RESEARCH



Reimagining a pass/fail clinical core clerkship: a US residency program director survey and meta-analysis



Andrew Wang^{1,2*}, Krystal L. Karunungan¹, Jacob D. Story¹, Nathan A. Shlobin³, Jiyun Woo⁴, Edward L. Ha¹, Karen E. Hauer⁵ and Clarence H. Braddock III¹

Abstract

Pass/fail (P/F) grading has emerged as an alternative to tiered clerkship grading. Systematically evaluating existing literature and surveying program directors (PD) perspectives on these consequential changes can guide educators in addressing inequalities in academia and students aiming to improve their residency applications.

In our survey, a total of 1578 unique PD responses (63.1%) were obtained across 29 medical specialties. With the changes to United States Medical Licensure Examination (USMLE), responses showed increased importance of core clerkships with the implementation of Step 2CK cutoffs. PDs believed core clerkship performance was a reliable representation of an applicant's preparedness for residency, particularly in Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education's (ACGME)Medical Knowledge and Patient Care and Procedural Skills. PDs disagreed with P/F core clerkships because it more difficult to objectively compare applicants. No statistically significant differences in responses were found in PD preferential selection when comparing applicants from tiered and P/F core clerkship grading systems. If core clerkships adopted P/F scoring, PDs would further increase emphasis on narrative assessment, sub-internship evaluation, reference letters, academic awards, professional development and medical school prestige.

In the meta-analysis, of 6 studies from 2,118 participants, adjusted scaled scores with mean difference from an equal variance model from PDs showed residents from tiered clerkship grading systems overall performance, learning ability, work habits, personal evaluations, residency selection and educational evaluation were not statistically significantly different than from residents from P/F systems.

Overall, our dual study suggests that while PDs do not favor P/F core clerkships, PDs do not have a selection preference and do not report a difference in performance between applicants from P/F vs. tiered grading core clerkship systems, thus providing fertile grounds for institutions to examine the feasibility of adopting P/F grading for core clerkships.

Keywords Medical education, Educational assessment, Clerkship, Residency and internship, Applicant selection

*Correspondence: Andrew Wang andrewwang@mednet.ucla.edu Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



© The Author(s) 2023. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.gr/licenses/by/4.0/. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.gr/licenses/by/4.0/. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedicated in a credit line to the data.

Introduction

Assessment of student performance in core clinical clerkships leads to grade assignments which are associated with residency selection by program directors (PD). Pass/fail (P/F) grading has emerged as an alternative to tiered clerkship grading [1]. Proponents contend that P/F grading promotes the development of a foundation for self-regulated learning and reduces grade inflation while promoting student wellness and minimizing racial and ethnic disparities [2, 3]. However, others argue that P/F grading increases stress, removes objective measures that allow differentiation on residency applications. Nonetheless, P/F grading has been widely adopted for preclinical coursework and United States Medical Licensure Examination (USMLE) Step 1 to P/F in January 2022. Many medical schools have temporarily adopted P/F grading in response to the COVID-19 pandemic following the guidance of the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME) [4]. These changes have spurred further discussions on the potential implications of permanently adopting a P/F core clerkship. Systematically evaluating existing literature and surveying PD perspectives on these consequential changes can guide educators in addressing inequalities in academia and students aiming to improve their residency applications.

Methods

For the survey, the authors manually queried a subset (2500 of more than 5000 programs, outreach > 50% for every medical specialty except internal medicine and family medicine) of valid PD emails through the ACGME public 2021–2022 List of Specialty Programs (n = 29). In rounds (1/2021-12/2021), PDs were contacted. This was 7-item anonymous online survey using the ExpertReview validation tool (Qualtrics XM operating system version X4 [Qualtrics International Inc]). The survey (using Qualtrics and Google Forms) (Supplementary Table 6) included questions on PD demographics. PDs were then prompted for their general perceptions regarding the impact of P/F clerkships in the context of changes to Step 1 and Step 2 CS on residency preparedness, selection and institutional disparities. Responses were recorded on 3-point Likert scales (disagree, neutral, agree) and reported as counts and percentages. Derived 95% confidence intervals (CI) were defined by AAPOR guidelines (Supplementary Table 3). Statistically significance (P < 00.05) was considered by nonoverlapping 95% CI using Stata statistical software (StataCorp version 16.1). Subgroup analyses between regions and between AAMCdefined primary care (internal medicine, family medicine, pediatrics, internal medicine/pediatrics) and nonprimary care specialties were complete. Surveys with incomplete PD demographics were excluded (n = 11) and incomplete surveys (< 3%) were censored. This study was IRB exempt because it used deidentified data.

For the meta-analysis, Embase, PubMed, and Scopus was searched since inception through 01/01/2022 (Supplementary Table 1) with no restrictions. Studies exploring P/F clerkship grading in the context of a cohort of PD assessments were included. Reviewers assessed study characteristics, clinical and nonclinical resident performance with PD's personal evaluation (worse:0 to best:100). This study followed the PRISMA guidelines (Supplementary Table 2).

Results

The total survey response rate was 63.1% [n=1578] (Table 1). The majority of participants were 50 ± 10 years old and male (63.0% [n=994]); had served as program directors for an average of 6.8±6.2 years and were distributed across US regions (Northeast 30.4% [n=480], Midwest 25.2% [*n*=398], South 24.0% [*n*=378], West 20.4% [n=322]). Family Medicine (13.1% [n=204]), Internal Medicine (9.8% [*n*=155]), Surgery (7.0% [n=110]), were the most commonly represented specialties. More responses from non-primary care (72.4% [n=1082]) specialties were collected than primary care specialties (31.4% [n=496]). Since changes to USMLE Step 1 to P/F and Step 2CS being discontinued, currently many PDs will implement a Step 2 CK cutoff score (71.2%, CI, 68.1–74.3; *n* = 1124), but no cutoff's in NBME score or minimum number of professional activities (research, community service, leadership) or supplemental application material would be required.

