

Mentoring Program
Department of Student Life
Program Assessment Report 2005 – 2006
Completed by Stephanie Triplett

The Mentoring Program has helped new students become part of the University since 1986. The program is voluntary for participants and works with three campus entities; students, faculty, and staff. This program contributes to the University's retention initiative by supporting students' academic, personal, and professional growth.

The Mentoring Program has established two goals for assessment; first, “**new students will participate in the program**” and, second, that “**new students will find the program beneficial**”.

Goal 1: New students will participate in the Mentoring Program.

This goal has several outcome measures including; the number of participants, (comprised of new students and mentors,) the minimum number of contacts made between the mentor and student, and the number of evaluations returned by both groups.

Data for the outcomes are evaluated in the following ways; new student participants (20% of incoming new students) are compared to the total number of new students who have enrolled. Participation of faculty and staff (.05% yearly increase) is compared to the previous year's number of faculty staff participants. The number of contacts (N=8) between students and their mentors is self-reported by mentors on a monthly basis. Program evaluations (100% should be returned) are collected at the last program, requested by email and letter and, again, are self-reported.

To date, the only data completed are for the number of participants, both mentors (105) and mentees (158). All other data reported are incomplete figures until July 1.

Data for participation of both mentors and mentees reveal a small decrease (mentor -3.6% & mentees -1.1%) in the number. As of May 12, returned mentor evaluations (30.5%.ret) are showing a (-4.4%) decrease but mentee evaluations (13.3% ret) reported a (7.3%) increase in the number returned. There has been an increase (4.7%) in the number of participants reporting 8 contacts. All percentages are based on comparisons from the previous year's evaluations. An email was sent to all mentees with an evaluation attached and a link to submit the evaluation electronically through the Mentoring webpage. Evaluations were sent to mentors with certificates of appreciation which also included a thank you letter with the option to send an evaluation electronically through the Mentoring webpage. A reminder email was sent to all mentors and mentees. Final data is not complete until July 1 and will be analyzed at that time.

Review of the program and planned events is an ongoing process by the Program Manager. A semester/yearly meeting with the Associate Dean of Student Life is part of the process. Mentors and students are given an opportunity to provide suggestions for improvement on end-of-the-year evaluations. This year a committee of faculty, staff and

students evaluated and indicated weaknesses in program structure and informational materials. The DSL Assessment Team and Program Manager evaluate the format of the assessment data periodically.

Actions taken to recruit new students include direct informational mailings with a follow-up email reminding students to access the webpage for information and to submit an application electronically. Follow up contact was made by letter or email to all students filling out an application to participate in the program. This follow up served as an acknowledgement of their interest and an opportunity to answer any questions they might have. Specific outreach was made to Honor Students was continued.

Efforts have been made to identify returning mentors earlier through update forms. Update forms were sent to mentors with their certificates of appreciation asking if they would be continuing as mentors for the next term. There was an option to send the form electronically.

Contact was made to specific departments asking for help to identify potential mentors. In publicizing the program on campus, the following initiatives were used. Articles about The Mentoring Program appeared in the *Cauldron* and the *Cleveland Stater*, a request for mentors appeared in the *OnCampus*. Department heads, contacted with program information and an appeal for participation, responded positively.

January was National Mentoring Month, mentors names were listed in a full page ad in the *Cauldron*, thanking them for their participation but also encouraging non-participating faculty and staff to “make a difference for a student”. Mentees were encouraged to take advantage of free Halmark e-cards to send to their mentors a “thank you for being my mentor” during the month. New faculty and staff will be sent a letter with information and a brochure about the program.

Conclusion:

Email has become the most effective way to communicate with most students, faculty and staff. There is a percentage of each group that responds to direct mailings, so we will continue to use both methods and re-evaluate next year. The letter sent to students before their orientation program dates proved to be a reasonable method for recruitment. Information in the letter includes; email and web page addresses, a phone number along with the online application process.

