A Report of an Educational Experiment on the Introduction of Mentoring into an Undergraduate Degree Programme

Dr Maggie Pollock, The Robert Clark Centre for Technological Education, University of Glasgow

[draft 2004]

Abstract

Mentoring was introduced, on an experimental basis, into a four-year undergraduate degree programme. This paper evaluates and discusses the processes, problems and student reaction to the scheme and also outlines the subsequent changes that resulted. With the aim of trying to encourage students to take more responsibility for their own learning, those from the third and fourth years were required to mentor/tutor students from years one and two and their efforts assessed. While it was clear that some students from the earlier years made good use of it and welcomed its introduction, there were not sufficient of these students to warrant continuation of the scheme as a compulsory assessed course for third and fourth year students. Similarly some students in years three and four did not really want to act as mentors, and indeed in some cases resented this use of their time, and were only attending because it was a course requirement thus sending a clear message to years one and two that this was a chore. These unforeseen difficulties resulted in a substantial increase in staff effort required to support the programme which meant the scheme as originally envisaged needed to be radically changed. Now we operate a successful programme where final year students opt to mentor students in earlier years on a voluntary basis and are given credit for their efforts.

Introduction

The benefits of peer tutoring, mentoring and Peer Assisted Learning (PAL) have been expounded by many authors (Goodlad and Hirst 1989, 1990 and Goodlad, 1995, Topping and Ehly 1998)) and the author was also responsible for a successful peer tutoring scheme sending engineering undergraduates into schools to assist teachers in the classroom by tutoring pupils. It is very popular in the United States of America as can be seen by the many websites now devoted to the introduction, development and promotion of Peer Tutoring (Thomas 2003, Kalkowski 2003) and Mentoring Schemes such as the National Mentoring Centre (2003). Many PAL schemes have been developed in the UK and there is now a Peer Assisted Learning (2003) website supported by Bournemouth University. One to one mentoring and tutoring is one of the oldest forms of instruction and learning; the artist or musician would pass on his skills to his pupil and the craftsman would pass on his knowledge to his apprentices. This can be extended to peer tutoring where an expert can pass on his knowledge to a novice.

This paper discusses the introduction and transformation of a mentoring scheme as part of an undergraduate degree programme. The processes of the scheme are examined along with the lessons learned which ultimately resulted in a radical rethink of the original concept which has finally provided the workable and effective scheme running at present

The original three main aims of introducing mentoring to the degree programme were:-

1. to allow reflection and reinforcement of previous learning for the mentors,
2. to support and assist students in earlier years in all areas of the curriculum,
3. to reduce some of the pressure on staff time by providing peer tutoring and mentoring support.

Mentoring was introduced into a four-year initial teacher education programme at its re-accreditation during session 1993/94. It was integrated into the assessment structure of the degree with the intention of accounting for 10% of the final degree mark. Students in the third and fourth years were to act as mentors to students in years one and two, and mentoring groups were formed containing students from all four years. One hour a week was time-tabled to allow students from all four years to meet in their groups. Attendance at this session was compulsory for the mentors and students from years one and two were encouraged to attend. Students were also encouraged to meet with each other at other times if they wished.

The most significant problem that arose was that many of the first and second year students did not take the mentoring seriously enough to ask for assistance and often did not bother turning up to the time-tabled sessions. This

resulted in the mentors becoming increasingly frustrated because they felt that their efforts and their assessment were being jeopardised by non-cooperation of students in years one and two. Intervention by staff was required to attempt to reach a solution and this became unsustainable in the long term.

It is difficult to make mentoring mandatory, even when credit is being given for participation, unless staff are prepared to monitor it closely and even then there will always be a percentage of students who are not interested in becoming involved. Mentoring as a compulsory component of the course was withdrawn after three years and it is now offered as a final year option where a student can volunteer to assist peers in earlier years and receive credit for it. Unstructured self-help groups organised by the students themselves also exist within the course in some year groups.

