continues to voice its support for federal bills to increase residency positions, including the Resident Physician Shortage Reduction Act of 2021 (S. 834), which would expand Medicare funding for 15,000 additional residency positions. Earlier legislative proposals from 2019 that garnered AMA support and advocacy would close a loophole in GME cap-setting criteria affecting hospitals that temporarily host small numbers of residents (H.R. 1358), and provide 1,000 additional Medicare-supported GME positions over five years in hospitals that have, or are establishing, accredited residency programs in addiction medicine, addiction psychiatry, or pain management (H.R. 2439).

Most recently, there were multiple provisions in the new Appropriations Act that provide benefits for GME, variations of which AMA has advocated for, including:

- Increased funding ($310 million) from 2021-2023 for the National Health Service Corps, and extended funding through 2023 for teaching health centers that operate GME programs. (Sec. 301)
- Hospitals will be allowed to host a limited number of residents for short-term rotations without being negatively impacted by a set permanent full time equivalent (FTE) resident cap or a per resident amount (PRA). A hospital must report full-time equivalent residents on its cost report for a cost reporting period if the hospital trains at least 1.0 full-time-equivalent residents in an approved medical residency training program or programs in such period. (Sec. 131)
- A thousand additional Medicare-funded GME residency positions (200 per year for 5 years), to be distributed to rural hospitals, hospitals that are already above their Medicare cap for residency positions, hospitals in states with new medical schools or new locations and branch campuses, and hospitals that serve Health Professional Shortage Areas. However, a hospital may not receive more than 25 additional full-time equivalent residency positions. (Sec. 126)

TECHNOLOGICAL PROBLEMS FOR SOAP

SOAP is a joint service of the NRMP and ERAS. Through SOAP, qualified applicants who do not obtain a position through the NRMP Match are privy to a list of participating programs that did not fill all their positions through the Match. Applicants submit applications to programs of interest. Programs review the applications and select candidates to interview (via phone, video, or in-person

if local), and positions are then offered to successful applicants. This occurs over a compressed timeframe, with three rounds over two days.

In 2019 the ERAS system experienced technical issues during the SOAP process, which affected applicants and program directors. The system was taken offline to correct the problem, resulting in a shortened time frame to complete the process; therefore, the NRMP reduced the number of rounds from three to two. The AAMC conducted an internal root-cause analysis and had an external review completed by an industry expert to evaluate technology and processes. Those reviews identified immediate and long-term steps that were implemented to mitigate future risk and to improve systems and operations.[1] Similar technical issues also occurred during the first day of the SOAP process in 2021. The cause of these issues was not known at the time this report was prepared, but the AAMC has apologized for the situation and promised another thorough investigation to understand the poor performance and identify and implement solutions to improve the process. The Council on Medical Education will continue to monitor the situation.

Typically, around 600 U.S. MD seniors are without a position at the conclusion of SOAP. In 2019, there were 623 without a position versus 620 in 2018. In 2020, there were 522. Overall, all applicants accepted offers with roughly the same frequency: the percent of offers accepted was 64.1 in 2018, 62.5 in 2019, and 61.8 in 2020.[2,3,4] Data from the 2021 Match were not available at the time this report was prepared. Although the compressed schedule caused additional anxiety during a period that is normally stressful, the resulting proportions of applicants with positions are much the same. However, the NRMP has become concerned that in the past few years there has been a decrease in the number of SOAP-eligible applicants at the conclusion of the Match, compared to an increasing number of unfilled positions placed in SOAP, and an increasing number of unfilled positions at the end of SOAP. Coupled with the uncertainty surrounding the upcoming application and match season due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the NRMP has decided to add an additional, fourth offer round to the SOAP process.[5]

EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES FOR APPLYING AND MATCHING

The AAMC has numerous tools and informational guides developed to help students select a specialty and then apply to, interview with, and rank programs, all through the CiM website (https://www.aamc.org/cim/). Users of most CiM material need a subscription. Students of U.S. MD-granting schools have a subscription through their schools as a result of their school's membership in the AAMC. Students of DO-granting schools and international medical students may have subscriptions through their schools or may need to purchase an individual subscription for $75. Medical school advisers also have access to CiM material.

