



# MODELS OF MENTORING

**A survey of SWitch members:  
Current practice and future intentions  
in relation to *mentoring*  
for Initial Teacher Training (ITT)  
and Continuous Professional Development (CPD)  
in the Lifelong Learning Sector**

Survey conducted on behalf of  
SWitch Centre for Excellence in Teacher Training  
by the Royal Artillery Centre for Personal Development

November 2007



# Contents

1. Introduction
2. The brief
  - 2.1. Summary of the original brief
  - 2.2. Relationship with other Switch projects
  - 2.3. Interpretation of the brief
  - 2.4. Constraints encountered
3. Methodology
  - 3.1. Summary of methods adopted
  - 3.2. Summary of the range and number of providers who contributed
4. Findings
  - 4.1. Summary of the organisational approaches to mentorship for ITT and CPD programmes
    - 4.1.1. The range of qualifications surveyed
    - 4.1.2. The extent of mentorship arrangements for ITT and CPD
    - 4.1.3. Analysis of mentorship approaches across all providers
    - 4.1.4. Analysis by type of provider
    - 4.1.5. Availability of written guidelines
  - 4.2. The role of the designated Mentor - analysis by type of organisation and qualification
    - 4.2.1. Recruitment of Mentors and selection criteria
    - 4.2.2. Contractual arrangements and funding
    - 4.2.3. Modes of contact with Mentees and time commitments of Mentors
    - 4.2.4. Roles and Responsibilities of Mentors
    - 4.2.5. Training, support and monitoring of Mentors
  - 4.3. Evaluating and improving mentorship arrangements
    - 4.3.1. Summary of methods of evaluating mentorship arrangements
    - 4.3.2. Plans of existing ITT/CPD providers to develop mentorship arrangements
  - 4.4. Plans of organisations not currently delivering ITT/CPD
    - 4.4.1. The range of providers in this category
    - 4.4.2. Summary of the plans
  - 4.5. Mentorship arrangements for programmes other than ITT/CPD
    - 4.5.1. Summary of the arrangements
    - 4.5.2. Possible applications to mentorship for ITT/CPD
5. Conclusions
  - 5.1. Summary of principal findings
  - 5.2. Recommendations for further research

## Appendix 1: List of respondents, by type

The *SWitch* CETT is one of two Centres for Excellence in Teacher Training appointed and funded by the Quality Improvement Agency (QIA) to work with Learning & Skills providers in the South West Region to improve and enhance the quality of teacher training provision. *SWitch* is a partnership of over 40 members, co-ordinated by Learning South West, made up of a range of organisations from across the Learning & Skills sectors. The partners work together to identify excellence in teacher training and to seek to spread this more widely across the region and beyond.

Tel: (01823) 365440

email: [switch\\_cett@learning-southwest.org.uk](mailto:switch_cett@learning-southwest.org.uk)    [www.learning-southwest.org.uk](http://www.learning-southwest.org.uk)

# 1. Introduction

The Royal Artillery Centre for Personal Development is delighted to have been given the opportunity to contribute to the promotion of excellence in teaching in the lifelong learning sector for the SWitch partnership. It is unlikely that you will have heard of us so this report will commence with a very brief explanation of who we are.

We provide civilian qualifications for the 7,500 soldiers serving in the Royal Artillery and their dependants. We offer over thirty vocational, professional and essential skills qualifications at levels 1 to 5, as well as learndirect. As an organisation we are relatively young – we have existed only since 1998 – with annual enrolments rising to 6,000 in 2006. We are passionate about excellence in relation to all aspects of our work and have been actively involved in the dissemination of good practice since becoming a Beacon status provider in 2002.

One of our principal motivations for undertaking this project was our consciousness that our own model of mentoring for our ITT programmes, dependent largely on the goodwill of the line managers of our trainee educators, is inadequate. Our contribution to the SWitch project overall is modest, limited to a quantitative survey of what models of mentoring are in place and what aspirations members have for further development. Others will follow and analyse in greater depth the examples of good practice that we believe exist within the partnership. This in turn will lead to the dissemination of that good practice.