Mentoring V Tutoring

The definition of the terminology used in this paper must first be explained before proceeding any further. The dictionary definitions of mentoring and tutoring differ. The definition of a mentor is "a wise or trusted adviser or guide" whilst the definition for tutor is "a teacher, usually instructing individual pupils" (Collins 1988). We envisaged that students in the later years would act in both capacities, mentor and tutor, to students in earlier years. The decision was, therefore, to call the course 'Mentoring' so that students in earlier years would look to the third and fourth year students for support and help to enable them to gain confidence as the degree programme progressed. We also wanted third and fourth year students to act as tutors, because there were many areas that students joining the course struggled with and being able to turn to students who had already been through the course for assistance and support would be of real benefit.

Topping and Ehly (1998, p9) interpret peer mentoring as "often cross-age, always fixed-role (although the mentor might gain something also), quite often cross institution, and often targeted on disadvantaged groups. It should not be confused with peer tutoring". This is their interpretation of what mentoring should be and only bears a passing resemblance to the dictionary definition. The role we had envisaged for the students is much closer to the dictionary definition because we hoped that the third and fourth year students would offer advice and guidance to the students in earlier years about any problems they encountered, as they had already faced the situations in previous years.

To avoid any further confusion the programme was called 'Mentoring', but the third and fourth year students were called 'tutors' and the first and second year students were called 'tutees'.

Background

The Bachelor of Technological Education Degree (BTechEd) is a four year concurrent teaching degree programme which produces teachers for Scottish schools who will teach the three technology subjects, Craft and Design, Technological Studies and Graphic Communication. With the increasing awareness that students must take responsibility for their own learning and that they also need time for reflection, it was proposed, when redeveloping the degree programme during session 1993/94, that the students in later years should be given responsibility for assisting and mentoring students in earlier years.

For the degree a model of peer tutoring as suggested by Gartner and Riessman (1993) was proposed. Their scheme ran in a school and transferring the idea to an undergraduate course for teacher education appeared to be a reasonable transition. The scheme would be of benefit to all students and staff in the following ways:-

1. All students would eventually become tutors and students in later years would tutor those in earlier years.

2. It would enable students in later years, the mentors (or tutors), to reflect on and reinforce their own learning thus helping them deepen their understanding of the subject matter. There is no better way of learning a topic than to be required to explain it to someone else. This is particularly relevant for those students who are going to be teachers, because they will gain extra experience in tutoring their subject. Much research work on this has already been carried out (Palinscar and Brown 1984, Slavin 1990).

3. Students in earlier years would have extra help at hand when staff were unavailable and would also develop relationships with their peers from other years.

4. With student numbers increasing in Higher Education and an overall reduction of academics any extra support for student learning would be of benefit to students and staff alike. Many of the students entering Higher Education now require more support than 20-30 years ago and introducing such a scheme would provide another level of support thus relieving some of the pressure of staff time as help could be sought from their peers first and staff would only have to intervene if all other avenues have failed.

5. In the long term this would engender an overall transformation of course culture to one of reflection,

reinforcement and enrichment of the learning experience for all students resulting in an increase in resources for supplying help and consequently a vast improvement in learning.

To enable the mentoring system to work, and for students in the later years to take it seriously, we decided that is would need to be assessed and become part of the final degree award. Many American models have tutoring schemes which are part of the course requirements (Cahalan and Farris 1990) and Jones (1995) reports on work carried out in New Zealand which is also part of an undergraduate programme.

Making mentoring compulsory and assessable for third and fourth year students and running it in a structured manner brought about unforeseen and hitherto unreported problems which were not easy to overcome without considerable effort on the part of staff, and this level of support proved to be unsustainable resulting in a radical rethink and change in the scheme which is now running on a voluntary basis with students given credit for their efforts.

Other authors have reported failures in peer tutoring, because "it is just as important to study projects which have failed, as it is to examine projects which have succeeded" (Fitz-Gibbon 1990, p26), but these are much rarer. It is necessary to unravel the problems surrounding a system and build on the knowledge gained.

Methodology

The mentoring programme did not begin until the students on the re-accredited degree programme reached their third year. In that year the students were asked to research the background to mentoring and student tutoring, and then write a report on their findings. They were also involved in setting up and operating the scheme and most of the ideas for running it were suggested by the students themselves. Only when there was both a third and fourth year cohort did the scheme begin properly. It was structured so that students in years three and four (the tutors), would mentor students from the first two years (the tutees). A number of students from each year were placed together to form a mentoring group consisting of students from all four years. One hour was time-tabled each week for all the years to meet together formally, and students could meet informally any time they wished.

