

University of Missouri, St. Louis

IRL @ UMSL

---

Adult Education Faculty Works

College of Education

---

January 1995

## Developing A Mentoring Program Improvement Evaluation Model

John Henschke

jahenschke@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://irl.umsl.edu/adulteducation-faculty>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Henschke, John, "Developing A Mentoring Program Improvement Evaluation Model" (1995). *Adult Education Faculty Works*. 100.

Available at: <https://irl.umsl.edu/adulteducation-faculty/100>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Education at IRL @ UMSL. It has been accepted for inclusion in Adult Education Faculty Works by an authorized administrator of IRL @ UMSL. For more information, please contact [marvinh@umsl.edu](mailto:marvinh@umsl.edu).

**Lindenwood College**

---

**From the Selected Works of John A. Henschke EdD**

---

1995

## Developing A Mentoring Program Improvement Evaluation Model

John A. Henschke, EdD



Available at: [https://works.bepress.com/john\\_henschke/47/](https://works.bepress.com/john_henschke/47/)

Proceedings  
of the  
Fourteenth Annual

**Midwest  
Research-to-Practice  
Conference**

**in Adult, Continuing, and  
Community Education**

**October 12-14, 1995**

|   |   |     |
|---|---|-----|
| James C. Fisher   | OLDER ADULT BASIC EDUCATION NEEDS AND ACTIVITIES<br>FROM A DEVELOPMENTAL PERSPECTIVE  | 80  |
| Kevin J. Freer<br>Verna Terminello<br>Robin Clossman-Wright | REDIRECTING RESEARCH AND PRACTICE TO MEET THE<br>CHANGING CONTEXT OF WORKPLACE LITERACY   | 86  |
| Antonia Gammage   | EXPECT THE UNEXPECTED: THE RESULTS AND CHALLENGES<br>OF INTRODUCING TRANSFORMATIVE LEARNING IN ADULT<br>BASIC EDUCATION                       | 91  |
| Abney V. Gleespen   | NURTURING DEMOCRACY BY SUPPORTING PLANNERS'<br>LEARNING: INSIGHTS FROM STUDIES OF COGNITION   | 97  |
| Catherine A.<br>Hansman-Ferguson<br>Arthur L. Wilson        | TEACHING ADULTS TO WRITE: A SITUATED ACTIVITY   | 103 |
| John A. Henschke  | DEVELOPING A MENTORING PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT<br>EVALUATION MODEL  | 109 |
| Jenny Hopkins   | ASPECTS OF ARAB CULTURE AFFECTING ADULT LEARNERS:<br>GENDER, CLASS, AND RELIGIOUS ISSUES  | 115 |
| Jiazhen Hu  | WHOLE LANGUAGE AND ADULT LITERACY   | 121 |
| Ruth Schmidle Lavin<br>John M. Dirkx                        | TEACHER BELIEFS ABOUT STAFF DEVELOPMENT VIA<br>DISTANCE EDUCATION: A RESEARCH APPROACH IN<br>PLANNING PRACTICE                                | 125 |
| Winston Lawrence  | DELIVERING UNIVERSITY ADULT EDUCATION IN A<br>CONTESTED POLITICAL AND ETHNIC ENVIRONMENT  | 131 |
| Huey B. Long  | INCORPORATING SELF-DIRECTED LEARNING INTO<br>THE CLASSROOM  | 137 |
| Daniel R. Olson   | TOWARD A THEORY OF LEARNING SCIENCE FOR<br>SCIENTIFIC LITERACY AMONG PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS   | 141 |
| Richard A. Orem<br>Patricia Hunsaker                        | GOAL SETTING FOR THE 21ST CENTURY: A STUDY OF<br>PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS OF ADULT BASIC EDUCATION  | 147 |
| Mary Ann Rasnak   | METACOGNITIVE DIMENSIONS OF THE SELECTION AND USE<br>OF LEARNING STRATEGIES BY ADULT COLLEGE STUDENTS<br>AND TRADITIONAL AGE COLLEGE STUDENTS | 153 |
| Karen T. Ricker<br>Maria T. Hruby                           | FOR SELF AND FOR OTHERS: WHY YOUNG ADULTS ARE<br>MOTIVATED TO VOLUNTEER IN A COMMUNITY SERVICE PROJECT  | 160 |
| Tonette Rocco   | ACADEMIC ACCOMMODATION: MEANING AND IMPLICATIONS<br>FOR ADULT EDUCATION PRACTITIONERS   | 166 |
| Tonette Rocco   | A DIALOGUE WITH JOHN OHLINGER: ISSUES OF EQUITY<br>IN ADULT EDUCATION   | 172 |