After implementing goal 1 over a 3 year period and compiling the results for the same amount of time, the language and effectiveness of this goal will be reviewed. The program is moving to the Comprehensive Learning Center as part of the University’s and the Division’s retention initiative.

Goal 2: New students will find the mentoring program beneficial

The **outcome measures** for this goal assess student satisfaction with the mentoring experience and the relationship with their mentor. Also assessed is the level of connectiveness to the University as a result of participation. The retention rate of program participants will be compared to the retention of non-participants.

Data for the **outcomes** are based on the information gathered from returned mentee evaluations. Of the returned evaluations, 80% of participants shall be satisfied with their experience and feel more connected to the University. This information is self-reported by the mentees. The retention rate of participants is compared to non-participants. Criteria for comparison were established by the SAMA Retention Analyst. Participants for this outcome are identified as having eight contacts with their mentor during the term/year.

There is no **final data** to measure student satisfaction and connectiveness. As of May 12, with 21 evaluations (13.3%) were returned, a (6.2%) increase from the previous year. An increase is reported in both satisfaction with the mentoring experience (26.5%) and satisfaction with the mentoring relationship (40.2%). An increase (31.2%) was also reported with being connected to the University. Final data are due, July 1. The retention rate of participants vs. non-participants is determined on October 1.

The program is **reviewed** yearly by the Program Manager and the Associate Dean of Student Life after the final data are collected July 1. Mentors and students are given an opportunity to provide suggestions for improvement on end-of-the-year evaluations. This year a committee of faculty, staff and students evaluated and indicated weaknesses in structure and materials. The DSL Assessment Team and the Program Manager evaluate the format of the data periodically.

Actions taken to increase the number of evaluations returned by all participants, students and faculty/staff include more aggressive collection methods at the last event of the year, email with an evaluation attached and an option to complete the form on-line. A second email will be sent in the middle of May. There will be an incentive (give away) to students who return evaluations.

Conclusion:

Based on the data from returned evaluations, students are satisfied with their overall mentoring experience, their mentor and have report more of a connection with the University. But the number of responses from the students is still insufficient to provide reliable and valid data for assessment purposes. Email has become an effective primary source of communication as shown by the increase in the number of returned evaluations.

Using 8 contacts as a measure of participation still proves problematic as participants typically become more acclimated to the University. By a student's second term, they find there are multiple sources for information and tend to need their mentors less often for information. They do tend to keep up limited social contact with their mentors. Another problem is that the number of contacts is self reported by mentors. Reliability and validity are again in question.

Goal 2 will also be reviewed because of the Mentoring Program's move to the Comprehensive Learning Center.

