

Lessons Learned: The AMCAS- Facilitated Pilot

The University of Toledo College of Medicine

James Kleshinski, MD
Associate Professor of Medicine
Associate Dean for Admissions



COLLEGE OF MEDICINE
THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO

Setting the table: Our perspective

- Prior to pilot, we had no separate CBC mechanism in place
 - As such, no “control” group for comparison



Issues we encountered- Examples

- Certiphi contacting accepted applicants before receiving notification of acceptance from our admissions office
- Amendment of notification procedure to accepted applicants



Issues we encountered- Examples

- Accepted students waiting to give consent to procure report (> 30 days)
 - Internal follow-up procedures with these students should be in place (i.e. students accepted late in the application season)
 - May effect writing or amendment of institutional policy and procedure



Issues we encountered- Examples

- Handling withdraw of accepted applicants who we were “Waiting for Permission” for check to be completed
- “Archive” the students name from the “Waiting for Permission” section on website, removing the student from view



Issues we encountered- Examples

- Internal mechanism for reviewing the CBC report
 - Who has access to reports?
 - Establishing an office procedure to “sign off” on reports



Issues we encountered- Examples

- Increase in number of general inquiries to our office about the impact of a positive “hit” on acceptance to medical school and state licensure implications
 - How should they be handled?



Overall impression of Certiphi to date

Excellent customer service:

- Tutorial for using the Certiphi website
- Response time to email or phone queries (usually the same day, always within 24 hours)
- Amending/enhancing reports as the pilot evolved
- Quick turn around time to procure check once consent given by applicant