The AAMC launched the Apply Smart website in 2016 to assist students in determining the optimal number of residency programs to which they should apply. The website provides information on the relationship between the number of applications submitted and the likelihood of entry into a residency program, highlighting the point at which the likelihood does not increase as the number of applications increase. Apply Smart also provides ranges of United States Medical Licensing Examination® (USMLE®) Step 1 scores as a comparison metric and suggests that students should consider limiting their applications at the point of diminishing returns.[6] Although relatively easy to use and understand, there are some caveats to the tool's utility. The tool relies on USMLE 3-digit Step 1 scores, so students who do not have a Step 1 score, e.g., some students at DO-granting medical schools, will not find the tool useful. Future use of the tool when Step 1 results are reported as pass/fail (proposed to occur in January 2022) will also be in doubt, unless another valid metric is provided. Further, the tool's methodology has been questioned, in that the data uses the number of applications submitted through ERAS, which does not distinguish between

preferred specialties and backup specialties. Therefore, for example, a student may submit 10 applications to a specialty that is not the preferred one and ultimately choose not to enter it. This datapoint will contribute to a low likelihood of entering that specialty with only 10 applications.[7] One suggestion is to pair ERAS applications data with interviews offered data, which, with the support of residency programs, is available through ERAS, thus creating a probability that a given number of applications results in an interview offer. Also suggested is pairing ERAS application data with NRMP data, to filter preferred specialties from backup specialties.[7]

The AAMC has also developed the Residency Explorer tool, which uses Step 1 scores as well as Step 2CK and COMLEX-USA Level 1 and Level 2-CE scores. Offered free to U.S. medical and international students, Residency Explorer has benefited by creating a consortium of data providers. Users create a profile based on their test scores and academic achievements, and Residency Explorer will provide a list of programs in a chosen specialty with statistics on current and recent residents. Users can then compare where they stand in relation to matched residents at a given program. In addition, other characteristics about the program are provided for students to consider. Programs that have few residents or have been accredited for only a few years will not have test score information available and may also have few program characteristics to report. As with the Apply Smart tool, Step 1 three-digit scores will not be available once score reporting transitions to pass/fail; therefore, students of MD-granting schools will have one less metric.

The NRMP produces several reports that can be helpful in guiding applicants' decision-making. The "Results from the Program Director Survey" describes what factors are considered by program directors, as well as their importance, when deciding which applicants to interview, and then the same for deciding how to rank applicants. The report is broken down by specialty. Unfortunately, the response rate by program directors to this survey is low, averaging 18 percent in 2019.[8] Similarly, the NRMP surveys applicants and asks about the program characteristics that influenced both application and ranking choices as well as the relative importance of those characteristics. In the "Results of the 2019 NRMP Applicant Survey by Preferred Specialty and Applicant Type" report, applying, interviewing, and ranking behavior is available by whether the applicant successfully matched or not. These data are also available by specialty. This report has a response rate of 42.3 percent, and specialties with fewer than 50 respondents are excluded.[9]

More data on applicant characteristics and applying, interviewing, ranking, and matching success are available in the Charting Outcomes in the Match reports, available for U.S. MD seniors,[10] U.S. DO seniors,[11] and graduates of international medical schools (IMGs).[12] All data are self-reported, with the exception of match data. These reports are also segmented into specialties. In addition, the NRMP used 2018 match data to create an interactive tool, the Interactive Charting Outcomes in the Match, which allows users to enter their own values, such as number of publications, and assess the percentage of applicants who matched or did not match, by Step 1 or Level 1 score range.[13] Given the similarity to Residency Explorer, the NRMP has not further developed the interactive charts and collaborates with the AAMC on Residency Explorer.

The AMA provides general guidance offered by experts in the field on choosing a specialty and effective applying and matching strategies, most of which can be found on the AMA website ("The Match journey made simple," at https://www.ama-assn.org/residents-students/match/match-journey-made-simple). The AMA has also developed a new residency calculator tool to help students estimate the costs of applying to programs (https://freidaresidencycalculator.com/).