Tutors were required to take a note of the attendance each week and write up a log sheet or keep a log book which was completed after each session. The information in their log books was kept to assist them with writing their final report. At the beginning of the third term a copy of the report along with the log book was submitted for assessment. Third year students were only given a grade for their report and logbook. Final year students were interviewed individually by two members of academic staff and a final grade was agreed between the student and the lecturers based on the report, logbook and interview. A more comprehensive account of the assessment procedure is given in Appendix B.

Initially the scheme was closely monitored by staff, but we did not want to interfere too much in its running, as we wished the students to take responsibility for it and make it their own. As part of the evaluation process both tutors and tutees were asked to complete questionnaires to provide feedback on their mentoring experience. In the first full year of running the scheme, the tutees were also asked to assess each tutor that was in their group, and the comments were then passed back confidentially to the tutors. A decision was made to discontinue this practice in following years, because each mentoring group had decided to run their scheme in different ways. In some groups, tutors and tutees worked on a one-to-one basis and some of the tutees felt unable to make comments about tutors they were not really working with.

Ongoing discussions throughout the year with the tutors lead to closer involvement of staff in the running of the scheme, which was not our original intention. Although we wished to monitor its progress we wished to remain hands-off.

A more detailed description of the structured format can be found in Appendix A.

Evaluation

As this was the first time such a scheme had been run within the Faculty of Engineering the outcome was fairly closely monitored. Several methods were used to evaluate the scheme. A free response questionnaire was given to both the tutors and tutees so that they could express their thoughts and feelings about the running of the scheme and how useful it was for them. These questionnaires were issued halfway through the academic session and again at the end of the session. In addition tutors and tutees spoke to lecturers throughout each year about their experience of the mentoring and, as stated before, greater lecturer involvement in the running of the scheme was required.

The reports submitted by third and fourth year students along with interviews carried out provided valuable information about the running of the scheme and formed part of the evaluation.

Further interviews were carried out with students as a result of the feedback from the questionnaires.

The following responses have been taken from the evaluation that was carried out during session 1997/98 and they were representative of the feedback from other sessions.

Results of Tutor evaluation

Evaluation forms were returned from 30 out of 37 tutors. Only 63% of the tutors felt that mentoring was useful, however, when this question was analysed by year, 83% of the fourth year students found it useful, whereas only 50% of third year tutors found it useful.

Results of Tutees evaluation

Evaluation forms were returned from 37 out of 44 tutees and 73% of the tutees found the mentoring helpful. The split between first and second year was fairly even with about three-quarters of the students in each year saying they found the mentoring helpful.

Both tutors and tutees were asked four questions and Table I shows a breakdown of responses as a percentage of questionnaires returned.

Table I Student responses on the mentoring scheme – session 97/98

Question	Tutor responses	Tutee responses
What do you think you have gained from the experience so far?	revisiting subjects from earlier years 30% mixing with other years 20% helpful to other students 17% communication skills 17% sharing problems 13% nothing at all 13%	helpful advice on school experience 38% get to know students from different years 22% just get some help (non specific) 22% helpful advice on subjects (mechanics, electronics, maths etc) 19% wider view of the course 19% nothing 8%
What do you think is the best and most enjoyable part of the tutoring?	being helpful 50% mixing with other years and making friends 43% nothing 10% getting more information about the course 7% small group work 3% general conversation 3%	getting to know students in different years 54% advice and experience of other students 19% help when needed 19% being able to prepare because one knows what lies ahead 14% relaxed atmosphere 11% nothing 11%