Program Assessment Report

Program Name: MENTORING

Date: May 19, 2006

Department or Unit Name: Department of Student Life

Individual completing form: Stephanie Triplett

Goal # 1 Students Will Participate in the Mentoring Program

Outcome Measure	Research Completed	Findings	Review	Actions	Improvements
# 1a Capture Rate (20% of incoming new students)	Data on Mentoring Program student enrollment are compiled at the end of academic year.	2005-06: N=158/955=16.1% 1.1% decrease 2004-05: N =159/922 = 17.2% (Data as of May 19 final data as of July 1.	The Mentoring Program Manager and Associate Dean of Student Life review student capture rate data on a semester/yearly basis. The Program Manager will also meet periodically with the DSL Assessment Team.	2005-06: Invitation to" join the program" letter sent prior to student's orientation date to be returned at their specific orientation. Email follow-up. 2006-07: (Future) Ongoing communication through the summer with applicants. One page mentoring "newsletter" sent during the summer with a new student fact sheet and list of reminders for the upcoming year. "Save the date" letter with	
# 1b Number of participating mentors (increase 5% per year)	Data on Mentoring Program mentor enrollment are compiled at the end of each term/academic year and analyzed by July 1	2005-06: N=105 3.6% decrease 2004-05: N = 109	The Mentoring Program Manager and the Associate Dean of Student Life review mentor participation data on a semester/yearly basis. The Program Manager will meet periodically with the DSL Assessment Team.	2005-06: On-Campus article printed in April. Letters sent to newly hired faculty and staff with brochures. 2006-07: (Future) Collaborate with Deans whose Colleges have large number of students requesting faculty mentors. Contact office supervisors requesting staff mentors.	
# 2a Based upon returned mentor evaluations, 80% of student mentees will complete the minimum number of contact times (eight per year)	Data on the number of mentee/mentor contact times are compiled at the end of each term academic year and analyzed by July 1 Data is self-reported.	2005-06: N=32/158 (20.3%) forms ret. N=22/32 (68.8%) 13.4% <u>increase</u> in ret. forms 4.7% <u>increase</u> in minimum contacts based on ret. forms. 2004-05: N=11/159 (6.9%) forms ret. N=7/11 (64%). (Data as of May 19 final data July 1).	The Mentoring Program Manager and the Associate Dean of Student Life review mentee/mentor contact data on a semester/yearly basis. The Program Manager will meet periodically with the DSL Assessment Team.	2005-06: Email reminders to report contacts will be sent to mentors once per month. This will be the primary communication venue. Form to document contacts will be included in the Mentoring Handbook to use as an aid for reporting monthly contacts. 2006-07: (Future) Continuation of email as primary communication. More intense follow-up w/i the first 2 weeks of term.	Increase reported in # of forms ret. and # of mentors reporting minimum amt. of contacts

<p># 2b 100% of participating mentees will complete program evaluation forms</p>	<p>Participating mentees are given an evaluation form in April and the data is compiled and reviewed by July 1 each program year (Data is self-reported.)</p>	<p>2005-06: N=21/158 (13.3%) forms ret. 7.3% <u>increase</u> in ret. forms. 2004-05: N= 11/159 (6.9%) ret forms. <u>(Data as of May 19 final data July 1)</u></p>	<p>The Mentoring Program Manager reviews mentee evaluation participation data on a yearly basis. The Program Manager will also meet periodically with the DSL Assessment Team</p>	<p>Emails sent to mentees who didn't turn in an evaluation at the last event. This will be the primary communication venue. Evaluation is attached to the email also an option to return the form electronically on the web page. Email reminders to return evaluations will be sent</p>	<p><u>Increase</u> in the # of mentees returning forms.</p>
<p># 2c 100% of participating Mentors will complete program evaluation forms</p>	<p>Participating mentors are given an evaluation form in April and the data are compiled and reviewed by July 1 each program year (Data is self-reported)</p>	<p>2005-06: N=32/105 =30.5% . 2004-05: N= 38/109 =34.9%. <u>(Data as of May 19 final data July 1)</u></p>	<p>The Mentoring Program Manager reviews mentor evaluation participation data basis. The Program Manager will also meet periodically with the DSL Assessment Team.</p>	<p>Mentors are encouraged to return evaluation electronically on the web page. Letter and certificate are provided to all mentors with reminder to complete an evaluation. Email reminders to return evaluations will be sent periodically.</p>	

Program Assessment Report

Department or Unit Name: **STUDENT LIFE**

Individual Completing Form: **Stephanie Triplett**

Program Name: **MENTORING**

Date: **May 19, 2006**

Goal # 2: New students will find the Mentoring Program beneficial.

Outcome Measures	Research Completed	Findings	Review	Actions	Improvements
#1 80% of the mentees returning the evaluation forms will be highly satisfied/ satisfied with their overall mentoring experience	Participating mentees are given a mentee evaluation form in April and the data are compiled and reviewed by <u>July 1</u> each program year (Data is self-reported)	2005-06: N=21/158 (13.3%) forms returned N=19/21 (90.5%) 26.5% Increase in satisfaction. 2004-05: N= 11/159 (7.1%) forms returned N= 7/11 (64%) satisfaction Final data compiled by July 1.	The Mentoring Program Manager and the Associate Dean of Student Life review mentee satisfaction w/ overall experience at the end of the program year. The Program Manager will meet periodically with the DSL Assessment Team.	2005-06: Evaluations completed by participants at last event of term. E-mail sent reminders with evaluation attachment also gives information for completing evaluation on-line. CAS Standards Committee made up of faculty, staff, and students provided input and suggestions to improve the program. Included was discussion of collection of data.	Increase in both the number of evaluations ret. and the level of satisfaction.