Aside from the AAMC and the AMA, other websites provide advice on residency program applications and interviews. Many of these are geared in particular to IMGs, but not always, and may charge a fee for assistance. Specialty societies also present information on program locations

and characteristics and advice on how to apply to programs in the specialty, such as family medicine (https://www.aafp.org/medical-school-residency/residency/process.html).

Finally, U.S. medical schools have dedicated staff that are eager to help students successfully match into residency programs, providing accessible online advice as well as personal counseling. The most commonly reported reason why a student does not successfully match is that the student's academic performance (e.g., clinical grades) and/or USMLE scores are below the norm for the desired specialty. Other commonly cited reasons are 1) applications in a single specialty, 2) lack of a backup plan, and 3) application to too few programs. These issues could be mitigated with advice, but some advisers report that some students do not make themselves available for career counseling.[14]

Pilots for 2021

The Otolaryngology Program Directors Organization, the Society of University Otolaryngologists, and the Association of Academic Departments in Otolaryngology created a voluntary signal preference program in advance of the 2021 match, modeled after the preference signaling program developed by the American Economic Association (AEA) to facilitate interview offers for economics graduate students. In the AEA model, students can send signals to up to two employers to indicate their interest in receiving an interview. Signals were found to increase probability of interviews, especially for niche scenarios (e.g., an applicant whose academic and personal background is limited to a single state or region may be viewed as unlikely to move to a different geographic region and therefore an interview may not be offered despite excellent qualifications of the applicant. A signal in this scenario changes the program's erroneous perception of applicant disinterest). The otolaryngology pilot allows applicants to signal up to 5 programs. The signals will be sent to participating programs around the time programs download applications from ERAS. Participating programs are advised to consider signals of interest as one factor in a holistic review of all applications and should not rely on signals to screen applications. In addition, programs should expect many non-signaled applications from interested and highly qualified applicants. Applicants were instructed not to signal their home institution or any programs at which they have completed a clinical subinternship in the current calendar year, and programs were advised not to expect to receive a signal from applicants in these scenarios.[15] Examining ERAS data does not suggest a reduction in the number of applications per applicant to otolaryngology programs compared to previous years.[16] It is not known publicly at this time how many programs and applicants participated in the pilot.

The Association of Professors of Gynecology and Obstetrics and the Council on Resident Education in Obstetrics and Gynecology have created the "Right Resident, Right Program, Ready Day One" pilot program for the obstetrics and gynecology specialty. The program received a $1.75M grant from the AMA's Reimagining Residency Initiative. Aspects of the program include a uniform application deadline date across all programs, limiting interview invitations to the number of interview slots available, allowing a minimum of 72 hours for applicants to respond to an interview invitation, and providing interview status (invited, waitlisted, or rejected) to all applicants by November 22, 2020.[17] In addition, the pilot program will develop an applicant compatibility index mobile device application that facilitates alignment between applicants' profiles and residency program offerings, and develop additional application review metrics for programs to use in screening. The goal is to increase transparency and efficiency in the process to reduce costs and anxiety and ultimately to increase individuals' success in training.[18]

CURRENT AMA POLICY

AMA policies related to this topic are listed in the Appendix.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Resolution 304-I-19 contained a wide variety of requests for action, including some in which the AMA is currently engaged. The AMA continues to advocate for an increase in GME positions, innovative models of GME training, and greater accountability overall in the funding for and outcomes of GME. The AMA has studied the causes of failures to match into a residency program—as have many medical education stakeholders—and has made resources available to students that can reduce the risk of failure (again, as have many medical education stakeholders). Other actions requested in the resolution are already reflected in material and tools prepared by the AAMC and NRMP. This information, however, is not all in one location. Furthermore, availability and ease of access to known successful strategies will not help applicants who do not avail themselves of advice that runs counter to their own sense of identity as a practitioner of a particular specialty.