We wish to record our thanks for the support we have received from the SWitch Co-ordinating Team and from the Project Leaders for the two research groups who are looking at the Dissemination of Good Practice in Mentor Training: Dr Michael Tedder and Dr Rob Lawy from the University of Exeter and Irene Chapman from Devon CC Adult and Community Learning. Many others, too numerous to mention, have helped by reviewing the questionnaire and giving advice on its scope and format. Our principal thanks, however, go to the 26 providers who took the time and trouble to complete the questionnaire.

Dr Nick Ashby, Project Leader  
Ms Anne Cuff, Principal Researcher  
Ms Caroline Scott, Associate Researcher

Royal Artillery Centre for Personal Development  
9 November 2007

## **2. The brief**

### **2.1. Summary of the original brief**

#### **2.1.1. The brief from SWitch**

The original brief from SWitch was published in the Project Aim for Project SW0707, Models of Mentoring, for which tenders were invited in September 2007. This was:

“To research the models of mentoring in use on teacher training programmes across the region, including their coverage of support for subject specialist skills, Skills for Life embedding and work with learners with difficulties and disabilities.”

#### **2.1.2. Project tasks**

The tasks identified by SWitch as the means to achieve this aim were as follows:

- “(1) To survey providers of accredited Teacher Training (ITT and CPD) programmes across the South West to identify the nature and extent of mentor support integral to their programmes
- (2) To collect information about the model(s) of mentoring used on different programmes, including:
  - the range, selection and training of mentors involved
  - the levels of mentoring offered, how this is funded and its use across the trainee cohort(s) on programme
- (3) To collect information about the model(s) of mentoring used on different programmes, including the coverage of their support for:
  - subject specialist areas
  - embedding of Skills for Life into a range of programmes
  - working with learners with difficulties and disabilities
- (4) To report on the findings from the above and disseminate information about the range of models to SWitch members and providers involved in the research”

#### **2.1.3. Additional requirements**

The SWitch Board then additionally asked the RA CPD to:

- a) Use partners identified to contribute to design of the questionnaire and analysis of data
- b) Aim to collate returns from all members

## **2.2. Relationship with other Switch projects**

At the same time as our bid was approved by the SWitch Board, two other bids were approved for Project SW0708 Disseminate Models of Good Practice in Mentor Training. These were from research groups led respectively by Irene Chapman of Devon CC ACL and Drs Michael Tedder and Rob Lawy of Exeter University.

We forwarded copies of the draft questionnaire to both these groups and had telephone discussions with both about the relationship of our research to theirs. We also consulted a range of other providers of all types both on the content and format of the survey questionnaire; this feedback was very valuable in refining the focus of the questionnaire.

Throughout the exercise we have been conscious of the potential for duplication of effort in that some elements of the respective projects overlap. At one point we were tempted to extend our research with a case study approach but we realised at an early stage that this was more properly the remit of one or both of the other research groups.

The most significant difference between the aims of our project and that of the other groups was that we were tasked with describing mentoring activity across the entire SWitch membership. **As a consequence, our research has been almost exclusively quantitative in nature, leaving more detailed, qualitative research to the groups with complementing briefs.**

We subsequently attended a meeting of the Exeter research group and presented our initial findings from the survey. The meeting concluded that the data that we had collected would be a useful starting point for the work of the Exeter group. The completed questionnaires will therefore be made available to both research groups so that they can further investigate what seems to us to be examples of good practice.

### **2.3. Interpretation of the brief**

After discussion of the brief with the other research groups, a range of other providers and the SWitch Co-ordination team, we decided to focus our research on the following areas:

- A. **Approaches to mentoring across the organisation**, with a view to identifying any cross-organisation policy or practice in place, to facilitate further research into best practice
- B. **The role of the designated Mentor**, with a view to examining how those individuals who carry the title "Mentor" function and are supported in practice, as base-line research
- C. **Evaluating and improving mentorship arrangements**, with a view to identifying what forms of evaluation currently exist as potential models of best practice and what themes for improvement emerge that SWitch could support in the future
- D. **Plans of organisations that do not yet have ITT or CPD programme in place**, with a view to identifying future development that SWitch could support
- E. **Mentorship arrangements for programmes other than ITT and CPD**, with a view to identifying potential good practice with which mentorship for ITT and CPD could be compared

### **2.4. Constraints encountered**

As with every other research activity the principal constraint was time. The original tender envisaged that the project would be conducted within the month of September. In reality, the SWitch Board considering the bids did not meet until 20 September and so we changed our project end date to the first week of November.