PDs believed (81.9%; 95% CI, 78.8–85.0; *n*=1292) core clerkship performance was a reliable representation of an applicant's preparedness for residency, particularly in Medical Knowledge (53.4%; 95% CI, 50.3-56.5; n = 838) and Patient Care and Procedural Skills (45.7%; 95% CI, 42.6–48.8; n=717) (Table 1). PDs disagreed with P/F core clerkships (88.9%; 95% CI, 85.8–92.0; n = 1403), expressed concerns that P/F core clerkships would make it more difficult to objectively compare residency applicants (96.4%; 95% CI, 93.3-99.5; n=1521) and make the applicant screening more arduous (86.5%; 95% CI, 83.4–89.6; *n*=1365). Yet, no statistically significant differences in responses were found in PD preferential selection when comparing applicants from tiered and P/F core clerkship grading systems. If core clerkships adopted P/F scoring, PDs would further increase emphasis on Step 2 CK performance (83.2%; 95% CI, 80.1-86.3; *n*=1307), narrative assessment (78.4%; 95%) CI, 74.3–81.5; n = 1232), sub-internship evaluation (71.8%; 95% CI, 68.7–74.9; *n*=1127), reference letters (65.9%; 95% CI, 62.8–79.0; n = 1033), academic awards or special honor societies (68.0%, 95% CI, 64.9-71.1;
 Table 1 Program director perspectives on residency preparedness and applicant selection following the change to pass/fail core clerkship grading