Current proposals in the literature to improve the process of applying to, interviewing with, and matching to residency programs include, among many, signaling program preference in the application,[19] multi-phase matches,[20,21] and capping the number of applications so that each applicant can be considered more holistically.[22] The recent decisions of the Federation of State Medical Boards and the National Board of Medical Examiners, and the National Board of Osteopathic Medical Examiners, to report results of the USMLE Step 1 and the COMLEX-USA Level 1 examinations, respectively, as pass/fail rather than a three-digit score will remove metrics relied on by many individual program directors and application tools as a measure easily obtained and understood, although questionable in its ability to predict clinical performance. The application and interview season for the 2021 Match presented its own challenges, as programs were encouraged to interview applicants through video to reduce exposure to COVID-19. Few programs are experienced using virtual interviews, and most that have, have used them as adjunct to in-person interviews.[23] Programs were also encouraged to provide more information on the type of resident they are looking for, beyond academic statistics and overused adjectives. This is essential insight for students, who need to know when making their decisions to apply as to how well they would fit a given program.

Movement is afoot to revise the current system for program application, interviewing, and matching. In the interim, key stakeholder organizations, like the NRMP and AAMC, can consolidate information that can assist students and their advisers to create effective application strategies. Those applicants without an adviser should also have easy access to such information. All applicants, however, will need to use this information rationally if the desire is to successfully match to a program without unnecessary financial cost.

The Council on Medical Education therefore recommends that the following recommendations be adopted in lieu of Resolution 304-I-19 and the remainder of this report be filed:

1. That our AMA reaffirm Policies D-310.977, “National Resident Matching Program Reform,” H-200.954, “US Physician Shortage,” and D-305.967, “The Preservation, Stability and Expansion of Full Funding for Graduate Medical Education.” (Reaffirm HOD Policy)

2. That our AMA encourage the Association of American Medical Colleges, American Association of Colleges of Osteopathic Medicine, National Resident Matching Program, and other key stakeholders to jointly create a no-fee, easily accessible clearinghouse of reliable and valid advice and tools for residency program applicants seeking cost-effective methods for applying to and successfully matching into residency. (Directive to Take Action)

Fiscal note: $1,000.

APPENDIX: RELEVANT AMA POLICY

D-310.977, "National Resident Matching Program Reform"

Our AMA:

(1) will work with the National Resident Matching Program to develop and distribute educational programs to better inform applicants about the NRMP matching process;
(2) will actively participate in the evaluation of, and provide timely comments about, all proposals to modify the NRMP Match;
(3) will request that the NRMP explore the possibility of including the Osteopathic Match in the NRMP Match;
(4) will continue to review the NRMP's policies and procedures and make recommendations for improvements as the need arises;
(5) will work with the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education and other appropriate agencies to assure that the terms of employment for resident physicians are fair and equitable and reflect the unique and extensive amount of education and experience acquired by physicians;
(6) does not support the current the "All-In" policy for the Main Residency Match to the extent that it eliminates flexibility within the match process;
(7) will work with the NRMP, and other residency match programs, in revising Match policy, including the secondary match or scramble process to create more standardized rules for all candidates including application timelines and requirements;
(8) will work with the NRMP and other external bodies to develop mechanisms that limit disparities within the residency application process and allow both flexibility and standard rules for applicant;
(9) encourages the National Resident Matching Program to study and publish the effects of implementation of the Supplemental Offer and Acceptance Program on the number of residency spots not filled through the Main Residency Match and include stratified analysis by specialty and other relevant areas;
(10) will work with the National Resident Matching Program (NRMP) and Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) to evaluate the challenges in moving from a time-based education framework toward a competency-based system, including: a) analysis of time-based implications of the ACGME milestones for residency programs; b) the impact on the NRMP and entry into residency programs if medical education programs offer variable time lengths based on acquisition of competencies; c) the impact on financial aid for medical students with variable time lengths of medical education programs; d) the implications for interprofessional education and rewarding teamwork; and e) the implications for residents and students who achieve milestones earlier or later than their peers;
(11) will work with the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC), American Osteopathic Association (AOA), American Association of Colleges of Osteopathic Medicine (AACOM), and National Resident Matching Program (NRMP) to evaluate the current available data or propose new studies that would help us learn how many students graduating from US medical schools each year do not enter into a US residency program; how many never enter into a US residency program; whether there is disproportionate impact on individuals of minority racial and ethnic groups; and what careers are pursued by those with an MD or DO degree who do not enter residency programs;
(12) will work with the AAMC, AOA, AACOM and appropriate licensing boards to study whether US medical school graduates and international medical graduates who do not enter residency programs may be able to serve unmet national health care needs;