What do you find the worst or most difficult part of tutoring?	poor attendance from first and second years, not taken seriously enough 23% getting the students to ask for help 17% having prepared work, the students then did not turn up at the allotted time 17% not enough time (because of other commitments) or notice given for help 17% nothing 17% not being able to help (because either haven't done course before or struggled with it) 13%	sitting doing nothing 27% trying to think of something to be helped with for mentoring 14% have to give a weeks notice for help 5% trusting a tutor to give the correct solution 3%
Can you suggest ways it could be improved?	more informal, with no assessment 20% one to one assistance with allocations made at the beginning of the year 20% group tutors by subject 7% more structured with supervision 7%	more structured 16% make it optional 8% make some tutors subject specialists 5% less time 5% more time 3% if the tutors wanted to help instead of having to 3%

Discussion of Results

Both the tutors and tutees regarded the mentoring scheme as a useful means of allowing the students to get to know each other from different years. The tutees also found that helpful advice about what to expect in later years was most useful, for example, how to cope with school experience. In both these areas the tutors are acting as mentors to the tutees. Tutees also appreciated being able to ask for specific help on course material, thus fulfilling one of the original aims of developing the scheme, i.e. providing students in the earlier years with help and assistance when needed. Half of the tutors said they enjoyed being helpful, and 30% felt they had gained by having to revisit subjects they had learned in earlier years, which is the fulfillment of another of the aims of the scheme. Seventeen percent of the tutors also thought it had helped to improve their communication skills. Disappointingly thirteen percent of the tutors and eight percent of the tutees felt they had gained nothing at all from the experience, and approximately 10% of both the tutors and tutees had not enjoyed the mentoring.

The tutors found that the lack of attendance and the fact that the first and second year students did not take the mentoring seriously a real drawback to the scheme. They also felt that they were being asked to help some students who then did not bother to come back after they had prepared work for them. The tutees felt that they were wasting their time and spending too much time doing nothing.

When asked for suggestions of how to improve the mentoring scheme, a mixture of contradictions appeared. Some tutors wanted it to be less formal and not assessed and some of the tutees wanted it to be more structured, which was surprising as it was already quite rigidly structured.

By looking at the results of the questionnaire it becomes clear there was a contradiction between "only 10 %" of the students stating they did not enjoy the mentoring or gained nothing from it, to 25 % or more of the students registering some dissatisfaction. This anomaly merited further investigation. Also staff received plenty of complaints about the scheme throughout the year.

Student Interviews

Discussions were held with final year students about the attitude of the students in the first and second year students. The final year students presented the following as the main problems with the scheme for them:-

1. lack of attendance - because the first and second year students were not being assessed, they felt attendance was not compulsory and only turned up when they felt like it.
2. an unwillingness to admit if they were having a problem - it was difficult to get the tutees to bring the problems they had to the mentoring sessions.
3. if they did bring problems along they would not turn up the following week after the tutors had spent time producing a solution - many more of the tutors complained than was obvious from the results of the evaluation (17%) that they had spent time (needed for their own work) on producing solutions and examples for the tutees only to find that the tutees did not bother to turn up for the sessions.

These problems caused frustration amongst the tutors because they knew they were going to be assessed on how they had run with mentoring scheme and many felt that their ability to make a good showing was being compromised by the poor attitude of some the tutees who were not taking the scheme seriously enough.

The tutors wanted staff to take a more active role and be there at the mentoring sessions, which was immediately at odds with one of the original aims of the mentoring which was to get students to take responsibility for their own learning and for staff to have a hands-off approach.

All the fears expressed by the tutors were genuine, so the tutees were approached to find out exactly what their attitude to the mentoring really was and this raised a number of other issues.

1. It was quite clear that some tutees found the mentoring sessions very useful and were grateful for having this opportunity to discuss problems with other students, and be helped with their academic work.
2. There were a number of students for whom the mentoring programme would have been an ideal vehicle for providing assistance, but who, for reasons they would not express, would not ask for help (of either the tutors or staff) and consequently performed poorly on the course.
3. There were quite a considerable number of students who felt that they did not need the help of the mentoring sessions and resented having to turn up and "waste their time". The end-of-year results, however, did not necessarily support either their feelings or their confidence.
4. There were also those tutees who did not trust their fellow students abilities, despite the efforts the students put in to find solutions to problems, and would always prefer to go to a lecturer for help.
5. Some of the students expressed the opinion that some of the tutors really did not want to be involved in the mentoring, but were only doing it because they had to.