SpecifyHeadingHeiding <t< th=""><th>Α.</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></t<>	Α.					
AneshesiologySignalSignalSignalSignalChild neurology457263Emergency medicine477262Family medicine572068Internal medicine/Pediatris55/29068Intervantional faciology (integrated and independent)57258Neurology24455858Neurology796858Neurology796858Neurology7968Neurology7968Neurology7968Neurology7968Neurology7968Neurology7968Neurology7968Neurology7968Neurology7968Neurology7968Neurology7968Neurology7968Orthopadic surgeny7070Physical medicine and rehabilitation707070Physical medicine and rehabilitation707070Physical medicine and rehabilitation71716370Physical medicine and rehabilitation7171717171717171 <t< td=""><td>Specialty</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Respondents (N)</td><td>Response Rate (%)</td></t<>	Specialty				Respondents (N)	Response Rate (%)
Child neurology:5472635Dermatology	Anesthesiology				51/77	66.2
Demain(p)45/7063/71Emergency medicine14/13064Entergency medicine24/13064Entergency medicine51/12068Internal medicine/field independent)24/13063Meuclogy (integrated and independent)14/14078Neurologic sargery171/12068Nuclear medicine171/12068Nuclear medicine171/12068Nuclear medicine171/12068Obstetries and genomics171/12068Nuclear medicine171/12068Nuclear medicine171/12068Obstetries and genomics171/12068Nuclear medicine171/12068Ophthalmologic171/12061Ophthalmologic surgery171/12061Ophthalmologic surgery171/12061Ophthalmologic surgery171/12063Polysical medicine and rehabilitation171/12063Prevente medicine protein171/12063Radiation oncology1171/12063Radiation oncology1171/12063Radiation oncology1171/12063Radiation oncology1171/12063Name1171/1206373Name1171/1206373Name1 <td>Child neurology</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>25/38</td> <td>65.8</td>	Child neurology				25/38	65.8
Emergy medicine949309461Family medicine5529063Intervent medicine/Pediatrics552961Intervent medicine/Pediatrics552961Medical genetics and genomics54273Medical genetics and genomics54274Neurologic surgery54374Nuckear medicine54374Nuckear medicine54374Nuckear medicine54374Nuckear medicine54374Obstetrics and genomics54374Obstetrics and genomics54374Outcharmedicine54374Outcharmedicine54374Outcharmedicine and rehabilitation54374Prediatrics54474Prediatrics54474Preventive medicine54474Preventive medicine54474Preventive medicine and rehabilitation5474Preventive medicine54474Preventive medicine54474Preventive medicine54474Preventive medicine54474Preventive medicine54474Preventive medicine54474Preventive medicine and rehabilitation544Preventive medicine <t< td=""><td>Dermatology</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>45/72</td><td>62.5</td></t<>	Dermatology				45/72	62.5
Family medicineSeriesSeriesSeriesInternal medicine/Pediatrics575757Internal medicine/Pediatrics575757Internal medicine/Pediatrics575757Medical genetics and genomics575757Neurologic surgery57575757Nuclear medicine57575757Nuclear medicine57575757Obstetrics and genecics57575757Opthalmology5757575757Opthalmology5757575757Opthalmology5757575757Opthalmology5757575757Opthalmology5757575757Pathology5757575757Pathology5757575757Pathology5757575757Pathology5757575757Pathology5757575757Pathology5757575757Pathology5757575757Pathology5757575757Pathology5757575757Pathology5757575757Pathology5757575757	Emergency medicine				84/130	64.6
International with the second of the secon	Family medicine				204/300	68
Interventional radiology (integrated an integrated and integrated an integrated and	Internal medicine				155/229	68
Interventional radiology (integrated and independent)26/4537.8Medical genetics and genomics14/2483.3Neurologic surgery147.8088.1Nuckar medicine197.9288.1Obsteritics and gynecology197.9288.1Othatpedics and gynecology187.9287.92Ophthal mology197.9287.92Ophthal mology187.9287.92Othopedic surgery187.9287.92Othopedic surgery187.9287.92Pathology197.9287.92Pathology197.9287.92Pathology197.9287.92Pathology197.9287.92Preventive medicine and rehabilitation197.9287.92Preventive medicine197.9287.92Preventive medicine197.9287.92Preventive medicine197.9287.92Preventive medicine197.9287.92Preventive medicine197.9287.92Preventive medicine197.9287.92Preventive medicine197.9287.92Preventive medicine197.9297.92Preventive medicine197.9297.92Preventive medicine197.9297.92Preventive medicine197.9297.92Preventive medicine197.9297.92Preventive	Internal medicine/Pediatrics				61/108	56.5
Medical genetics and genomics14/2458.3Neurologic surgery58.058.0Nuclear medicine19.10268.0Obsterics and geneology19.11269.0Opthalmology19.11210.0Opthalmology19.11210.0Ototayngology19.11210.0Ototayngology19.11210.0Ototayngology19.11210.0Paldation19.11210.0Polating <td>Interventional radiology (integrated</td> <td>and independent)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>26/45</td> <td>57.8</td>	Interventional radiology (integrated	and independent)			26/45	57.8
Neurologic surgery36/961Neurology747058Nuclear medicine719068Obstetrics and genecology91/3263Opthalmology16363Opthalmology171063Othopagic surgery171063Otolayngology171063Pediatris171763Pediatris171763Pediatris171763Pediatris171763Pediatris171763Pediatris171763Pediatris171763Pediatris171763Patris surgery (integrated and independer)171763Pediatris17176363Radiation oncology1171763Storgery1171763Storgery1171763Unology11163Storgery11163Storgery11111National year of the specific structure struct	Medical genetics and genomics				14/24	58.3
Neuclog47,8058,81Nuclear medicine71963,81Obstetrics and geneology91,91,3263,81Opthalmology114,3263,12Opthalmology184,0163,12Othopedic surgery184,0163,12Pathology177,1063,12Pathology177,1063,12Pathology177,1063,12Pathology177,1063,12Pathology177,1063,12Pathology177,1263,12Preventive medicine and independem177,1263,12Preventive medicine177,1263,12Preventive medicine177,1263,12Preventive medicine177,1263,12Preventive medicine111,1277,1263,12Preventive medicine111,1277,1263,12Preventive medicine111,1211,1211,12Preventive medicine111,1211,1211,12Preventive medicine111,1211,1211,12Preventive medicine111,1211,1211,12Preventive medicine111,1211,1211,12Preventive medicine111,1211,1211,12Preventive medicine111,1211,1211,12Preventive medicine111,1211,1211,12Preventive medicine111	Neurologic surgery				36/59	61
Nuclear medicine7/1936.8Obsterics and gynecology9/1329/13280.9Ophhalmology1/166.16.1Orthopedic surgery38/0238/0281.0Otolaryngology17/1081.06.2Pethology17/107/107.1Pethology17/107.17.1Pethology17/127.17.1Polysical medicine and rehabilitation17.17.17.1Physical medicine117.17.17.1Preventive medicine117.17.17.1Preventive medicine117.17.17.1Radiation oncology117.17.17.1Radiation scillogy-diagnostic117.17.17.1Surgery1117.17.17.1Tanstional year117.17.17.17.1Toracic surgery (integrated)117.1 <td>Neurology</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>47/80</td> <td>58.8</td>	Neurology				47/80	58.8
Obserties and genecology9/132689Opthalmology1/6361Otholyogology63/1063/10Otolaryogology8/6263/10Pathology7/1062Pediatics7/107/10Physical medicine and rehabilitation7/107/10Preventive medicine7/107/10Preventive medicine7/107/10Preventive medicine7/1163/10Preventive medicine7/127/10Radiation oncology7/117/10Radiation oncology7/117/10Surgery1/107/11Straigery1/107/11Straigery1/107/11Straigery1/107/11Straigery1/107/11Straigery1/107/11Straigery1/107/11Straigery1/107/11Straigery1/107/11Straigery1/107/11Straigery1/101/10Straigery1/101/10Straigery1/101/10Straigery1/101/10Straigery1/101/10Straigery1/101/10Straigery1/101/10Straigery1/101/10Straigery1/101/10Straigery1/101/10Straigery1/101/10Straigery1/101/10Straigery1/101/10Straigery <td>Nuclear medicine</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>7/19</td> <td>36.8</td>	Nuclear medicine				7/19	36.8