(13) will work with the AAMC, AOA, AACOM and the NRMP to evaluate the feasibility of a national tracking system for US medical students who do not initially match into a categorical residency program;
(14) will discuss with the National Resident Matching Program, Association of American Medical Colleges, American Osteopathic Association, Liaison Committee on Medical Education, Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education, and other interested bodies potential pathways for reengagement in medicine following an unsuccessful match and report back on the results of those discussions;
(15) encourages the Association of American Medical Colleges to work with U.S. medical schools to identify best practices, including career counseling, used by medical schools to facilitate successful matches for medical school seniors, and reduce the number who do not match;
(16) supports the movement toward a unified and standardized residency application and match system for all non-military residencies; and
(17) encourages the Educational Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates (ECFMG) and other interested stakeholders to study the personal and financial consequences of ECFMG-certified U.S. IMGs who do not match in the National Resident Matching Program and are therefore unable to get a residency or practice medicine.

H-200.954, "US Physician Shortage"

Our AMA:

(1) explicitly recognizes the existing shortage of physicians in many specialties and areas of the US;
(2) supports efforts to quantify the geographic maldistribution and physician shortage in many specialties;
(3) supports current programs to alleviate the shortages in many specialties and the maldistribution of physicians in the US;
(4) encourages medical schools and residency programs to consider developing admissions policies and practices and targeted educational efforts aimed at attracting physicians to practice in underserved areas and to provide care to underserved populations;
(5) encourages medical schools and residency programs to continue to provide courses, clerkships, and longitudinal experiences in rural and other underserved areas as a means to support educational program objectives and to influence choice of graduates' practice locations;
(6) encourages medical schools to include criteria and processes in admission of medical students that are predictive of graduates' eventual practice in underserved areas and with underserved populations;
(7) will continue to advocate for funding from public and private payers for educational programs that provide experiences for medical students in rural and other underserved areas;
(8) will continue to advocate for funding from all payers (public and private sector) to increase the number of graduate medical education positions in specialties leading to first certification;
(9) will work with other groups to explore additional innovative strategies for funding graduate medical education positions, including positions tied to geographic or specialty need;
(10) continues to work with the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) and other relevant groups to monitor the outcomes of the National Resident Matching Program; and
(11) continues to work with the AAMC and other relevant groups to develop strategies to address the current and potential shortages in clinical training sites for medical students.
(12) will: (a) promote greater awareness and implementation of the Project ECHO (Extension for Community Healthcare Outcomes) and Child Psychiatry Access Project models among academic health centers and community-based primary care physicians; (b) work with stakeholders to identify and mitigate barriers to broader implementation of these models in the United States; and

(c) monitor whether health care payers offer additional payment or incentive payments for physicians who engage in clinical practice improvement activities as a result of their participation in programs such as Project ECHO and the Child Psychiatry Access Project; and if confirmed, promote awareness of these benefits among physicians.

D-305.967, "The Preservation, Stability and Expansion of Full Funding for Graduate Medical Education"

