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Continuing Activities

The mentoring forum on the NASIG web page continued to show little activity. The Group has not conducted an official analysis to determine why this is the case, but notes that there is relatively little activity in any of the NASIG forums. The return of NASIG-L may have had some impact.

The Mentoring Group will complete its committee manual this year.

Completed Activities

The mentoring program at the 2011 Conference was an overall success. Twenty-eight mentor/mentee pairs were matched prior to the conference, and an additional twelve pairs were matched during the First Timers/Mentoring Reception on the first day of the conference for a total of 80 participants (40 pairs). This is a significant increase over 2010 and is likely due in part to the 2010/11 chairs being prepared to make matches during the reception based on the 2009/10 chairs’ experience.

The First Timers/Mentoring Reception was well attended by mentors and mentees, as well as some first time attendees who had not registered as mentees before the conference. However, there were few experienced NASIG conference attendees at the reception, which made making on-the-spot matches somewhat more difficult. This might be avoided in the future by putting out a call to those experienced NASIG conference attendees and inviting them to attend the reception, even if they are not paired with a mentee prior to the conference. Our thanks goes to those NASIG conference attendees who did attend the 2011 reception (including several Board members) and were gracious enough to step in as mentors at the last minute.

After the 2011 conference, the Mentoring Group conducted a survey of 2011 mentors and mentees about their experience. The survey was conducted via the NASIG Survey Monkey account and we received a total of fifty responses (a 62.5% response rate since all mentors and mentees, including those who were paired on-the-spot at the conference, were invited to respond). A summary of their responses is included below:

- Twenty-seven mentors and twenty-three mentees responded to the survey.
- 95% had been paired prior to the conference and had contact with their partner prior to the conference.
100% of mentors and 84.2% of mentees responding attended the reception.

In answer to the question “What did you enjoy most about the Mentoring / First Time Attendee reception?” mentors and mentees reported:
- Meeting their mentees and other mentor/mentee pairs, networking.
- The casual atmosphere.
- The food.
- Ease of finding and talking with their mentees.
- Organizing tables by name made it easier to find my mentor/mentee.
- “I joined my mentor at a large table of veteran attendees and very new librarians, so it was a great mix of experiences. I particularly enjoyed hearing about NASIG adventures back when folks stayed in college dorms.”
- “Talking with both mentors and people attending the conference for the first time. After that meeting, I felt much more comfortable the rest of the week.”
- Having a “friendly face” to connect with during the conference.

In answer to the question “What can we do to improve the Mentoring / First Time Attendees reception at next year’s conference?” mentors and mentees reported:
- Tables weren’t big enough, not enough tables but also “having so many tables makes it so people cannot socialize as widely.”
- Distribute mentor/mentee ribbons before the reception.
- “Having on the spot mentors was also a good idea.”
- Overlapping with the vendor expo didn’t leave enough time to enjoy both events.
- Hold a “Mentoring/First Time Attendees breakfast space to give folks a scheduled time to reconnect.”
- Provide more description of how to find your mentor/mentee at the reception ahead of time.
- Ice-breaker games, starter questions to encourage conversation.

Most agreed that pairings made before the conference were preferable.

79% (38) rated their overall experience as “good” or “great,” 17% (8) rated it as “ok, neither great nor terrible,” and 4% (2) rated it a “poor” experience. Based on their other comments, it appears likely that those who had a poor experience were those who had little contact with their mentor/mentee after their initial meeting.

The incoming chair, vice-chair, and board liaison met during the conference to plan activities and activities for the upcoming year. These included conducting and analyzing the Mentoring Post-Conference Survey, writing the group’s annual report, and completing the group’s committee manual.

**Budget**

The Mentoring Group does not require funding for its activities for 2011/12.
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