Opthalmology41/6365.1Orthopdic surgery53/0162.4Otolaryngology31/2166.2Pathology47/7166.2Pediatrics57.671.7Physical medicine and rehabilitation57.671.7Physical medicine and rehabilitation71.771.2Preventive medicine71.771.2Preventive medicine71.771.2Preventiv	Obstetrics and gynecology				91/132	68.9
Orthopedic surgery54/10162/101Ottolaryngology3/8026.3Pathology4/716.2Pediatrics7/1067.1Physical medicine and rehabilitation5.15.1Physical medicine and rehabilitation5.17.1Pastic surgery (integrated and independent)7.17.1Preventive medicine7.17.1Preventive medicine7.17.1Radiation oncology7.17.1Radiation oncology7.17.1Surgery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Urology7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Urology7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.17.1Stragery7.	Ophthalmology				41/63	65.1
Otolaryngolog38/62613Patholog47/10662Pediatics76/1067.7Physical medicine and rehabilitation55/5267.3Plastic surgery (integrated and independent)55/5267.3Preventive medicine77/12163.6Preventive medicine77/12163.6Radiation oncology77/12163.6Radiation oncology77/12163.6Surgery (integrated and independent)77/12163.6Thoracic surgery77/12163.6Surgery (integrated)77/12163.6Toracic surgery77/12163.6Toracic surgery77/12163.6Toracic surgery77/12163.6Urology77/12163.7Vacular surgery (integrated)77/12163.7B77/12163.763.7Vacular surgery (integrated)77/12163.7B77/12110/16863.7B77/12110/16863.7B77/12110/16863.7B77/12110/16810/168B77/12110/16810/168B77/12110/16810/168B77/12110/16810/168B77/12110/16810/168B77/12110/16810/168B77/12110/16810/168B77/12110/16810/168B77/12110/16810/168B77/121 <t< td=""><td>Orthopedic surgery</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>63/101</td><td>62.4</td></t<>	Orthopedic surgery				63/101	62.4
Pathology47771662Pediatrics76/10671.7Physical medicine and rehabilitation94/4751.1Plastic surgery (integrated and independent)35.5267.3Preventive medicine77.12163.6Preventive medicine77.12163.6Radiation oncology77.12163.6Radiation oncology77.12163.6Surgery77.12157.9Surgery77.958.8Surgery77.958.8Transitional year77.957.8Urology77.957.9Vascular surgery (integrated)77.958.3Surgery77.957.9Transitional year77.958.3Vascular surgery (integrated)77.958.3S77.957.956.3B10.00277.956.3B10.00277.956.3B10.00277.956.3S10.00277.956.3S10.00277.956.3B10.00277.957.9B10.00277.957.9S10.00277.957.9S10.00277.957.9S10.00277.957.9S10.00277.957.9S10.00277.957.9S10.00277.957.9S10.00277.957.9S10.00277.957.9S	Otolaryngology				38/62	61.3
Pediatrics96/10091.7Physical medicine and independint31.1Plastic surgery (integrated and independint35.2Preventive medicine17.3Preventive medicine17.3Sychiaty77.1Standation cology77.1Radiation cology77.1Radiation cology77.1Strappy77.1Strappy77.1Strappy77.1Strappy10.1Transitional year10.1Transitional year10.1Vacular surgery (integrated)77.1Strappy77.1Strappy10.1Transitional year10.1Vacular surgery (integrated)10.1Strappy10.1S	Pathology				47/71	66.2
Physical medicine and rehabilitation14,4714,17Plastic surgery (integrated and independence)35/2067,37Preventive medicine77,12063,61Preventive medicine77,12063,61Radiation oncology77,9758,61Radiology-diagnostic77,9758,61Surgery77,9751,61Transitional year77,9751,61Transitional year77,9751,61Vacular surgery (integrated)77,9751,61Surgery77,9751,61Vacular surgery (integrated)77,9751,61R10,10810,10851,61Sacular surgery (integrated)77,9751,61R10,10810,10810,108R10,10810,10810,108R11,10810,10810,108Sacular surgery (integrated)11,10810,108R11,10810,10810,108R11,10810,10810,108R11,10810,10810,108Sacular surgery (integrated)11,10810,108R11,10810,10810,108R11,10810,10810,108R11,10810,10810,108Sacular surgery (integrated)11,10810,108Sacular surgery (integrated)11,10810,108Sacular surgery (integrated)11,10810,108Sacular surgery (integrated)11,10810,108Sacular surgery (integrated)11,108 <td>Pediatrics</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>76/106</td> <td>71.7</td>	Pediatrics				76/106	71.7
Platic surgery (integrated and independent)35/52673Preventive medicine17/36472Preventive medicine77/121636Sadiation oncology17/36457Radiation oncology11/16656Radiation oncology110/168657Radiogy-diagnostic110/168657Surgery110/168578Thoracic surgery110/168657Transitional year110/168657Urology110/168507Vacular surgery (integrated)110/168653B18/20631B18/20631B18/20631B110/16818/30631B110/16818/30631B110/16818/30631B110/16818/303180%B110/16818/303180%B110/16818/30312B110/16818/30312B110/16818/30312B110/16818/30310%B110/16818/30310%B110/16818/30310%B110/16818/30310%B110/16818/30310%B110/16818/30310%B110/16818/30310%B110/16818/30310%B110/16818/30310%B110/16818/30310%B11	Physical medicine and rehabilitation	1			24/47	51.1
Preventive medicine 17/36 472 Psychiatry 77/121 63.6 Radiation oncology 21/46 45.7 Radiology-diagnostic 57/97 58.8 Surgery 110/168 65.5 Thoracic surgery 21/37 57.8 Transitional year 110/168 65.5 Vascular surgery (integrated) 57.97 68.5 B. 57.97 68.5 AGGME Core Competencies Professionalism and Ethics 57.97 68.5 B. 110/168 65.5 68.5 ACGME Core Competencies Professionalism and Ethics 151 25.70% 40.50% 33.80% (21.6-27.8) (21.6-27.8) (20.7-36.9) (21.7-36.9) (21.7-36.9) Interpersonal and Communication Skills 155 24.70% 40.00% 35.30% (21.6-27.8) (20.7-27.8) (20.7-36.9) (22.7-38.4) (22.7-38.4) Medical Knowledge 150 18.30% 23.00% 33.00% (20.4-27.8) (20.4-27.8) (20.4-26.6) (20.9-36.1) Medical Knowledge	Plastic surgery (integrated and inde	pendent)			35/52	67.3
Psychlary	Preventive medicine				17/36	47.2
Radiation oncology 11/46 45.7 Radiation oncology 57/97 58.8 Surgery 110/168 65.5 Strongery 21/37 57.8 Transitional year 57.8 57.9 Urology 57.8 57.8 Vascular surgery (integrated) 57.9 68.5 Strong Y 57.8 56.3 RAGME Core Competencies Professionalism and Ethics 57.9 RAGME Core Competencies Professional and Communication Skills 25.70% 40.50% 33.80% RAGME Core Competencies Professional and Communication Skills 155 25.70% 40.00% 35.30% RAGME Core Competencies Medical Knowledge 155 24.70% 40.00% 35.30% RAGME Core Competencies Medical Knowledge 150 24.70% 40.00% 35.30% RAGME Core Competencies Systems-Based Practice 152 24.70% 40.00% 32.93% RAGME Core Competencies Systems-Based Practice 152 24.70% 40.00% 32.00% RAGME Core Competencies Systems-Based Practice 152	Psychiatry				77/121	63.6
Adiology-diagnostic 57,000 58,00000000000000000000000000000000	Radiation oncology				21/46	45.7
Surgery 110/168 655 Thoracic surgery 21/37 57.8 Transitional year 37/81 45.7 Urology 18/32 56.3 Vascular surgery (integrated) 18/32 56.3 B. 22.6-28.8 (37.4-43.6) (30.7-36.9) Interpersonal and Communication Skills 155 24.70% 40.00% 35.30% (21.6-27.8) (26.9-43.1) (32.2-38.4) (30.7-36.9) Interpersonal and Communication Skills 155 24.70% 40.00% 35.30% (21.6-27.8) (26.9-43.1) (32.2-38.4) (30.7-36.9) Medical Knowledge 155 18.30% 26.9-43.1) (32.2-38.4) Visional Science 10.10% 33.00% 21.6-27.8 (26.9-43.1) (32.2-38.4) Visional Science 10.2 18.30% 28.30% 53.40% 20.9-36.1) Visional Science 10.2 21.50% 43.50% 33.00% 20.9-36.1) Visional Science 10.2 21.10% 33.20% 45.70% Visional Science 110.0% 33.20% 45.70%	Radiology-diagnostic				57/97	58.8