1. Our AMA will actively collaborate with appropriate stakeholder organizations, (including Association of American Medical Colleges, American Hospital Association, state medical societies, medical specialty societies/associations) to advocate for the preservation, stability and expansion of full funding for the direct and indirect costs of graduate medical education (GME) positions from all existing sources (e.g. Medicare, Medicaid, Veterans Administration, CDC and others).
2. Our AMA will actively advocate for the stable provision of matching federal funds for state Medicaid programs that fund GME positions.
3. Our AMA will actively seek congressional action to remove the caps on Medicare funding of GME positions for resident physicians that were imposed by the Balanced Budget Amendment of 1997 (BBA-1997).
4. Our AMA will strenuously advocate for increasing the number of GME positions to address the future physician workforce needs of the nation.
5. Our AMA will oppose efforts to move federal funding of GME positions to the annual appropriations process that is subject to instability and uncertainty.
6. Our AMA will oppose regulatory and legislative efforts that reduce funding for GME from the full scope of resident educational activities that are designated by residency programs for accreditation and the board certification of their graduates (e.g. didactic teaching, community service, off-site ambulatory rotations, etc.).
7. Our AMA will actively explore additional sources of GME funding and their potential impact on the quality of residency training and on patient care.
8. Our AMA will vigorously advocate for the continued and expanded contribution by all payers for health care (including the federal government, the states, and local and private sources) to fund both the direct and indirect costs of GME.
9. Our AMA will work, in collaboration with other stakeholders, to improve the awareness of the general public that GME is a public good that provides essential services as part of the training process and serves as a necessary component of physician preparation to provide patient care that is safe, effective and of high quality.
10. Our AMA staff and governance will continuously monitor federal, state and private proposals for health care reform for their potential impact on the preservation, stability and expansion of full funding for the direct and indirect costs of GME.
11. Our AMA: (a) recognizes that funding for and distribution of positions for GME are in crisis in the United States and that meaningful and comprehensive reform is urgently needed; (b) will immediately work with Congress to expand medical residencies in a balanced fashion based on expected specialty needs throughout our nation to produce a geographically distributed and appropriately sized physician workforce; and to make increasing support and funding for GME programs and residencies a top priority of the AMA in its national political agenda; and (c) will continue to work closely with the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education, Association of American Medical Colleges, American Osteopathic Association, and other key stakeholders to raise awareness among policymakers and the public about the importance of expanded GME funding to meet the nation's current and anticipated medical workforce needs.
12. Our AMA will collaborate with other organizations to explore evidence-based approaches to quality and accountability in residency education to support enhanced funding of GME.

13. Our AMA will continue to strongly advocate that Congress fund additional graduate medical education (GME) positions for the most critical workforce needs, especially considering the current and worsening maldistribution of physicians.
14. Our AMA will advocate that the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services allow for rural and other underserved rotations in Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME)-accredited residency programs, in disciplines of particular local/regional need, to occur in the offices of physicians who meet the qualifications for adjunct faculty of the residency program's sponsoring institution.
15. Our AMA encourages the ACGME to reduce barriers to rural and other underserved community experiences for graduate medical education programs that choose to provide such training, by adjusting as needed its program requirements, such as continuity requirements or limitations on time spent away from the primary residency site.
16. Our AMA encourages the ACGME and the American Osteopathic Association (AOA) to continue to develop and disseminate innovative methods of training physicians efficiently that foster the skills and inclinations to practice in a health care system that rewards team-based care and social accountability.
17. Our AMA will work with interested state and national medical specialty societies and other appropriate stakeholders to share and support legislation to increase GME funding, enabling a state to accomplish one or more of the following: (a) train more physicians to meet state and regional workforce needs; (b) train physicians who will practice in physician shortage/underserved areas; or (c) train physicians in undersupplied specialties and subspecialties in the state/region.
18. Our AMA supports the ongoing efforts by states to identify and address changing physician workforce needs within the GME landscape and continue to broadly advocate for innovative pilot programs that will increase the number of positions and create enhanced accountability of GME programs for quality outcomes.
19. Our AMA will continue to work with stakeholders such as Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC), ACGME, AOA, American Academy of Family Physicians, American College of Physicians, and other specialty organizations to analyze the changing landscape of future physician workforce needs as well as the number and variety of GME positions necessary to provide that workforce.
20. Our AMA will explore innovative funding models for incremental increases in funded residency positions related to quality of resident education and provision of patient care as evaluated by appropriate medical education organizations such as the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education.
21. Our AMA will utilize its resources to share its content expertise with policymakers and the public to ensure greater awareness of the significant societal value of graduate medical education (GME) in terms of patient care, particularly for underserved and at-risk populations, as well as global health, research and education.
22. Our AMA will advocate for the appropriation of Congressional funding in support of the National Healthcare Workforce Commission, established under section 5101 of the Affordable Care Act, to provide data and healthcare workforce policy and advice to the nation and provide data that support the value of GME to the nation.
23. Our AMA supports recommendations to increase the accountability for and transparency of GME funding and continue to monitor data and peer-reviewed studies that contribute to further assess the value of GME.
24. Our AMA will explore various models of all-payer funding for GME, especially as the Institute of Medicine (now a program unit of the National Academy of Medicine) did not examine those options in its 2014 report on GME governance and financing.
25. Our AMA encourages organizations with successful existing models to publicize and share strategies, outcomes and costs.