# DEVELOPING A MENTORING PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT EVALUATION MODEL

John A. Henschke

## ABSTRACT

Formal adult teacher model mentoring programs tend to have a predictable set of elements: policies, mentor selection procedures, mentor training activities, mentor role expectations, mentor-adult teacher matching, and secondary developmental relationships. Mentoring is an individualized, long-term, teaching/learning relationship between two people used to accomplish a variety of purposes. Yet, little evaluation has been conducted to determine its results, or the effectiveness of the current process, with an eye to making program improvements. The purpose of this qualitative research study was to: develop a program improvement model for an adult teacher mentoring program; apply the model to a formal adult teacher mentoring program; perform a metaevaluation of the model and implementation; and, recommend changes to the model. A case study design was used to accomplish the purpose. Three data sources included individual and group interviews, and 1988 to 1993 historical program documentation. A purposeful sampling strategy was used to select nineteen interviewees from a possible forty-two. The model included defining evaluative questions, data collection, data analysis and interpretation, and reporting, an experienced metaevaluator addressed the model's trustworthiness. Findings confirmed little program accountability, site condition adaptations, model authenticity, and added to the model, identifying stakeholders and decision makers, and replanning and redesign.

## INTRODUCTION

Formal adult teacher mentoring programs tend to have a predictable set of elements: policies, mentor selection procedures, mentor training activities, mentor role expectations, adult teacher role expectations, mentor-adult teacher matching, and secondary developmental relationships. These elements could be considered as constituting a model mentoring program. General research on the mentoring relationship, which is a teaching/learning transaction, indicates that mentoring is an individualized, long-term relationship between two people; and, the attitudes, beliefs, values, knowledge, and skills imparted by a mentor to a protégé result from wisdom and experience of the mentor, not from innate character traits.

Mentoring has been used for: religious instruction of children, enhancing the skills and intellectual development of young men entering adulthood, transforming returning higher education students' vision of their future, transitions from one occupation to another, career advancement and employment opportunities in business, helping girls undertake the responsibilities of motherhood and homemaking, men to adapt to life changes, helping clergy learn the ministry profession, enhancing learning in the workplace for better functioning on the job (Knowles, 1972), beginning teachers to develop expertise in the instructional process, availability of help even in the self-directed learning process (Tough, 1979), and seasoned instructors to undertake new ways of educating.

Although formal mentoring programs have been around for many centuries and applied to many contexts and situations, little evaluation has been conducted to determine its results, or the effectiveness of the current process, with an eye to making program improvements.

## BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

### MENTORING

Kram (1985) has extensively investigated mentoring in business. He interviewed numerous people

at various levels in the organizations: fifteen junior-level managers, twenty-five mentor-protégé pairs, and ten officers. He believes that developmental work relationships occur throughout the full range of career life and are affected by the life and career stages of participants and the organizational context in which the relationship happens. He thus concludes from the research that formal mentoring programs are ineffective because mentoring relationships cannot be engineered, and individuals are most likely to develop a variety of relationships that provide some mentoring functions, instead of meeting all their needs in one relationship.

Merriam (1983) suggested that thoughtful, cautious consideration be given to developing formal mentoring programs. Her extensive mentoring literature review showed the phenomena of mentoring as not clearly conceptualized and research designs as unsophisticated and poorly, if ever, evaluated.

Nevertheless, mentoring relationships are continuing to be prescribed as part of comprehensive preparation programs for beginning adult teachers. Cruickshank (1989) reports that forty states indicate some activity along this line. Waters and Bernhardt (1989) caution that this push for mentoring programs not be allowed to mask the complexity of designing these programs.

## EVALUATION

There is a clear distinction between types of program evaluation which are conducted, formative and summative. Formative evaluation provides feedback to people who are trying to improve something. Summative evaluation provides information for decision makers who are wondering whether to fund, terminate, or purchase something (Scriven, 1980, pp. 6-7).

This study utilized an existing state-mandated formal mentoring program to inform the original design of an evaluation model and its subsequent improvement, thus making moot any further discussion of improvement (formative) versus performance (summative) evaluations. In choosing the formative evaluation, the positivist approach was eliminated since in the mandated mentoring program there were no: clear goals, prespecified causal linkages, preordinate evaluation designs, objective or generalizable judgments of program worth.

The interpretive approach of formative evaluation was chosen because of the compatible assumptions: (1) knowledge and theory are both propositional and tacit, based on theory and personal intuition, experiences and beliefs; (2) causal links among program goals and outcomes are studied as they naturally occur in the program without imposition of external controls or manipulation; (3) evaluative models are evolutionary instead of preordinate; and, (4) evaluation results are a combination of description and judgment of program merit in a particularized context.