Transitional year 21/37 57.8 Transitional year 37/81 45.7 Urology 50/73 68.5 Vascular surgery (integrated) 18/32 56.3 B. 18/2 63.3 ACGME Core Competencies Professionalism and Ethics 151 25.70% 40.50% 33.80% Interpersonal and Communication Skills 155 24.70% 40.00% 35.30% (216-27.8) (216-27.8) (269-43.1) (322-38.4) Medical Knowledge 157 18.30% 23.00% 33.00% (126-27.8) 25.31.4) (50.3-56.5) 33.00% Procedural Skills 156 25.00% 43.50% 33.00% (20-26.2) 23.50% 43.50% 33.00% (21.6-27.8) (20.9-43.1) (23.2-38.4) Medical Knowledge 150 152.201.4) (50.3-56.5) (30.7-36.5) (30.7-36.5) James Based Practice 156 23.50% 43.50% (29.9-36.1) Procedural Skills 156 21.0% 33.0% (20.9-36.1) Procedural Skills 156	Surgery				110/168	65.5
Tansitional year 37/81 45.7 Urology 50/73 68.5 Vascular surgery (integrated) 18/32 56.3 B. 25.70% 40.50% 33.80% ACGME Core Competencies Professionalism and Ethics 151 25.70% 40.50% 33.80% Interpersonal and Communication Skills 155 24.70% 40.00% 35.30% Q16.2-27.80 (26.9-43.1) (32.2-38.4) (32.2-38.4) Medical Knowledge 157 18.30% 28.30% 53.40% (15.2-21.4) (25.2-31.4) (50.3-56.5) (50.3-56.5) Procedural Skills 1569 23.50% 43.50% 33.00% (20.4-26.6) (40.4-46.6) (29.9-36.1) (29.9-36.1) Procedural Skills 1569 21.10% 33.20% 45.70% Procedural Skills (18.0-24.2) (30.1-36.3) (42.6-48.8) Procedural Skills 18.02 20.60% 39.90% 37.50%	Thoracic surgery				21/37	57.8
Urology 50/73 68.5 Vascular surgery (integrated) 18/32 56.3 B. 25.70% 40.50% 33.80% ACGME Core Competencies Professionalism and Ethics 1551 25.70% 40.50% 33.80% Interpersonal and Communication Skills 155 25.70% 40.00% 35.30% Interpersonal and Communication Skills 1554 24.70% 40.00% 35.30% Interpersonal and Communication Skills 1557 18.30% 28.30% 53.40% Interpersonal and Communication Skills 1557 25.21.41 (50.3-56.5) Systems-Based Practice 1569 23.50% 43.50% 33.00% Interpersonal Skills 1569 21.10% 33.20% 45.70% <t< td=""><td>Transitional year</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>37/81</td><td>45.7</td></t<>	Transitional year				37/81	45.7
Vascular surgery (integrated) 18/32 56.3 B. ACGME Core Competencies Professionalism and Ethics 151 25.70% 40.50% 33.80% Interpersonal and Communication Skills 1551 24.70% 40.00% 35.30% Interpersonal and Communication Skills 1554 24.70% 40.00% 35.40% Interpersonal and Communication Skills 1554 24.70% 48.30% 34.0% Interpersonal and Communication Skills 1569 23.50% 43.50% 34.0% Interpersonal and Communication 1569 23.50% 43.50% 45.70% </td <td>Uroloav</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>50/73</td> <td>68.5</td>	Uroloav				50/73	68.5
B. ACGME Core Competencies Professionalism and Ethics 1551 25.70% 40.50% 33.80% (22.6-28.8) (37.4-43.6) (30.7-36.9) Interpersonal and Communication Skills 1554 24.70% 40.00% 35.30% (21.6-27.8) (26.9-43.1) (32.2-38.4) Medical Knowledge 1570 18.30% 28.30% 53.40% (15.2-21.4) (25.2-31.4) (50.3-56.5) Systems-Based Practice 1569 23.50% 43.50% 33.00% (20.4-26.6) (40.4-46.6) (29.9-36.1) Procedural Skills 1569 21.10% 33.20% 45.70% Procedural Skills (18.0-24.2) (30.1-36.3) (42.6-48.8) Practice-Based Learning and Improvement 1562 22.60% 39.90% 37.50%	Vascular surgery (integrated)				18/32	56.3
ACGME Core Competencies Professionalism and Ethics 151 25.70% 40.50% 33.80% Interpersonal and Communication Skills 154 24.70% 40.00% 35.30% Interpersonal and Communication Skills 155 24.70% 40.00% 35.30% Interpersonal and Communication Skills 156 24.70% 40.00% 35.30% Interpersonal and Communication Skills 1570 18.30% 26.9-43.10 32.2-38.40 Interpersonal and Communication Skills 1570 18.30% 28.30% 53.40% Interpersonal and Communication Skills 1570 23.50% 33.00% 33.00% Interpersonal and Communication Skills 1570 21.50% 33.00% 30.0% Interpersonal and Communication Skills 156 21.10% 33.20% 45.70% Interpersonal and Communication Skills 18.024.20 30	в.					
Interpersonal and Communication Skills (22.6-28.8) (37.4-43.6) (30.7-36.9) Interpersonal and Communication Skills 1554 24.70% 40.00% 35.30% (21.6-27.8) (26.9-43.1) (32.2-38.4) Medical Knowledge 1570 18.30% 28.30% 53.40% (15.2-21.4) (25.2-31.4) (50.3-56.5) Systems-Based Practice 1569 23.50% 43.50% 33.00% (20.4-26.6) (40.4-46.6) (29.9-36.1) Patient Care and 1569 21.10% 33.20% 45.70% Procedural Skills (18.0-24.2) (30.1-36.3) (42.6-48.8) Practice-Based Learning and Improvement 1562 22.60% 39.90% 37.50%	ACGME Core Competencies	Professionalism and Ethics	1551	25.70%	40.50%	33.80%
Interpersonal and Communication Skills 1554 24.70% 40.00% 35.30% (21.6-27.8) (26.9-43.1) (32.2-38.4) Medical Knowledge 1570 18.30% 28.30% 53.40% (15.2-21.4) (25.2-31.4) (50.3-56.5) Systems-Based Practice 1569 23.50% 43.50% 33.00% (20.4-26.6) (40.4-46.6) (29.9-36.1) Patient Care and 1569 21.10% 33.20% 45.70% Procedural Skills (18.0-24.2) (30.1-36.3) (42.6-48.8) Practice-Based Learning and Improvement 1562 22.60% 39.90% 37.50%	·····			(22.6-28.8)	(37.4-43.6)	(30.7-36.9)
Medical Knowledge 1501 18.30% 28.30% 53.40% Medical Knowledge 1570 18.30% 28.30% 53.40% Systems-Based Practice 1569 23.50% 43.50% 33.00% Q20.4-26.6) (40.4-46.6) (29.9-36.1) Patient Care and 1569 21.10% 33.20% 45.70% Procedural Skills (18.0-24.2) (30.1-36.3) (42.6-48.8) Practice-Based Learning and Improvement 1562 22.60% 39.90% 37.50%		Interpersonal and Communication Skill	s 1554	24 70%	40.00%	35 30%
Medical Knowledge 1570 18.30% 28.30% 53.40% (15.2-21.4) (25.2-31.4) (50.3-56.5) Systems-Based Practice 1569 23.50% 43.50% 33.00% (20.4-26.6) (40.4-46.6) (29.9-36.1) Patient Care and 1569 21.10% 33.20% 45.70% Procedural Skills (18.0-24.2) (30.1-36.3) (42.6-48.8) Practice-Based Learning and Improvement 1562 22.60% 39.90% 37.50%				(216-278)	(26.9-43.1)	(32 2-38 4)
Instant Michaely 15.0 15.0 15.0 15.0 Systems-Based Practice (15.2-21.4) (25.2-31.4) (50.3-56.5) Systems-Based Practice 1569 23.50% 43.50% 33.00% (20.4-26.6) (40.4-46.6) (29.9-36.1) Patient Care and 1569 21.10% 33.20% 45.70% Procedural Skills (18.0-24.2) (30.1-36.3) (42.6-48.8) Practice-Based Learning and Improvement 1562 22.60% 39.90% 37.50%		Medical Knowledge	1570	18 30%	28 30%	53.40%
Systems-Based Practice 1569 23.50% 43.50% 33.00% (20.4-26.6) (40.4-46.6) (29.9-36.1) Patient Care and 1569 21.10% 33.20% 45.70% Procedural Skills (18.0-24.2) (30.1-36.3) (42.6-48.8) Practice-Based Learning and Improvement 1562 22.60% 39.90% 37.50%		incular knowledge	1570	(15 2-21 4)	(25.2-31.4)	(50 3-56 5)
Patient Care and 1569 21.00% 15.00% 29.9-36.1) Procedural Skills 1569 21.10% 33.20% 45.70% Practice-Based Learning and Improvement 1562 22.60% 39.90% 37.50% (19.5-25.7) (36.8-44.0) (34.4-40.6) (34.4-0.6)		Systems-Based Practice	1569	23 50%	43 50%	33,00%
Patient Care and 1569 21.10% 33.20% 45.70% Procedural Skills (18.0-24.2) (30.1-36.3) (42.6-48.8) Practice-Based Learning and Improvement 1562 22.60% 39.90% 37.50% (19.5-25.7) (36.8-44.0) (34.4-40.6)		Systems based Fractice	1505	(20.4-26.6)	(40,4-46,6)	(29.9-36.1)
Procedural Skills (18.0-24.2) (30.1-36.3) (42.6-48.8) Practice-Based Learning and Improvement 1562 22.60% 39.90% 37.50% (19.5-25.7) (36.8-44.0) (34.4-40.6) (34.4-40.6) (34.4-40.6)		Patient Care and	1560	21 10%	33 20%	45 70%
Practice-Based Learning and Improvement 1562 22.60% 39.90% 37.50% (19.5-25.7) (36.8-44.0) (34.4-40.6)		Procedural Skills	1509	(180-242)	(30.1-36.3)	(42 6-48 8)
(10.5.25.7) (36.8_AA.0) (24.4_A0.6)		Practice-Based Learning and Improvem	ent 1562	22.60%	39.90%	37 50%
		Tractice-based Learning and improven	CIII 1502	(10 5_25 7)	(36.8-44.0)	(34.4-40.6)