Taking these issues into consideration it became obvious that the mentoring scheme as originally envisaged was not going to work satisfactorily without considerable input from academic staff thus passing the responsibility for learning back to the lecturer rather than being taken by the student. Also there were too many mentors who had to make a good showing for their assessment chasing too few students who really wanted to use the scheme.

Although all tutors were given a grade for their mentoring, based on their reports, logbooks and interviews, after much discussion with final year students and the external examiner a decision was eventually made not to include the grade into their final degree classification.

Resultant Changes

A number of options could have been tried to recover from the situation, the most obvious of which would been to make tutees log their experience of mentoring each week and complete a report at the end of each year. This could have become an assessable part of their degree programme that would then have required compulsory attendance to enable them to write anything meaningful, and would also have become a preparation for them when they became tutors in their third year. A second option would have been for staff to supervise the mentoring sessions more closely, but this takes responsibility for the mentoring away from the students and its educational value would have been markedly reduced.

A decision was taken to remove the structure and compulsory element whilst still keeping the module assessable. A voluntary programme now runs as a final year option and several students become mentors each year. The assessment is still based on the schedule presented in Appendix B. Last year one of the students stated that mentoring was the most enjoyable modules that he had taken over the four years of the course, and his girlfriend commented that he was 'almost' more interested in finding out the results of the students he had been working with all year than his own

results. The students who had been helped by the mentoring were so impressed by the commitment of one the mentors and how much it had helped them that they were definitely going to become mentors in their final year.

Conclusions

There are at least three distinct, though related, kinds of scheme each with their own literature:_
1. 1.   peer tutoring (setting up learners to teach each other, often one on one),
2. 2.   mentoring (setting up experienced students to assist those going through earlier parts of a course), and
3. 3.   PAL (peer assisted learning) or SI (supplemental instruction) - schemes where more experienced students put on discussion groups for students on a course, with aspects of tutoring, mentoring, and peer interaction.

When thinking of running any of these schemes, however, a decision must be made on what turned out to be the key issue in the scheme reported here – 'how do you motivate the participants?' This applies to both motivating the mentors/tutors, and to motivating the mentees/tutees.

The main alternatives are:-
- •   making it a compulsory requirement for completing the course,
- •   assessing it for credit,
- •   making it voluntary,
- •   paying students to tutor.

In the course reported here, it was a compulsory requirement, but still resulted in:-
- •   a steep price in additional staff input
- •   the obstinate non-engagement of a minority of students with consequent lack of benefit for them, and
- •   the fact that making it compulsory makes it impossible to be confidential thus preventing an important subset of students from exposing what are in fact problems for them.

In PAL and SI schemes mentees/tutees attend on a voluntary basis, but mentors are often paid. The literature indicates that often only 10% of mentees on these schemes participate in early years, rising to at best 50%, while the mentors (who may benefit even more) are probably only 2-8% of their cohort. Thus the benefits are, in practice, only made available to a minority of the class. A big issue is whether this is acceptable - like use of the library, which is usually another recommended but voluntary resource. This is in fact a general educational issue.

In developing countries where education is not compulsory, it is seen as a privilege and works well for the subset who receive it. In the UK where education is supposedly compulsory, there is a serious problem of absenteeism and disruption by pupils who do attend but clearly do not wish to. Educators are thus in the position that they believe, on the basis of good evidence, they know what is good for learners, but are unable to deliver it unless they can convince the learners of this benefit, which they often fail to do. Making an educational intervention, such as mentoring, compulsory still fails to reach the hard core resisters, yet may deliver benefits to a large middle ground of those who would not voluntarily participate but when forced to, acquiesce sufficiently to benefit.

This scheme was a 'failure' when measured against the original criteria which included benefiting all students and the reduction of staff time. However, there remains an issue of whether dropping the scheme should be judged a failure against the criterion of the potential benefits we can reasonably predict for many students when such schemes are in place. Ethically, even legally, not offering such schemes could be seen as failing against the criterion of a duty of care as we are very aware of the benefits these schemes bring to the students are willing to participate.

