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PROBLEM
There are certain academic requirements that residents are expected to complete for graduation that are set by the AGME and standardized among US residency programs. Faculty expectations of residents according to year, however, are not among these standardized requirements and can cause some confusion for residents.

BACKGROUND
Research on standardized expectations for family practice residents is sparse. One study of a Canadian family medicine residency program assessed characteristics of “troublesome” residents and described faculty expectations of residents in the program as being implicit. Another study assessing intern orientation in family medicine residency programs demonstrated a disconnect between residents and program directors on orientation goals. With few articles available on expectation setting, it is clear that there is opportunity to expand this area for quality improvement purposes.

PURPOSE
Twofold purpose of this quality improvement initiative:
1. Determine what the expectations of residents are based on feedback from faculty members and the current residents of the Aurora Family Medicine program
2. Present the expectations to the program residents in hopes of providing a guide for residents as they progress through the program

METHODS
1. Program faculty and residents were surveyed on resident expectations, according to year in the program, via email.
2. Questions posed to both faculty and residents are listed below:
   - What do you expect from new interns as they progress through the year?
   - What do you expect from new 1st-year residents as they progress through the year?
   - How do your expectations of specific areas of growth from Intern year to 2nd year training differ?
   - What do you expect from new 2nd-year residents as they progress through the year?
   - How do your expectations of specific areas of growth from 2nd year to 3rd year training differ?
3. The responses were de-identified and analyzed.
4. The expectations were put in a document according to year and presented to the residents during scheduled didactic time.
5. The residents who responded to the initial survey were sent a post-presentation survey to evaluate the document and presentation's efficacy of expectation dissemination.

INTERVENTION
An in-person didactic session was scheduled to explore themes that emerged from the data, and to provide a handout with expectations and goals, divided by year. This was done in an effort to increase awareness of explicit expectations by faculty for progression throughout the course of residency.

RESULTS
Of the 28 residents surveyed, 19 responded. Initial surveys of the residents showed 95% of the residents believed faculty had expectations of them, but 42% said they did not know what those expectations were (32% said they did know, 21% replied unsure). Of the faculty surveyed, 14 responded. 79% of faculty reported having expectations of residents with 79% also thinking residents did not know what those expectations were.

Fifteen of the 19 residents who responded to the initial survey responded to the post-presentation survey. 93% of the residents believed faculty had expectations of them, and 80% of residents reported they now know what those expectations were. 13 out of 15 residents thought the handout helped clarify faculty expectations, 2 residents reported they did not see the handout or attend the didactic session.

CONCLUSIONS
The overall consensus of the residents and faculty was that there were expectations of the residents as they progress through the program, but those exact expectations had not been discussed. Despite the lack of discussion, the expectations from both groups were surprisingly similar.
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