Table 1 (continued)

Residency applicant selection factors	Clerkship narrative assessment	1571	7.20%	14.40%	78.40%
			(4.1-10.3)	(11.3-17.5)	(74.3-81.5)
	Step 2 CK	1571	4.70%	12.10%	83.20%
			(1.6-7.8)	(8.0-15.2)	(80.1-86.3)
	NBME scores	1555	14.70%	41.70%	43.60%
			(11.6-17.8)	(38.6-44.8)	(40.5-46.7)
	Medical school prestige	1567	19.80%	27.50%	52.70%
			(16.7-32.9)	(24.4-30.6)	(49.6-55.8)
	Reference letters	1568	8.70%	25.40%	65.90%
			(5.6-11.8)	(22.3-28.5)	(62.8-69.0)
	Sub-internship evaluation	1570	4.00%	24.20%	71.80%
			(0.9-7.1)	(21.1-27.3)	(68.7-74.9)
	Personal statement	1559	12.40%	45.90%	41.70%
			(9.3-15.5)	(42.8-49.0)	(38.6-44.8)
	Professional development activities	1562	7.10%	34.40%	58.50%
			(4.0-10.2)	(31.1-37.5)	(55.4-61.6)
	Academic awards or special honor societies	1565	5.70%	26.30%	68.00%
Academic Inequalities	Medical student burnout	1562	(2.6-8.8) 52.80%	(23.2-29.4) 33.50%	(64.9-71.1) 13.70%
		1500	(49.7-55.9)	(30.4-36.6)	(10.6-16.8)
	Gender and racial/ethnic disparities	1529	55.10% (52.0-58.2)	28.00%	(13.8-20.0)
	Grade inflation	1566	34.70%	21.20%	44.10%
			(31.6-37.8)	(18.1-24.3)	(41.0-47.2)
	Variations in tiered grading distribution	1565	32.70%	24.80%	42.50%
			(29.6-35.8)	(21.7-27.9)	(39.4-45.6)

