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Our goal was to develop a survey to assess the mentoring environment across schools, academic missions, and departments

AAMC/Faculty Forward data revealed that UMMS Faculty lack formal mentoring compared to 4 peer and 23 cohort institutions

AAMC Faculty Forward Survey April 2009
49.3% UMMS Full-time faculty response rate
A Mentoring Advisory Board was developed to provide guidance to the Provost and the Office of Faculty Affairs on the mentoring needs of the institution.

The mentoring survey identified our mentoring needs and culture.

**Survey Demographics**
- Dissection of data by demographics:
  - Subgroups: Students, Trainees, Faculty
  - Schools (UMMS, GSBS, GSN)
  - Departments
  - Academic Missions
  - Generation, Gender and Ethnicity

**Baseline Assessment**
- Mentee(s) and Mentor(s) perspective of the mentoring environment:
  - Identification of mentor
  - Communication and Quality of Mentoring Relationship
  - Current Areas Receiving Guidance
  - Mentoring Training and Capacity

**Needs Assessment**
- Strategic development of mentoring resources and programs:
  - Mentoring Relationship Preferences
  - Mentoring Topic Preferences and Resources Needed
  - Mentoring Incentives
Engagement of key stakeholders and strategic reminders increased survey participation

- Multiple presentations to participant groups on survey goals
- Invitation e-mail sent by leadership (Deans, Program Directors, and Chairs) to students, trainees and faculty
- Each sub-group piloted survey for feedback prior to distribution
- QHS distributed online survey utilizing REDCap to 3,876 potential participants
- Reminders e-mailed to non responders every 2 weeks
  - Survey remained open for 11 weeks
- Posters tracked weekly response for students, trainees and faculty across campus
- Facebook: UMass Mentoring
  - Twitter: UMMS Mentoring
- Survey closes for data analysis in collaboration with Quantitative Health Sciences department

The mentoring survey had an overall 48% response rate and allowed analysis of the data by generation and gender

**Demographics**

- **Students**
  - Generation Y (n=1,153)
  - OVERALL RESPONSE RATE = 58%
    - Age=20–29 yrs.: Millennials (45%)
- **Trainees**
  - Generation X (n=917)
  - OVERALL RESPONSE RATE = 43%
    - Age=30–47 yrs.: Boomerang Generation (30%)
- **Faculty**
  - Generation X
    - Baby Boomers (n=1,806)
  - OVERALL RESPONSE RATE = 43%
    - Age=50–61 yrs.: Baby Boomers (21%)

**Key:**

- Generation X (1965-1982)
- Baby Boomers (1946-1964)
Two thirds of the faculty reported no previous mentoring training.
More than 50% of Faculty Mentors indicated they would attend mentoring training.

Giving Effective Feedback: 64% Yes, 20% Maybe, 16% No
Setting Goals and Expectations: 58% Yes, 22% Maybe, 20% No
Leadership Development: 58% Yes, 21% Maybe, 21% No
Establishing and Maintaining the Mentoring Relationship: 56% Yes, 23% Maybe, 21% No
Career Management: 56% Yes, 23% Maybe, 21% No

Personal gratification was the most meaningful incentive for mentoring.

- Personal Gratification: 77%
- Academic Advancement: 51%
- Institutional Recognition: 42%
- Mentoring Time and Effort Tracking and Offset: 42%
- Financial Incentives: 29%
- Mentoring Awards: 23%

64% of Faculty perceived that mentoring is valued by their program or department.