

Supplementary Data

TABLE

Summary of Select Item-by-Item Results From the Phase 2 Cognitive Interviews (n=27)

Round 1		Round 2		Final Recommendations
Tested Survey Item	Comments From Residents/Fellows	Tested Survey Item	Comments From Residents/Fellows	
<p>“How often were you scheduled for less than 1 full day out of 7 days free of clinical and educational work (averaged over a 4-week period)?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Never – Almost Never – Sometimes – Often – Always 	<p>Most respondents answered “Never” to this question. A couple of respondents noted that this question was confusing, and one provided a false positive as a response.</p> <p>Respondents were asked which version of the question they preferred, with the following alternate provided: “How often were you scheduled for fewer than 4 full days (24 consecutive hours) free of clinical and educational work over a 4-week period?”</p> <p>Almost all respondents agreed that they preferred the alternate version. Some responded that it was simpler, did not involve averaging, and was less confusing.</p>	<p>This item was revised following round 1 and tested in round 2 as follows:</p> <p>“How often do you have at least 4 full days free of clinical and required educational work in a 28-day period?”</p>	<p>One respondent said “Rarely,” because “with 24-hour workdays, I don’t usually get a full 24-hour day off.”</p> <p>Another respondent answered “Often,” because he had 4 days off in 4 of the past 5 months.</p>	<p><i>Recommendation:</i> Adopt the wording tested in round 2, with slight modifications, as it was more easily understood by respondents.</p> <p><i>Final version:</i></p> <p>“How often did you have 4 or more days free of clinical and required educational work in a 28-day period?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Never – Almost Never – Sometimes – Often – Always

Round 1		Round 2		Final Recommendations
Tested Survey Item	Comments From Residents/Fellows	Tested Survey Item	Comments From Residents/Fellows	
<p>“How often did you report fewer work hours than actually worked in your weekly reports to appear in compliance with regulations?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Never – Almost Never – Sometimes – Often – Always 	<p>Two respondents describe situations where they reported work hours that may have deviated from actual hours worked. Both said that they often entered hours for many working days in a single session, and therefore were not able to precisely recall exact hours worked. The hours that they reported were within work hour rules because they felt as though they had not violated the rules.</p> <p>When asked whether respondents would be able to answer honestly, one respondent said that this depended on the intent of the question. She noted that if respondents understood that the intent of the question is to help programs, then people should be able to answer honestly. However, if the responses were to result in an adverse action, it would be hard to answer honestly.</p> <p>Another respondent noted the distinction between underreporting and feeling pressure from a program to underreport.</p> <p>Several respondents noted that this question actually measures both the action of underreporting hours and the motivation of wanting to appear in compliance with regulations.</p>	<p>This item was revised following round 1 and tested in round 2 as follows:</p> <p>“How often did you report fewer work hours than actually worked?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Never – Almost Never – Sometimes – Often – Always 	<p>One respondent said that it could be difficult to answer honestly. “I might not answer this truthfully if I were in a program that worries about accreditation.”</p> <p>Another respondent said that they would report this honestly, but yet also said that they “just write 9-5 and paste and copy so you don’t have to count your hours.”</p>	<p><i>Recommendation:</i> Editing the question to omit interest in misreporting for the sake of compliance did not reduce the sensitivity of this item. Because respondents were motivated to answer dishonestly, this question cannot be useful for assessing work hour reporting requirements.</p> <p><i>Final version:</i> Item deleted.</p>

Artino AR Jr, Malloy K, Miller RS, Kirk LM, Brigham TP. A redesign of the ACGME resident/fellow survey through expert reviews and cognitive interviews. *J Grad Med Educ.* 2023;15(1):67-73. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-22-00437.1>