## PURPOSE

The mentoring and evaluation literature review formed the basis of formulating the purpose of this study which was (1) to develop a program improvement evaluation model for an adult teacher mentor program; (2) to apply the model to a formal adult teacher mentoring program; (3) to perform a metaevaluation of the model and its implementation; and, (4) to recommend changes to the model.

## ASSUMPTIONS

This model was also based upon three major assumptions derived from the mentoring and evaluation literatures and upon a conventional definition of formative evaluation. The three assumptions are that adult teacher mentoring programs: (1) can be conceptualized as supporting a complex web of relationships designed to affect the behavior and beliefs of both mentors and mentees; (2) are not discrete isolated entities but a series of related activities embedded in a

broader organizational context which affects the structure, process, and evaluation of the program; and, (3) have stakeholders who hold disparate views which present a rich set of multiple realities.

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS/FORESHADOWING ISSUES

Several foreshadowing issues emerged from the literature review which helped formulate the questions which guided this research. Does the evaluation and its implementation: (1) Access relevant audiences and serve their practical needs? (2) Respect individual rights and standards of ethical practice? (3) Differentiate mentor and mentee perceptions regarding mentoring activities among various program sites? (4) Indicate how and why mentees access other developmental work relationships? (5) Identify organizational barriers to mentoring? and, (6) Show relative effectiveness of mentoring selection and training?

## RESEARCH METHODS AND DESIGN

A case study research design (Yin, 1981) was used to: design the mentor program improvement evaluation model; implement the model; conduct a metaevaluation of the model and its implementation; and, recommend changes to the model. Three data sources were utilized for triangulation in the study: taped, guided individual and group interviews, and 1988 to 1993 historical program documentation. A purposeful sampling strategy (Patton, 1980) was used to select nineteen interviewees from a sample population of forty-two. The formative mentor program improvement evaluation model includes: defining evaluation questions, data collection, data analysis and interpretation, and reporting shown in Figure 1. The metaevaluation was conducted by an independent auditor experienced in qualitative research, and addressed the trustworthiness—credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability—of implementing the model.

### Phase 1

#### **Define evaluation questions**

##### Activities:

- \*Review evaluation and mentor research
- \*Interview program director and Professional Development Committee

##### Products:

- \*Preliminary interview guides

### Phase 2

#### **Data collection**

##### Activities:

- \*Site interviews
- \*Collect program documents

##### Products:

- \*Narrative site summaries

##### Verification:

- \*Interviewees

### Phase 3

#### **Data analysis & interpretation**

##### Activities:

- \*Site analysis
- \*Theme and pattern analysis
- \*Document analysis

##### Products:

- \*Case summary

##### Verification:

- \*Professional Development Committee

### Phase 3

#### **Reporting**

##### Activities:

- \*Write reports
- \*Distribute reports
- \*Collect verification comments

##### Products:

- \*Comprehensive case report
- \*Executive summary reports

##### Verification:

- \*Evaluation participants

Figure 1. Formative Evaluation Program Improvement Model

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Findings of the metaevaluation process indicated little evidence of individual or program-wide accountability. Figure 2 displays the conditions, causes and consequent adaptations, which as reported by interview subjects, tended to affect their ability to be in a mentor relationship.

| CONDITIONS                    | CAUSES  | ADAPTATIONS   |
|-------------------------------|---|---|
| <u>TIME TO MEET</u>           |   |   |
| Adequate                      | *Synchronous or compatible schedules  | *Frequent meetings<br>*Increased adoption of mentor duties  |
| Inadequate                    | *Mismatched schedules<br>*Assignment mismatch   | *No formal meetings<br>*Spontaneous "quick fix" crises meetings only<br>*First-year teacher forms substitute relationship       |
| <u>ASSIGNMENT MATCH</u>       |   |   |
| Good                          | *Trained mentor available at grade level or in same department as first-year teacher  | *Frequent meetings<br>*Variety of mentor assistance given to first-year teacher   |
| Poor                          | *Lack of qualified mentor in the cadre to meet the need<br>*Planned mismatch to increase communication among departments              | *Infrequent meetings<br>*Repeated use of the same mentors<br>*Mentor role dissonance<br>*Teammates instead of formal mentor     |
| <u>PROXIMITY</u>              |   |   |
| Near                          | *Grade level or department match  | *Frequent meetings  |
| Distant                       | *Assignment mismatch  | *Infrequent meetings<br>*Decrease in types of assistance given to first-year teacher<br>*Beginner forms substitute relationship |
| <u>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT</u> |   |   |
| Adequate                      | *Administrator plans aide coverage for mentor and first-year teacher to meet<br>*Administrator evaluates mentor-beginner relationship | *Increased adoption of mentor duties  |
| Inadequate                    | *Poor administrator communication with mentor and first-year teacher  | *Mentor role dissonance<br>*Mentor feels unaccountable  |

Figure 2. Conditions Affecting the Mentor Relationship



The auditor verified the implementation of the model as an authentic evaluation to: fairly portray program participants views; increase participant awareness of the program environment; increase participant understanding of how others value and hold meaning for the program; and, effect actual program changes as a result of the evaluation.

## CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

A revised mentor program evaluation model was fashioned for improvement of the mentoring program as a conclusion of the metaevaluation which adds two phases to the original four phases. The two new phases are now Phase 1 and Phase 6. This revision is shown on Figure 3.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><u>Phase 1</u><br/> <b>Identify stakeholders and decision decision makers</b><br/> <u>Activities:</u><br/>           *Define audiences of the evaluation<br/>           *Describe sites program locations<br/> <u>Products:</u><br/>           *List of stakeholders and decision makers</p>  | <p><u>Phase 2</u><br/> <b>Define evaluation questions</b><br/> <u>Activities:</u><br/>           *Review evaluation and mentor research<br/>           *Interview program director<br/> <u>Products:</u><br/>           *Focus group interview guides</p>        |
| <p><u>Phase 3</u><br/> <b>Data collection</b><br/> <u>Activities:</u><br/>           *Conduct site focus groups<br/>           *Design questionnaires<br/>           *Plan and schedule use of the questionnaire<br/>           *Deliver and collect questionnaire returns<br/> <u>Products:</u><br/>           *Summary of focus group notes by site<br/>           *Completed questionnaires sorted by sites</p> | <p><u>Phase 3</u><br/> <b>Data analysis &amp; interpretation</b><br/> <u>Activities:</u><br/>           *Analysis of site data<br/>           *Theme and pattern analysis<br/> <br/> <u>Products:</u><br/>           *Site summaries</p>                         |
| <p><u>Phase 5</u><br/> <b>Reporting</b><br/> <u>Activities:</u><br/>           *Write reports<br/>           *Distribute reports to program participants<br/> <u>Products:</u><br/>           *Annual summary report</p>   | <p><u>Phase 6</u><br/> <b>Replanning and design</b><br/> <u>Activities:</u><br/>           *Plan program changes<br/>           *Plan strategies to monitor changes<br/> <u>Products:</u><br/>           *Program procedures<br/>           *Evaluation plan</p> |

Figure 3. Revised Formative Evaluation Program Improvement Model

Implications of this study are that the findings and conclusions may be useful to adult, extension, community, and continuing educators seeking to prepare and/or mentor new educators of adults being engaged to teach in their programs. Professional development organizations, state departments of education, university or college faculty, and corporate human resource developers who provide preparation for teachers of adults could also use these findings and conclusions for upgrading the quality of teaching, mentoring, learning and performance which would result.

## REFERENCES

- Brookfield, S.D. (1986). Understanding and Facilitating Adult Learning. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cruikshank, D. & Cruz, J. (1989). Trends in teacher preparation. Journal of Teacher Education, 40 (3), 49-56.
- Daloz, L. A. (1986). Effective Teaching and Mentoring. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Grow, G. (1991). Teaching learners to be self-directed. Adult Education Quarterly, 41, (3), 125-149.
- Kram, K. (1985). Mentoring at Work Developmental Relations in Organizational Life. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Knowles, M.S. (1972). Ways of learning. Journal of Continuing Education and Training, 1 (5), 285-287.
- Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic Inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Merriam, S. (1983). Mentors and protégés: A critical review of the literature. Adult Education Quarterly, 33 (3), 161-173.
- Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative Evaluation Methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Scriven, M. (1973). The methodology of evaluation. In B. R. Worthen & J. R. Sanders (Eds.), Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice (pp. 66-106). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Tough, A. (1979). The Adult's Learning Projects. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Waters, L.B. & Bernhardt, V.L. (1989). Providing effective induction program support for teachers: It's not as easy as it looks. In J. Reinhartz (Ed.), Teacher Induction. National Education Association (pp.52-60).
- Yin, B. (1981). The case study as a serious research strategy. Knowledge Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, 3 (1), 97-111.

---

John A. Henschke  
 Associate Professor of Adult Education  
 University of Missouri-St. Louis  
 Continuing Education Specialist  
 University Extension-University of Missouri and Lincoln University  
 8001 Natural Bridge Road  
 St. Louis, MO 63121-4499  
 Presented at the Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education, National Louis University, Wheaton, IL, October 12-14, 1995.