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Steps - Completed

Create draft mentor assessment survey
Pilot survey Phase 1 w/ Dentistry junior faculty
n=20/24=83%; SurveyMonkey
✓ Refine and shorten survey based on results of first pilot
✓ CHR approval for educational evaluation
✓ Pilot survey Phase 2 w/ Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, Dentistry: n=185/820=23%; SurveyMonkey
  (total unique n=207)
Steps - Completed

- Analyzing initial survey results
- Finalize survey with SOM Ed Rsrch Grp
- Review pilot results w/ CTSI CD Electronic Mentor Evaluation Committee
  
  (Gansky, Feldman, Chren, Riley, McCune, 11/18/10)
- Conf call with CTSI web support re: deployment
- Conf call e*Value group re: deployment
Metrics

- **Process**
  - Complete Phase 1 survey
  - Complete Phase 2 survey
  - Develop elec mentor eval system
  - Manuscript published

- **Outomes**
  - Mentee satisfaction with e-mentor eval
  - Incorporate e-mentor eval in Advance
MENTORSHIP EFFECTIVENESS SCALE

Your name: ____________________________

Directions: The purpose of this scale is to evaluate the mentoring characteristics of ____________________________, who has identified you as an individual with whom he/she has had a professional, mentor/mentee relationship. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement listed below. Circle the number that corresponds to your response. Your responses will be kept confidential.

0 = Strongly Disagree (SD)
1 = Disagree (D)
2 = Slightly Disagree (SID)
3 = Slightly Agree (SIA)
4 = Agree (A)
5 = Strongly Agree (SA)
6 = Not Applicable (NA)

7. My mentor motivated me to improve my work product.
   0  1  2  3  4  5  6

8. My mentor was helpful in providing direction and guidance on professional issues. (e.g., networking).
   0  1  2  3  4  5  6

9. My mentor answered my questions satisfactorily (e.g., timely response, clear, comprehensive).
   0  1  2  3  4  5  6

10. My mentor acknowledged my contributions appropriately (e.g., committee contributions, awards).
    0  1  2  3  4  5  6

11. My mentor suggested appropriate resources (e.g., experts, electronic contacts, source materials).
    0  1  2  3  4  5  6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My career mentor is readily available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My career mentor demonstrates professional integrity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>My career mentor is supportive and encouraging.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My career mentor provides useful critiques of my work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My career mentor motivates me to improve my work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>My career mentor is helpful in providing direction and guidance on professional issues.</td>
<td>My career mentor answers my questions satisfactorily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>My career mentor acknowledges my contributions appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>My career mentor suggests appropriate solutions to problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>My career mentor challenges me to extend my abilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My career mentor takes a personal interest in my career.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>My career mentor devotes special time and consideration to my career.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>My career mentor communicates with me as needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>My career mentor helps me to formulate clear career goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>My career mentor facilitates building my professional network.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>My career mentor provides thoughtful advice on my scholarly work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>My career mentor is supportive of work-life balance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>My career mentor treats me with respect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Overall, I’m satisfied with my career mentor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**UCSF 2010 Pilot**

1. My mentor is accessible.
2. My mentor is an active listener.
3. My mentor demonstrates professional expertise.
4. My mentor encourages me to establish an independent career.
5. My mentor provides useful critiques of my work.
6. My mentor motivates me to improve my work.
7. My mentor is helpful in providing direction and guidance on professional issues.
8. My mentor acknowledges my contributions appropriately.
9. My mentor takes a sincere interest in my career.
10. My mentor helps me to formulate clear goals.
11. My mentor facilitates building my professional network.
12. My mentor provides thoughtful advice on my scholarly work.
13. My mentor is supportive of work-life balance.
14. Overall, I’m satisfied with my mentor.
Phase 2 Pilot Demographics

- 69% female, 31% male
- 62% White, 24% Asian, 10% other
- 8% Hispanic
- Median age 37 (range 30-62)
- 65% SOM; 18% SOD; 13% SON; 5% SOP
- 8% Ladder, 15% Clin X, 16% In Res, 37% HS Clin, 24% Adjunct
- 50% Parn, 14% SFGH, 7% Beale, 7% MtZ, 10% LHts, 16% C
- Median research time 21-40%; each other 1-20
Phase 2 Pilot
Feasibility, Acceptability

- Time to complete
  mean 4:27; median 2:53; 81% in \( \leq 5:00 \)
- Of 163 reporting a mentor, 150 (92%) completed 14-item survey

- “Very fast and easy to use.”
- “…include comments section, as I would have commented on the areas in which I need more support”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Coeff of Variation</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_Q1_accessible</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_Q2_listener</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_Q3_expertise</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_Q4_independence</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_Q5_critiques</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_Q6_motivates</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_Q7_direction</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_Q8_acksnowledges</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_Q9_interest</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_Q10_goals</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_Q11_network</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_Q12_advice</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_Q13_balance</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_Q14_Overall</td>
<td>150</td>
<td><strong>3.46</strong></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4=always, 3=often, 2=sometimes, 1=rarely, 0=never

½ between always & often
Q1-Q13 → 1 factor, 86% variation
Comments: which mentor? >1 mentor, etc

- “I have more than one mentor. One mentor is primarily for research. Another is primarily for career development. I also have an assigned mentor in my department. I answered the question as if the first two people were one person.”

- “Too hard to answer if you don't really have a single "primary" mentor, but rather have various people you use for mentorship.”
Comments

○ “I think it would be additionally helpful to have 'peer-mentorship', i.e. facilitate junior faculty meeting each other to offer support for people who are going through roughly the same stages.”

○ “Mentoring is Great.”
Next steps

1. Finish compiling items for C&T research mentor subscale (Q1 2012)
2. Finalize UCSF FMP roll-out
3. Analyze psychometric properties of campus e*Value data (Q3 2012)
4. Review campus results with CTSI CD elec mentor eval Com (Q3 2012)
5. Revise C&T subscale; roll-out (Q4 ‘12)
6. Submit paper on psychometric properties of campus data (Q1 2013)
Thank you