Mentoring to Achieve Research Independence - the MATRIX Program

Mid-Term Assessment Meeting

Héctor Valdivia
Professor of Medicine
Cardiovascular Research Center
MATRIX Faculty Director
~Agenda~

- 12:00-12:05 pm: Welcome (Hector Valdivia)
- 12:05-12:10 pm: Identifying an ISME (Debbie Meltzer)
- 12:10-12:15 pm: Resources/Websites (Lori Uttech-Hanson)
- 12:15-12:45 pm: NIH Style Mock Review (Panel)
- 12:45-1:15 pm: MATRIX - Where are we/How can we improve? (Dr. Valdivia shares mid-year evaluation results)
- 1:15-1:30 pm: Questions/Discussion
# MATRIX Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATRIX Administrators</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meet coaches</strong></td>
<td><strong>Secure ISME</strong></td>
<td><strong>Grant Writing Seminar (Feb 2, 3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Seminar: Biostatistics &amp; Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mid-year Event, ISMEs included</strong></td>
<td><strong>Secure ESME</strong></td>
<td><strong>Research Strategy finalized</strong></td>
<td><strong>Finalize all sections and submit full draft for review to ESME</strong></td>
<td><strong>Submit proposal (early Oct.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentees</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discuss R01/NIH basics in terms of submission, review, funding, etc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attend Chalk Talks and discuss with mentee(s)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discuss Specific Aims</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discuss Specific Aims</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discuss Research Strategy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discuss Research Strategy and remaining proposal sections</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discuss full proposal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Read critiques from ESME/ISME</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attend and participate in Closing Event.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coaches</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mock review of “model” R01 proposals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hold monthly meetings</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meet one-on-one as needed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meet one-on-one as needed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meet one-on-one as needed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meet one-on-one as needed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meet one-on-one as needed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meet one-on-one as needed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meet one-on-one as needed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meet coaches</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chalk talks planned</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chalk talks presented</strong></td>
<td><strong>Specific Aims finalized</strong></td>
<td><strong>Research Strategy finalized</strong></td>
<td><strong>Submit proposal (early Oct.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Submit proposal (early Oct.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Submit proposal (early Oct.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Submit proposal (early Oct.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Submit proposal (early Oct.)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Specific Aims finalized
- Research Strategy finalized
- Finalize all sections and submit full draft for review to ESME
- Revise proposal based on critiques from ESME/ISME
Coach Report

2023 MATRIX Coach Mid-Year Evaluation

June 7th 2023
Coach Report

1. Program structure

Q - On average, what do you think about the frequency that you are meeting with your mentees (includes both small group and individual)?

![Bar chart showing the frequency of meetings perceived as appropriate by participants. The chart indicates that a majority feel the meetings are held at an appropriate frequency.](chart.png)
Coach Report

1. **Program structure**

   *Q - Do you feel you have the necessary resources to support your mentees?*

   ![Bar graph showing a yes response to the question.](image-url)
2. Program performance

Q - My mentees actively engage and participate in monthly team/pod meetings.
Coach Report

2. Program performance

Q - My mentees are staying on track to submit an R01 (or equivalent) proposal submission.
2. Program performance

Q - For your monthly team/pod meetings, please tell us briefly what worked well and what did not.

We have held three chalk talks, which seem to be quite useful.

Overall ok - some of our mentees are overtaxed with teaching and the Matrix program duties get pushed off so they often do not attend meetings.

Having goals and an agenda works well.

Defining expectations early, open communication

Meeting face-to-face as a group works well for the group. We typically schedule meetings of our full team to have the benefit of both coaches and input from all of mentees.

Going over the grant material that the mentees have written works well.

Having the mentees prepare updated drafts of specific sections to discuss ahead of time is most helpful.

We met three times so far and the mentees presented their research projects and in particular, we spent quite a bit of time working on the specific aim pages. So far, things are going well.
2. Program performance

Q - For your monthly team/pod meetings, please tell us briefly what worked well and what did not.

The discussions during the meeting seem to go well, but mentees sometimes do not prepare drafts ahead of time, limiting the feedback we can give in the meeting.

My mentee is very engaged and has several grants in development, which makes my job easy. I think one challenge is that every attendee in MATRIX probably has different needs.

Our meeting is generally held in person. When someone gets sick to have hybrid format, the effect is not as good as in-person meeting.

I really enjoy the larger group we have this year. I think it offers more interaction and likelihood of shared interests, builds a better collegial atmosphere and allows the mentees more input and feedback (and examples).
## 3. Suggestions for improvement:

*Q - At this point, can you think of any additional resources, services, or support that MATRIX could provide to assist you in your role as a coach?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, I think the program works well. I think two themes that keep coming up with our team is commitment to the time that it takes to write a proposal and picking the ISME early. These are essential to the success of the mentee, yet it still is not coming through to some of them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, I have everything I need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not right now. I think much of the success depends heavily on &quot;fit&quot; between coach and mentees. Mine seems fine so far, at least from my point of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Suggestions for improvement:**

   **Q - At this point, can you think of any additional resources, services, or support that MATRIX could provide to assist you in your role as a coach?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **Getting the NIH workbook when the mentees get this is helpful so coaches can use as a guide for discussion.**
3. **Suggestions for improvement:**