It would appear that the only way that mentoring could become successful would be to run it on a voluntary basis. This is addressed by allowing final year students volunteer to become mentors and if they choose it as an option they get credit for their efforts. This does not, however, get round the issue of those students who would probably benefit most from being either tutored or becoming a mentor by avoiding the opportunity altogether. Only by making it compulsory once again can this be addressed, but the efforts required in staff time to make this work really makes this option unsupportable.

References

Cahalan, M & Farris, E (1990) *College Sponsored Tutoring and mentoring Programs For Disadvantaged Elementary and Secondary Students*, Higher Education Surveys - Report no. 12 (Washington DC: US Department of Education. Office of Planning, Budget & Evaluation) (ED323884)

Collins 1988, The Collins Dictionary and Thesaurus in one volume, ed William T McLeod, Collins London and Glasgow

Fitz-Gibbon, C T (1990) *Success and Failure in Peer Tutoring Experiments* in *Explorations in Peer Tutoring* (eds) Goodlad, S and Hirst, B (Oxford: Basil Blackwell)

Gartner, A & Riessman, F (1993) *Peer-Tutoring: toward a New Model*, ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher and Teacher Education, Washington DC

Goodlad, S & Hirst, B (1989) *Peer tutoring: a guide to learning by teaching* (London: Kogan Page)

Goodlad, S & Hirst, B (eds) (1990) *Explorations in peer tutoring* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell)

Goodlad, S (ed.) (1995) *Students as Tutors and Mentors* (London:Kogan Page)

Jones, J (1995) Peer Tutoring for Academic Credit, in *Students as Tutors and Mentors* (London:Kogan Page) Ch15 pp191-203.

Kalkowski, P (2003) http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/sirs/9/c018.html (December 2003)

Marton, F & Saljo, R (1976a) *On qualitative differences in learning: outcome and process*, British Journal of Educational Psychology, 46, 4-11

Marton, F & Saljo, R (1976b) On qualitative differences in learning: II. Outcomes as a function of the learner's conception of the task, British Journal of Educational Psychology, 46, 115-127

National Mentoring Centre (2003), http://www.nwrel.org/mentoring/ (December 2003)

Palinscar, A & Brown, A (1984) Reciprocal teaching of comprehension fostering and comprehension monitoring activities, Cognition and Instruction ,2, 117-175

Peer Assisted Learning (2003) http://www.peerlearning.ac.uk/ (December 2003)

Reisner, ER, Petry, CA & Armitage, M (1990) *A review of programs involving college students as tutors of mentors in grades K-12* (Volumes I and II) (Washington DC: Policy Studies Institute) Department of Education

Slavin, R (1990) Research into cooperative learning: consensus and controversy, Education Leadership, 512-554

Thomas, RL (2003) http://www.indiana.edu/~eric_rec/ieo/digests/d78.html (December 2003)

Topping, K and Stewart, E (eds) 1998, Peer Assisted Learning, Lawrence ErlBaum Associates, Mahwah, New Jersey and London

Appendix A   Mentoring Structure and Procedure

When the first cohort of students reached their third year, instead of beginning the mentoring programme without the support of a fourth year group, they were given the task of researching the literature and presenting ideas for running the mentoring the following year.

As a result of discussions between staff and students a fairly rigid structure was imposed during the first session the scheme was run, using some of the ideas and evaluation techniques suggested by the students. This allowed the students to have ownership of the scheme.

The following year mentors were taken from years three and four and worked together as a small team of between five to eight students. The students in the third year were classed as apprentices and those in the final year were senior mentors (students from both years being called tutors). Each team of students was responsible for a similar number of junior students from the first and second year (to be called tutees). One hour each week was time-tabled to allow the students to meet for assistance formally, and any other assistance was maintained informally. A group of students from all four years together made one complete mentoring group, and one complete group was distinguished from another by a number.

All third and final year students were required to act as mentors.

The following procedure was followed:-

(i) Each group of tutors nominated a leader who was responsible for keeping the **Group Log Book** up to date. The Group Log Book contained the weekly attendance sheets, the tutees log sheets, the forward planner and anything else thought relevant to the mentoring sessions. It was kept in the secretary's office and could be removed for updating, but required a signature on removal and return. The group leader could be rotated if wished.