Round 1		Round 2		Final Recommendations
Tested Survey Item	Comments From Residents/Fellows	Tested Survey Item	Comments From Residents/Fellows	
<p>“Considering your training and ability, how adequate was the <i>level of supervision</i> you received from program faculty when providing patient care?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Much less than was needed – A little less than was needed – About the right amount – A little more than was needed – Much more than was needed 	<p>Most residents and fellows responded, “About the right amount,” 2 responded “A little more than was needed,” and 1 noted that he weighed 1 attending over others when developing his response. He noted that most attendings provided the right amount of supervision, but that at least 1 other provided too much and that influenced his response.</p> <p>Overall, the item performed well, and no changes were recommended.</p>	<p>No changes were made, and the item was tested again in round 2.</p>	<p>Most residents and fellows responded, “About the right amount.” One respondent answered, “A little more than was needed,” another answered, “Much more than was needed,” and a third said, “A little less than was needed.” One respondent noted that different areas of the specialty have different levels of supervision, but she was able to account for these differences in her response.</p>	<p><i>Recommendation:</i> Adopt the wording tested in rounds 1 and 2. However, upon further discussion between the Task Force and RTI, the decision was made to replace the word “adequate” with “appropriate.”</p> <p><i>Final version:</i></p> <p>“Considering your training and ability, how appropriate was the <i>level of supervision</i> you received from program faculty when providing patient care?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Much less than was needed – A little less than was needed – About the right amount – A little more than was needed – Much more than was needed

Round 1		Round 2		Final Recommendations
Tested Survey Item	Comments From Residents/Fellows	Tested Survey Item	Comments From Residents/Fellows	
<p>“How often have your rotations and other major assignments provided an appropriate balance between your educational activities (eg, clinical teaching, conferences, lectures) and supervised patient care responsibilities?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Never – Almost Never – Sometimes – Often – Always 	<p>Two respondents had difficulties with this item. One said that his program did not participate in many conferences and lectures, and that the answer depended on the patient and rotation requirements. This respondent selected, “Sometimes.” Another resident struggled with the definition of “appropriate balance.”</p> <p>Despite mentioning several minor issues with the item, respondents did not have any difficulty providing a response. Therefore, no changes were recommended.</p>	<p>No changes were made, and the item was tested again in round 2.</p>	<p>Respondents were once again able to answer the question without too much trouble, and answers ranged from “Sometimes” to “Always.”</p> <p>One resident recommended simplifying the question to the following:</p> <p>“How often is there an appropriate balance between your educational activities (eg, clinical teaching, conferences, lectures) and supervised patient care responsibilities?”</p>	<p><i>Recommendation:</i> Simplify the question’s wording, as recommended by the resident. In addition, upon further discussion between the Task Force and RTI, the second half of the item was further simplified.</p> <p><i>Final version:</i> “How often has there been an appropriate balance between your educational activities (eg, clinical teaching, conferences, lectures), and patient care responsibilities?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Never – Almost Never – Sometimes – Often – Always

Round 1		Round 2		Final Recommendations
Tested Survey Item	Comments From Residents/Fellows	Tested Survey Item	Comments From Residents/Fellows	
<p>“Has your program instructed you on how to use fatigue mitigation processes to prevent fatigue or sleep deprivation from affecting your patient care responsibilities?”</p> <p>– Yes – No</p>	<p>Responses to this question were mixed. A couple of respondents said that this had not occurred since orientation, so they had a hard time recalling whether it was a topic of instruction.</p> <p>Despite the mixed reactions to this item, respondents did not have any difficulty providing a response. Therefore, no changes were recommended.</p>	<p>No changes were made, and the item was tested again in round 2.</p>	<p>Four respondents said no to this question, and 1 questioned whether the survey was asking about something other than sleep. Another resident said that her program only told them to get as much sleep as possible, and that there were no other instructions about how to deal with fatigue.</p>	<p><i>Recommendation:</i> Simplify the item by focusing on instructions regarding sleep.</p> <p><i>Final version:</i> “Has your program instructed you on how to minimize the effects of sleep deprivation on patient care?”</p> <p>– Yes – No</p>

Abbreviation: RTI, Research Triangle Institute.

Note: In the interest of survey security and to encourage honest answers and discourage coaching by program directors, a full copy of the final Resident/Fellow Survey and the cognitive interview guide are not included in this report. Instead, samples of the original items and their revisions are provided.