n=1064), professional development (58.5%; 95% CI 55.4–61.6; *n*=914) and medical school prestige (52.7%; 95% CI, 51.1–57.3; *n*=826). Findings for reference letters remained significant only among non-primary care PD specialties. Finally, in addressing academic inequalities in core clerkship, while PDs agreed changing core clerkship to P/F would help improve grade inflation (44.1%; 95% CI, 41.0-47.2; *n*=691) and variations in tiered grading distributions (42.5%; 95% CI, 39.3–45.5; *n*=665), PDs did not agree gender and racial/ethnic disparities (55.1%; 95% CI, 52.0-58.2; *n*=842) and burnout (52.8%; 95% CI, 49.7–55.9; *n*=825) would be improved.

In the meta-analysis, 6 studies from 4,931 studies were identified with 2,118 participants at a median response rate of 81.0% (Supplementary Table 5) [5-10]. Overall, 7 specialties from PD respondents were represented and all studies were published before 2000 and were nonrandomized control trials (Supplementary Table 4). Reported as means, there was no difference in PD preference for residents from P/F or tiered grading system throughout residency training (37.0% Tiered; 95% CI, 0-100, p > 0.05). Adjusted scaled scores with mean difference from an equal variance model from PDs showed residents from tiered clerkship grading systems overall performance (5.5; 95% CI, 0.0-12.9), learning ability (2.7; 95% CI, 0.0-5.4), work habits (2.9; 95% CI, 0.0-5.8), personal evaluations (-1.6; 95% CI, -3.8-0.6) and educational evaluation (1.7; 95% CI, 0.0-4.3) were not statistically significantly different than from residents from P/F systems. However, there was a difference in the number of qualities of work products produced (6.8; 95% CI, 1.4–12.2, *p* < 0.0001). Metaregression standard difference in means revealed no difference in tiered system residents' overall performance in residency compared to P/F applicants (0.0001 fixed, *p* > 0.05; -0.0047 random, *p* > 0.015) (Table 2).

Table 2 Forest Tree Plot of studies examining PD overall performance assessment between residents from tiered or P/F clerkship grading

Model	Study name	Statistics for each study			study		Std diff in means and 95% CI		
		Std diff in means	Variance	Lower limit	Upper limit	p-Value			
	Moss et al. (1978)	0.618	0.028	0.288	0.948	0.000			
	Tardiff et al. (1980)	0.259	0.003	0.158	0.360	0.000			
	Carmel et al. (1979)	0.000	0.030	-0.339	0.339	1.000			
	Hughes et al. (1983)	-0.130	0.002	-0.224	-0.036	0.006			
	Vosti et al. (1999)	-0.952	0.015	-1.195	-0.708	0.000			
Fixed		0.001	0.001	-0.063	0.064	0.979			
Random		-0.047	0.037	-0.425	0.331	0.808			

Summary of Studdies P/F (-) vs Tiered (+)

Discussion

The Coalition for Physician Accountability Review Committee has recommendations for changes to the residency match process – bringing a new paradigm that moves away from the "overreliance on licensure examination scores in the absence of valid, trustworthy measures of students' competence and clinical abilities". Our findings suggest that while PDs do not favor P/F core clerkships, PDs do not have a selection preference and do not report a difference in performance between applicants from P/F vs. tiered grading core clerkship systems.

The ACGME Outcomes Project Advisory Committee has established a framework of clinical competencies to guide medical schools in developing their clinical education programs. Perhaps as a result, PDs believed that core clerkship performance was a reliable representation of an applicant's preparedness for residency. However, as ACGME continues to favor outcome-based measurements [11], medical schools are now expected to demonstrate how they use educational outcomes to improve student performance with little guidance. PDs did not feel strongly about whether the use of a tiered grading system for clerkship is adequate in ensuring that the ACGME clinical competencies are achieved. Shifting to P/F may allow institutions to focus on improving the quality of clerkship MSPE letters through greater emphasis on direct observation and real-time feedback [12].

The expansion of P/F grading in medical education from preclinical coursework to Step 1 to core clerkships has been driven by studies advocating for its potential to improve learning, wellness and academia inequalities [3]. Conversely, tiered clerkship grades and narrative assessments have been shown to be biased against underrepresented minority students, impeding efforts to improve diversity across specialties [2]. While PDs agreed that transitioning core clerkships to P/F would improve grade inflation and variations in tiered grading distributions, they did not believe racial, ethnic or gender disparities or burnout would improve. Further study is needed not only to balance calls for a P/F medical curriculum with the need for objective metrics, but also to determine whether doing so can sufficiently address existing disparities [13].

Several limitations of this study should be considered. First, the meta-analysis had a relatively small number of studies and medical specialties included, with all studies published prior to the year 2000 representing a different environment for resident selection compared to day. However, our prospective survey of PDs across specialties demonstrated similar results. Second, the meta-analysis's resident survey assessment questions were not standardized and often normative perceptions, only quantitative data was summarized utilizing adjusted mean differences to compare performances. Third, while the survey total number of respondents was high, overall response rate across all specialties was insufficient to avoid selection and availability heuristic bias which limits generalizability. However, no difference was observed during subgroup and sensitivity analysis. Finally, this study focused on PDs associated with MD degree granting programs and may not be applicable to DO related programs.

