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Background

- Transitioning from Residency to a busy clinical fellowship is often perceived as stressful
- Senior fellows that have advanced clinical and institutional experience are well-suited to mentor junior fellows
- Prior to July 1, 2015:
  - Cardiology faculty mentors were paired with fellow mentees (1:1)
  - No formal peer mentorship program was established
  - House systems are used in many academic settings to provide mentoring, improve community spirit, and create leadership opportunities for more senior house members

Needs Assessment

- In June 2015:
  - Fellows were asked to reflect on peer mentorship in their first year of training
  - A baseline survey indicated that most junior fellows were either equivocal or dissatisfied with peer mentorship

Objectives

- To design and implement a formal peer-to-peer mentorship program within a pediatric subspecialty training program
- To measure the level of fellow satisfaction in peer mentorship and track progress of the program throughout the academic year

Program Description

- Pediatric Cardiology Fellowship “House” Mentorship Program:
  - Designed by rising senior fellows
  - Implemented July 2015
  - Matched Senior and Junior Fellows into one “House”
  - Each “House” includes one first, second and third year fellow, and one faculty mentor

Program Evaluation

- Satisfaction Level with Peer Mentorship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Implementation (n=14)</th>
<th>Post-Implementation (n=5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = very dissatisfied</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = very satisfied</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Key elements were implemented within each peer mentorship House, including:
  - Regular clinical rotation “check-ins”
  - Preparation of complex Patient Management Conferences
  - Additional “buddy” coverage for the fellow’s initial independent call
  - Assistance with performing initial bedside echocardiograms
  - Five months after implementation of the program, a follow-up survey was sent to the first year fellows

Conclusion

- Implementation of a Fellow “House” Program in our busy clinical fellowship resulted in improved peer mentorship satisfaction of first-year trainees
- Senior fellows are capable of providing mentorship to junior fellows including:
  - Transition from Resident to Fellow
  - Clinical obligations
  - Complex patient management conference
- An internal fellow mentorship program can be a useful adjunct to traditional Faculty-Fellow mentorship programs to assist with the transition from resident to fellow

Future Directions

- During the 2nd half of the academic year our “House” focus will shift to:
  - Career planning
  - Transition from junior to senior fellow
  - Research interests
- During Fellowship Recruitment our House System is used as an example of peer mentorship and trainee support
- Fellows will transition to new “Houses" for the next academic year
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