26. Our AMA encourages insurance payers and foundations to enter into partnerships with state and local agencies as well as academic medical centers and community hospitals seeking to expand GME.
27. Our AMA will develop, along with other interested stakeholders, a national campaign to educate the public on the definition and importance of graduate medical education, student debt and the state of the medical profession today and in the future.
28. Our AMA will collaborate with other stakeholder organizations to evaluate and work to establish consensus regarding the appropriate economic value of resident and fellow services.
29. Our AMA will monitor ongoing pilots and demonstration projects, and explore the feasibility of broader implementation of proposals that show promise as alternative means for funding physician education and training while providing appropriate compensation for residents and fellows.
30. Our AMA will monitor the status of the House Energy and Commerce Committee's response to public comments solicited regarding the 2014 IOM report, Graduate Medical Education That Meets the Nation's Health Needs, as well as results of ongoing studies, including that requested of the GAO, in order to formulate new advocacy strategy for GME funding, and will report back to the House of Delegates regularly on important changes in the landscape of GME funding.
31. Our AMA will advocate to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services to adopt the concept of “Cap-Flexibility” and allow new and current Graduate Medical Education teaching institutions to extend their cap-building window for up to an additional five years beyond the current window (for a total of up to ten years), giving priority to new residency programs in underserved areas and/or economically depressed areas.
32. Our AMA will: (a) encourage all existing and planned allopathic and osteopathic medical schools to thoroughly research match statistics and other career placement metrics when developing career guidance plans; (b) strongly advocate for and work with legislators, private sector partnerships, and existing and planned osteopathic and allopathic medical schools to create and fund graduate medical education (GME) programs that can accommodate the equivalent number of additional medical school graduates consistent with the workforce needs of our nation; and (c) encourage the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME), the Commission on Osteopathic College Accreditation (COCA), and other accrediting bodies, as part of accreditation of allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, to prospectively and retrospectively monitor medical school graduates’ rates of placement into GME as well as GME completion.
33. Our AMA encourages the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to coordinate with federal agencies that fund GME training to identify and collect information needed to effectively evaluate how hospitals, health systems, and health centers with residency programs are utilizing these financial resources to meet the nation’s health care workforce needs. This includes information on payment amounts by the type of training programs supported, resident training costs and revenue generation, output or outcomes related to health workforce planning (i.e., percentage of primary care residents that went on to practice in rural or medically underserved areas), and measures related to resident competency and educational quality offered by GME training programs.

REFERENCES

[1] Amy Mathias, personal communication. June 2020.

[2] National Resident Matching Program, Results and Data: 2018 Main Residency Match®. National Resident Matching Program, Washington, DC. 2018.

[3] National Resident Matching Program, Results and Data: 2019 Main Residency Match®. National Resident Matching Program, Washington, DC. 2019.

[4] National Resident Matching Program, Results and Data: 2020 Main Residency Match®. National Resident Matching Program, Washington, DC. 2020.

[5] Match Update: Fourth Offer Round Added To The 2021 SOAP Process. .http://www.nrmp.org/soap-fourth-round/ Accessed June 26, 2020.

[6] Apply Smart for Residency. https://students-residents.aamc.org/applying-residency/filteredresult/apply-smart-data-consider-when-applying-residency/. Accessed June 16, 2020.