*Q - At this point, do you have any suggestions for improving MATRIX?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No suggestions at this point.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at this point. Let's see how my mentees perform on their grants :)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentee motivation is highly variable. It would help to select mentees that most want to be engaged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Even when a mentee does not submit an R01 I think the program still benefits them in that it helps them consider and clarify career plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly advocate for larger mentee groups (3-4 mentees per coach).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mentee Report

2023 MATRIX Coach Mid-Year Evaluation

June 7th 2023
Mentee Report

1. **Program structure:**

   *Q - On average, how often does your mentor hold small group (pod/team) meetings?*

![Bar Chart showing frequency of pod/team meetings]

- Less than once per month
- Once per month
- More than once per month
1. **Program structure:**

   Q - How often do you meet with your mentor one-on-one (individually) outside of monthly small group (pod/team) meetings.
2. **Program satisfaction:**

*Q - On average, what do you think about the frequency that you are meeting with your mentor (includes both small group and individual)?*
2. Program satisfaction:

Q - Please indicate the value of the small group (pod/team) meeting topics and experiences to date.
2. Program satisfaction:

Q8 - If your response to #7 above was “Fair” or “Poor”, please tell us what did not meet your expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We are meeting as group for chalk talks but not for our overall proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much focus on individual projects and not things that will apply to us all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mentee Report

2. Suggestions for improvement:

Q - Please share which topics or experiences at your monthly small group (pod/team) meetings you found to be especially valuable for you and why.

- Feedback on the research, tips on preparation of additional documents (biosketch, budget)
- Structure and preparation for chalk talk; grantsmanship advice
- Not applicable, we haven't met as small group
- Hearing the mentors' advice to other team members is helpful because the advice is often applicable to my application.
- Getting chance on talking on different topics and aspects of grant is helpful.
- Input from scholars and mentors. Practice articulating aims and research direction
- My team has different expertise and I value the different perspectives in discussing everyone's proposal.
- What to include in your specific aims page.
- Spec aims page and going over 1 page introduction for resubmission
- Discussing aims

Primarily engaging with the mentors and hearing them dissect chalk talks and specific aims pages. Hearing their opinion about the best way to spin a particular proposal or the strengths and weaknesses of particular proposals.
Q - Please share which topics or experiences at your monthly small group (pod/team) meetings you found to be especially valuable for you and why.

- Brainstorming is the most valuable experience. Receiving feedback from competent, though not expert in the specific topic, colleagues is extremely useful to understand the best way to convey the key points of my research and what I propose to do.
- Organization of research applications
- Feedback on writing including specific aims. This has helped foster personal growth and focus for my application.
- None yet
2. **Suggestions for improvement:**

   Q - *Please share which topics or experiences at your monthly small group (pod/team) meetings you found to be less valuable to you and why.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None. All we discuss is relevant and useful to get a better sense of how grants are written and/or reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some items that seem to be stylistic, while they provide alternate examples, are less useful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All were valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I honestly enjoy our meetings and find most everything valuable to some degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All information seems relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mentee Report

Q - Please share which topics or experiences at your monthly small group (pod/team) meetings you found to be less valuable to you and why.

I think everything has been very valuable for me thus far. I don't feel any of my time has been wasted on a particular topic to date.

We have only focused on reviews of grant materials.

Regular meetings from the introduction seem to have too much administrative pieces without tangible opportunities to grow in grant writing.

Hearing individual stories of why and where they are at
Q - My mentor is helping me stay on track to submit an R01 (or equivalent) proposal submission.
**Mentee Report**

*Q - At this point, do you have any suggestions for improving the MATRIX Program, including additional resources, topics, or experiences?*

- A mock study section would be useful
- Additional suggested deadlines or milestones
- Group meetings need to happen more often outside of chalk talks.
- The biostats drop in was extremely helpful. Providing bkostats resources throughout would be very valuable. I find the one-on-one meetings with my mentor the most helpful so far.
- Not specific
- It's been good and I am very appreciative of this program.
- N/A
- It would be nice if mentors were also aware of grant requirements for NSF as some of us can submit to both mechanisms and certain ideas may make more sense to submit to NSF over NIH.

A calendar that outlines when events are occurring ahead of time.
Q - At this point, do you have any suggestions for improving the MATRIX Program, including additional resources, topics, or experiences?

Might be helpful to have overview of campus resources relevant to grants
Not at this point.
N/A
Not right now. The main challenge in my pod is that others in the pod have very different research areas so they are less able to give useful feedback.

I think a mock study section would be useful to understand the process of reviewing grants. Most ESI have not participated in study sections yet, and see how grants are evaluated might help PI to work on the critical aspects of how a proposal should be presented

No
none

More guidance to mentors of how frequently we should be meeting.
Questions/feedback?

Please contact the MATRIX Team:
Matrix Mentoring Program matrixmentoring@med.wisc.edu

Team members:
Debbie Meltzer at dmeltzer@wisc.edu
Héctor Valdivia at hvaldivia@wisc.edu
Lori Uttech-Hanson uttechhanson@wisc.edu
Christy Schulz at crschulz@wisc.edu