<p>#2 80% of the mentees returning evaluation forms will report that they felt more connected to the University through their mentoring experience.</p>	<p>Participating mentees are given a mentee evaluation form in April and the data is compiled and reviewed by <u>July 1</u> each program year (Data is self reported)</p>	<p>2005-06: N=21/158 (13.3%) forms ret. N=20/21 (95.2%) 31.2% Increase in connection to the univ. 2004-05: N=11 /159 (7.1%) forms returned 7/11 (64%) connection Final data compiled by July 1.</p>	<p>The Mentoring Program Manager and the Associate Dean of Student Life review data to determine the success of the program in promoting connectedness at the end of the program year. The Program Manager will meet periodically with the DSL Assessment Team.</p>	<p>2005-06: Evaluations completed by participants at last event of term. E-mail sent reminders with evaluation attachment also gives information for completing evaluation on-line. CAS Standards Committee made up of faculty, staff, and students provided input and suggestions to improve the program. Included was discussion of collection of data.</p>	<p>Increase in both the number of evaluations ret. and the level of connectiveness.</p>
<p>#3 80% of the mentees returning the evaluation forms will report that they felt highly satisfied/ satisfied with their mentoring relationship</p>	<p>Participating mentees are given a mentee evaluation form in April and the data are compiled and reviewed by <u>July 1</u> each program year (Data is self-reported)</p>	<p>2005-06: N=21/158 (13.3%) forms ret. N=20/21 (95.2%) 40.2% Increase in satisfaction with mentors 2004-05: N= 11 /159 (7.1%) forms returned 6/11 (55%) satisfaction Final data compiled by July 1.</p>	<p>The Mentoring Program Manager and the Associate Dean of Student Life review data to determine mentee satisfaction with mentoring relationships at the end of the program year. The Program Manager will meet periodically with the DSL Assessment Team.</p>	<p>2005-06: Evaluations completed by participants at last event of term. E-mail sent reminders with evaluation attachment also gives information for completing evaluation on-line. CAS Standards Committee made up of faculty, staff, and students provided input and suggestions to improve the program. Included was discussion of collection of data.</p>	<p>Increase in both the number of evaluations ret. and the level of satisfaction with mentoring relationships.</p>

<p>#4 Fall to Fall Retention Rate of Participating Mentees (min. eight contacts /yr) vs. non-Mentees</p>	<p>Fall to Fall retention rates are calculated for program participants from the previous year by <u>October 1 each year</u>. Contact data based on returned mentor evaluations. (Data is self-reported).</p>	<p>2005-06: N=32/158 (20.2%) evaluations returned. N= 22/32 (68.8%) had eight contacts based on ret. evaluations. 2004-2005: N=34/159 (21.4%) evaluations returned. N= 7/34 (21%) had eight contacts based on returned evaluations. <u>(Final data compiled by July 1.)</u></p>	<p>Mentoring Program Manager and Associate Dean of Student Life review retention data after data has been compiled. The program Manager will meet periodically with the DSL Assessment Team.</p>	<p>2005-06: Evaluations completed by participants at last event of term. E-mail sent reminders with evaluation attachment also gives information for completing evaluation online. CAS Standards Committee made up of faculty, staff, and students provided input and suggestions to improve the program. Included was discussion of collection of data.</p>	<p>Increase in both the number of evaluations ret. And the number of contacts.</p>
--	---	--	--	--	---