We suggest that the COVID-19 pandemic has provided fertile grounds for institutions to examine the feasibility of adopting P/F grading for core clerkships. As educators begin to decide the extent to which their curricula will be shaped by the pandemic, medical education remains at a turning point.

Abbreviations

AAEE American Medical Education in Europe Guide
 AAMC Association of American Medical Colleges
 ACGME Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education
 AAPOR American Association for Public Opinion Research
 Cl Confidence Interval

СК	Clinical Knowledge
CS	Clinical Skills
ERAS	Electronic Residency Application Service
FSMB	Federation of State Medical Boards
IRB	Institutional Review Board
LCME	Liaison Committee on Medical Education
MSPE	Medical Student Performance Evaluation
NBME	National Board of Medical Examiners
P/F	Pass/Fail
PRISMA	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses
PD	Program Director
USMLE	United States Medical Licensure Examination

Supplementary Information

The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-023-04770-8.

Additional file 1: Supplementary Table 1. Search Strategy. Supplementary Table 2. PRISMA Checklist. Supplementary Table 3. AAPOR Disclosure Checklist. Supplementary Table 4. Characteristics of the Included Studies Examining PD Perceptions on P/F Clerkship [1-6]. Supplementary Table 5. Flow Chart of Study Selection to Quantitively Evaluate PD Perceptions of Residents from Schools with Tiered Versus P/F Clerkship Grading. Supplementary Table 6. Program Director Online Survey.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Molly Beestrum, MLIS (Galter Health Sciences Library, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL),for her insightful feedback on our study's search terms and continued support.

Authors' contributions

Andrew Wang; study concept and design; drafting of the manuscript; acquisition of data; administrative, technical or material support; analysis and interpretation of data; critical revision of the manuscript. Krystal L. Karunungan - study concept and design; drafting of the manuscript; acquisition of data; administrative, technical or material support; analysis and interpretation of data; critical revision of the manuscript. Jacob D. Story - acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; and critical revision of the manuscript. Nathan Shlobin - acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; and critical revision of the manuscript. Jiyun Woo - administrative, technical or material support; and critical revision of the manuscript. Edward L. Ha - study concept and design; analysis and interpretation of data; and critical revision of the manuscript. Karen E. Hauer - study concept and design; analysis and interpretation of data; and critical revision of the manuscript. Clarence H. Braddock III - study concept and design; analysis and interpretation of data; and critical revision of the manuscript.

Authors' information

None.

Funding

UCLA - Medical Student Research & Scholarship [aw].

Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

This study was IRB exempt by UCLA's General Institutional Review Board (GIRB) because it used public deidentified survey data. Informed consent was obtained from all voluntary participants who submitted the survey. This study followed the AAPOR and PRISMA guidelines.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Author details

¹ David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles, 10833 Le Conte Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA. ²College of Medicine, Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science, Los Angeles, CA, USA. ³Feinberg School of Medicine, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL, USA. ⁴Crean Lutheran High School, Irvine, CA, USA. ⁵University of California, San Francisco School of Medicine, San Francisco, CA, USA.

Received: 1 March 2023 Accepted: 12 October 2023 Published online: 24 October 2023

References

- Alexander EK, Osman NY, Walling JL, Mitchell VG. Variation and imprecision of clerkship grading in U.S. medical schools. Acad Med. 2012. https:// doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0b013e31825d0a2a.
- Teherani A, Hauer KE, Fernandez A, King TE, Lucey C. How small differences in assessed clinical performance amplify to large differences in grades and awards: a cascade with serious consequences for students underrepresented in medicine. Acad Med. 2018. https://doi.org/10.1097/ ACM.00000000002323.
- Spring L, Robillard D, Gehlbach L, Moore Simas TA. Impact of pass/fail grading on medical students' well-being and academic outcomes. Med Educ. 2011;45(9):867–77.
- LCME update on medical students, patients, and COVID-19: approaches to the clinical curriculum. (2020). https://lcme.org/wp-content/uploads/ filebase/March-20-2020-LCME-Approaches-to-Clinical-Curriculum.pdf. Accessed 7 Apr 2020.
- Carmel H, Amini F. Comparison of the performance of psychiatric residents from pass/fail versus graded medical schools. J Med Educ. 1979. https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-197911000-00013.
- Moss TJ, Deland EC, Maloney JV. Selection of medical students for graduate training: Pass/Fail versus grades. N Engl J Med. 1978. https://doi.org/ 10.1056/nejm197807062990106.
- Tardiff K. The effect of pass-fail on the selection and performance of residents. J Med Educ. 1980. https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-19800 8000-00002.
- Hughes RL, Golmon ME, Patterson R. The grading system as a factor in the selection of residents. J Med Educ. 1983. https://doi.org/10.1097/00001 888-198306000-00006.
- Vosti KL, Jacobs CD. Outcome measurement in postgraduate year one of graduates from a medical school with a pass/fail grading system. Acad Med. 1999. https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-199905000-00023.
- Dietrick JA, Weaver MT, Merrick HW. Pass/fail grading: a disadvantage for students applying for residency. Am J Surg. 1991. https://doi.org/10.1016/ 0002-9610(91)90204-Q.
- Natesan P, Batley NJ, Bakhti R, et al. Challenges in measuring ACGME competencies: considerations for milestones. Int J Emerg Med. 2018;11:39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12245-018-0198-3.
- 12. Hauer KE, Lucey CR. Core clerkship grading: the illusion of objectivity. Acad Med. 2019;94(4):469–72.
- Makhoul AT, Pontell ME, Ganesh Kumar N, Drolet BC. Objective measures needed - program directors' perspectives on a Pass/Fail USMLE Step 1. N Engl J Med. 2020;382(25):2389–92. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp20061 48. PMID: 32558467.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.