INTRODUCTION

• The American Urological Association (AUA) Urology Residency Matching Program tightly regulates communication between applicants and urology residency programs following an applicant’s interview. Residency programs are prohibited from certain post-interview communication in order to protect urology applicants.

• The purpose of this study was to understand the frequency and nature of post-interview communication as it relates to the rules and regulations of the AUA match, as well as the impact of such communication on the outcomes of the match.

METHODS

• An anonymous, 20-question electronic survey questionnaire was sent to all applicants (n=231) to a single urology residency training program during the 2017 AUA match cycle.

• The survey was administered one month after the release of match results and queried applicants regarding their experiences with post-interview communication.

• Statistical analyses were performed using Microsoft Excel and SPSS. Statistical analyses included the Chi-squared test for categorical data, as well as Fisher’s exact test.

RESULTS

• 78/231 surveys were completed (34% response rate). Respondents applied to a mean of 78 residency programs and attended a mean of 2 away rotations. 23 respondents (29%) participated in a second look visit

• 47 respondents (60%) reported receiving post-interview communication, in the form of emails, letters, or phone calls.

• The odds of matching to a given residency program based on the type of communication are presented in Table 2. Rules violations that resulted from these communications are displayed in Table 3.

• 20 respondents (26%) were asked to reveal where they would be ranking a program on their rank list, and 15 (19%) reported that post-interview communication caused them to rank a program higher than initially planned (or keep at #1).

• 8 applicants (10%) reported that programs promised to rank them at the top of their list if the applicant would reciprocally rank the program at the top of his/her list.

• 16 (21%) reported that they were “strongly encouraged and/or pressured” into returning for a second look visit. The average estimated cost of a second look visit combined was $253.

CONCLUSIONS

• Post-interview communication between applicants and urology residency programs is prevalent, with numerous violations of the rules of the match. Prohibited communication may impact the rank lists of urology applicants. Consideration should be given to prohibiting all forms of post-interview communication.

Table 1. Applicant survey questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What information should one look for when interviewing for a urology program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How many programs did you apply to?</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.12-186.64</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What was the total estimated cost of your second look visit?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.12-186.64</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 47 applicants received post-interview communication. Several applicants were contacted numerous times, for a total of 68 contacts between applicants and residency programs.