(ii) Each tutor was required to keep their own **Personal Log Book** in which they kept their log sheets, personal evaluation sheets from the tutees and any other information they thought relevant. The information in their log books was to be used when at future date to assist with compiling their reports.

(iii) One hour each week was timetabled for the tutoring sessions, and any extra time was made by private arrangement and not a requirement. One room was booked for each mentoring group.

(iv) The tutees log sheets were required to provide feedback to the tutors on how the tutoring session had been for them and to ask tutors what they would like to be discussed at the next session. No great depth was required from the tutees.

Tutees were asked to note that the tutors were there to assist but not to do any tutorials etc for them. They were also asked to give enough warning about what help was required, so that tutors had adequate preparation time.

(v) At each session the leader was responsible for making sure that the **Attendance Sheet** and the **Tutees Log Sheets** were completed, allowing 5 minutes at the end of each session for the attendance sheets to be filled in and signed by all present and for the tutees to complete their log sheets.

(vi) After each session the tutors in the group decided who would prepare what, for the following session. This was to be noted on a **Forward Planner** sheet also to be kept in the group logbook.

(vii) Also after each session, each tutor was responsible for completing a **Tutor's Log Sheet** reflecting on how the mentoring session went for themselves. This log sheet was handed in to the secretary during the following week for signature by a lecturer and then collected later.

(viii)   Any staff assistance required must be sought with plenty of warning.

(ix) An evaluation sheet, to be completed by tutees regarding their experience of the tutors, based on a suggestion by one of the fourth year students was used in the first instance and each tutor kept copies of evaluation sheets relevant to themselves. The evaluation sheets were given to the tutees by a lecturer and were returned to the lecturer anonymously. These were confidential and copies were only given to the tutor concerned. Originals were retained by lecturer.

(x) Other Evaluation Sheets were also given to the tutees twice in the year, at the beginning of the second term and third terms. These were to evaluate the tutees experience of mentoring itself. Sheets to be retained by lecturer.

(xi) Tutor Evaluation Sheets were completed by the tutors twice in the year, at the beginning of the second term and third terms, to record the experience of the mentoring process for themselves. Sheets to be retained by lecturer.

A fairly strict control was kept of the mentoring during the first year and this was relaxed a little during the second year so that less paperwork was generated. The tutors, however, still kept log books to reflect on their experience.

Appendix B   Assessment schedule

The students were required to keep a log book of their mentoring experiences. A short synopsis of each meeting should have been recorded and the completed log book along with a report on the mentoring should have been submitted at the beginning of the third term in each of the third and fourth years. The report should include reflections on the student's own progress and growth during the period of mentoring along with an account of the experience itself.

Each final year tutor was interviewed individually by two staff members and the decision of the grade to be awarded for the mentoring programme was reached by agreement between the lecturers and the student.

Mentoring in the third and final year will be linked together for grading.

Grading:

A An excellent mentor - has always appeared for and written a clear synopsis for each session. The report shows a deep reflection and obvious growth from the experience. The evaluation forms from the junior students have always been positive. (Sessions have only been missed for very sound reasons).

B A good mentor - has always appeared for and written a reasonably clear account of each session. The report shows the student has reflected reasonably well on the experience and has gained from it. The evaluation forms from the junior students are mostly positive. (Sessions have only been missed for very sound reasons).

C An average mentor - usually appears for each sessions and keeps a log of the sessions. The report shows that the student has gained from the experience, but reflection is limited. The evaluation forms from the junior students are mostly positive. (Not all sessions are accounted for).

D A poor mentor - appears for most sessions and keeps a brief log of the sessions. The report is very limited in the student's reflection of the mentoring process and it is not obvious that the student has gained from the mentoring. The evaluation forms from the junior students are ambivalent towards the mentor. (More than 10% of sessions not accounted for).

F Fail - the students has not taken the mentoring seriously. The log book is scanty and not many sessions have been written up. The report is poor with little or no reflection on the experience and no obvious growth. The evaluation forms from the junior students tend to be negative towards the student. (Many sessions have been missed, more than 20% for no obvious reasons).