

UMass Worcester Mentoring Advisory Board

January 30, 2013 Meeting Minutes

Date/Time: Wednesday, January 30, 2013
3:00-4:00pm

Meeting Location: Island Conference Room, S2-350

<u>MEETING INFORMATION:</u>	<u>INVITEES/ATTENDEES:</u> (Attendees are identified in BOLD)	
<p>Agenda</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Introductions of newest members: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Pranoti Mandrekar, PhD Co-Chair, Minority Academic Advancement Committee (MAAC) b. José Lemos, PhD Chair of the International Committee for the Council on Equal Opportunity and Diversity II. Mentoring Survey Response Rate Update III. Comprehensive Mentoring Framework IV. Onboarding Mentoring Program <p>Attachments:</p> <p>Julia Andrieni: UMass Worcester Mentoring Survey Response Rate Summary</p> <p>Rob Milner: A Framework for Faculty Mentoring at UMW</p> <p>Joanna Cain: Onboarding at UMMS: Welcoming and Mentoring New Faculty</p>	<p>Julia Andrieni Carol Bova Joanna Cain Tony Carruthers Deborah DeMarco Jerry Gurwitz Dave Hatem Tony Imbalzano Catarina Kiefe Jean King Dan Lasser</p> <p>Guest: Glenn Mangurian</p>	<p>José Lemos Katherine Luzuriaga Pranoti Mandrekar Elaine Martin Bob Matthews Rob Milner Judy Ockene Deborah Plummer Michele Pugnaire Linda Sagor Gyongyi Szabo Luanne Thorndyke</p>

Item #	Statement /Owner	Time Allotted	Comments/Minutes	Action/Status
1	Julia Andrieni Presentation: UMass Worcester Mentoring Survey Response Rate Summary	10 mins.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ACE Sloan Faculty Survey Response rate was 40%. The UMass Worcester Mentoring Survey maintained a 40% response rate by all subgroups: Faculty = 42.5% Trainees = 42.5% Students = 57.4% • 15 Basic Science and Clinical departments had faculty survey response rates \geq 40%. 	Next Steps: Julia Andrieni will meet with Bruce Barton and QHS Statistician to analyze results.

Item #	Statement /Owner	Time Allotted	Comments/Minutes	Action/Status
1			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jerry Gurwitz expressed post-docs response rate was interesting as it was greater than the resident/fellow response rate. There was a discussion on the potential factors influencing this decreased response rate. • Jerry Gurwitz also expressed an interest to examine the non-responders to validate results. • Some departments stated they had faculty who were contracted and this group of faculty may not be as engaged as full-time employed faculty. Response rates in departments with contracted faculty were lower. Helpful to find out what portion of non responders were full-time, part-time, contracted, per diem, etc. 	<p>Small focus groups could be formed with the non-respondents to find out why they did not participate in the survey – were they too busy/not time, not interested, etc</p>
2	<p>Rob Milner Presentation: A Framework for Faculty Mentoring at UMW</p>	20 mins.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • José Lemos inquired about a possible monetary or other type of incentive for mentors. • Jean King mentioned that there is not just one mentoring solution; there are many overlapping and unique skills, resources, views, and models 	<p>Mentoring resources, tools, and best practices are being developed by the Office of Faculty Affairs.</p>
3	<p>Joanna Cain Presentation: Onboarding at UMMS: Welcoming and Mentoring New Faculty</p>	20 mins.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The onboarding mentoring program target is New Faculty • There are 3 key elements to onboarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Orientation ○ Mentoring ○ Resources • Onboarding Mentor Program feedback collected at 6 months • Dave Hatem mentioned that within the Learning Communities, there are both junior and senior mentors. The senior mentors tend to have a more robust skills set. • Deb DeMarco mentioned that there should be a “farm team” or “bull pen” mentors. She thought that several faculty members would be interested in the mentoring role for specific skill sets. 	<p>Onboarding Mentor Program implemented in fall 2012.</p>