[7] J. Bryan Carmody (2020) Applying Smarter: A Critique of the AAMC Apply Smart Tools. Journal of Graduate Medical Education: February 2020, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 10-13. https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-19-00495.1

[8] National Resident Matching Program, Data Release and Research Committee: Results of the 2020 NRMP Program Director Survey. National Resident Matching Program, Washington, DC. 2020.

[9] National Resident Matching Program, Data Release and Research Committee: Results of the 2019 NRMP Applicant Survey by Preferred Specialty and Applicant Type. National Resident Matching Program, Washington, DC. 2019.

[10] National Resident Matching Program, Charting Outcomes in the Match: U.S. Allopathic Seniors, 2018. National Resident Matching Program, Washington, DC 2018. https://mk0nrmp3oyqui6wqfm.kinstacdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Charting-Outcomes-in-the-Match-2018_Seniors-1.pdf. Accessed June 16, 2020.

[11] National Resident Matching Program, Charting Outcomes in the Match: Senior Students of U.S. Osteopathic Medical Schools, 2018. National Resident Matching Program, Washington, DC 2018. https://mk0nrmp3oyqui6wqfm.kinstacdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Charting-Outcomes-in-the-Match-2018-Osteo.pdf. Accessed June 16, 2020.

[12] National Resident Matching Program, Charting Outcomes in the Match: International Medical Graduates, 2018. National Resident Matching Program, Washington, DC 2018. https://mk0nrmp3oyqui6wqfm.kinstacdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Charting-Outcomes-in-the-Match-2018-IMGs.pdf. Accessed June 16, 2020.

[13] Interactive Charting Outcomes in the Match. https://www.nrmp.org/interactive-charting-outcomes-in-the-match/#:~:text=Interactive%20Charting%20Outcomes%20in%20the%20Match%20has%20been%20built%20using,Charting%20Outcomes%20in%20the%20Match.&text=PDF%20copies%20of%20the%202018,Residency%20Data%20and%20Reports%20page. Accessed June 16, 2020.

[14] AMA Council on Medical Education. Report 5-A-17 Options for Unmatched Medical Students.

[15] Otolaryngology Preference Signaling. https://opdo-hns.org/mpage/signaling. Accessed January 10, 2021.

[16] Association of American Medical Colleges. ERAS Statistics. https://www.aamc.org/data-reports/interactive-data/eras-statistics-data. Accessed January 9, 2021.

[17] Murphy B. The Match process is packed with stress. Ob-gyns aim to fix it. https://www.ama-assn.org/education/improve-gme/match-process-packed-stress-ob-gyns-aim-fix-it. Accessed January 10, 2021.

[18] Winkel AF, Morgan HK, Burk-Rafel J, et al. A model for exploring compatibility between applicants and residency programs: Right Resident, Right Program. *Obstet Gynecol* 2021;137:164–9.DOI: 10.1097/AOG.0000000000004179.

[19] Whipple ME, Law AB, Bly RA. A computer simulation model to analyze the application process or competitive residency programs. *J Grad Med Educ*. 2019 Feb;11(1):30-35. doi: 10.4300/JGME-D-18-00397.1.

[20] Monir JG. Reforming the Match: A proposal for a new 3-phase system. *J Grad Med Educ*. 2020 Feb;12(1):7-9. doi: 10.4300/JGME-D-19-00425.1.

[21] Hammoud MM, Andrews J, Skochelak SE. Improving the residency application and selection process: An optional early result acceptance program. *JAMA*. 2020;323(6):503-504. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.21212.

[22] Weissbart SJ, Kim SJ, Feinn RS, Stock JA. Relationship between the number of residency applications and the yearly Match rate: Time to start thinking about an application limit? *J Grad Med Educ*. 2015 Mar;7(1):81-5. doi: 10.4300/JGME-D-14-00270.1.

[23] Wolff M, Burrows H. Planning for virtual interviews: Residency recruitment during a pandemic. *Acad Pediatr*. 2021;21:24−31.