We agreed with the original concept that our research needed to be conducted on a short timescale so as to facilitate the research being undertaken by the other two research groups. This did mean, however, that not only was our own project team under considerable pressure but also that consultation on how we intended to undertake the project had to be completed in a matter of days. Most importantly, it meant that we could give respondents to the survey a shorter time to make their returns than we would have wished. We are conscious that this will have placed burdens on our colleagues. In the end, we received returns from 26 of the 29 organisations we requested returns from.

## **3. Methodology**

### **3.1. Summary of methods adopted**

Given the time constraints and the predominantly quantitative nature of the data that we intended to capture we opted for a questionnaire as our primary research tool. To give respondents a variety of ways in which to make their return we invited them either to complete the questionnaire on-line, handwrite it and post it to us or request a telephone survey. Of the 26 returns we received, 22 were made on-line, three by phone and one was handwritten.

The high return rate of 26 received out of 29 requested indicates that the choice of methodology from this perspective was justified. Against this, it has to be said that the topic lends itself to both quantitative and qualitative research and it was frustrating for us and almost certainly for our respondents not to be able to explore perceptions, models, practice and aspirations in greater depth with individual organisations. In this respect, the small number of telephone surveys we undertook was more satisfying and generated some of the fullest responses.

It was felt quite strongly by those whom we consulted in preparing the questionnaire, that respondents should not be constrained by multiple-choice questions. Given that the numbers and range of respondents was such that there would be little statistical value in analysing responses as percentages, we agreed that multiple-choice methodology was inappropriate. The consequence of this in terms of presentation of findings is that we have included a large number of tables that record the raw data of the responses so that readers can draw their own conclusions.

On the other hand, we were advised that it would be valuable to be able to see what variation existed across different types of provider. In our analysis, therefore, we have included this dimension where appropriate.

### **3.2. Summary of the range and number of providers who contributed**

A list of all the respondents can be found at Appendix 1. The sample was based on membership of SWitch and cannot therefore be taken as representative of provision across the region. This was the primary reason, as stated above, why we have not attempted to analyse the findings as proportional descriptions of perception and practice across a representative sample of providers.

Of the four HEIs that are Switch members, two made returns that reflected their own provision, outside the provision of their partner FE colleges. One made no separate return because all the provision was made through partner colleges. The fourth made a return based on its ITT for schools provision.

Altogether twelve FE colleges responded. The majority of these were in partnership arrangements with HEIs. There was a noticeable difference in the kinds of response Colleges made in relation to ITT delivering qualifications accredited by awarding bodies, notably City and Guilds, and PGCE and Cert Ed qualifications accredited by HEIs.

In addition, four providers of Adult and Community Learning, four Work-based Learning Providers and three Voluntary and Community providers participated. The variety of provision in these three types was considerable. One WBL provider, one ACL and one V&C provider deliver CPD courses only. One WBL provider supports mentors for its own staff undertaking ITT courses elsewhere.

Of the three returns from organisations who do not currently provide ITT or CPD for the LLL sector, one was an HEI, one was an FE College and one was an ACL provider.

## Section 4: Findings

### 4.1 Organisational approaches to Mentorship for ITT and CPD programmes

#### 4.1.1 The range of qualifications surveyed

A total of 26 organisations made returns, made up as follows:

- 3 Higher Education Institutions
- 12 Further Education Colleges
- 4 Adult Education providers
- 4 Work-based Learning providers
- 3 Voluntary and Community sector organisations

The range of ITT courses covered includes both Awarding Body and HEI accredited programmes and these are summarised below. The names of the HEI programmes differ according to the awarding institution, but the programmes have been grouped according to type rather than individually. The full list of programmes and the range of levels covered in the HEI courses can be found in Appendix 2. Both full time pre-service and part time in-service programmes are included, as are subject specialist courses for Skills for Life teachers. The CPD provision covered included Assessor and Verifier awards, Learning and Development awards, specialist programmes run by a V&C organisation and a range of short, non-accredited programmes.

Of the 26 organisations surveyed, all but 3 are currently offering mentoring arrangements for ITT or CPD programmes for the LLL sector. These organisations were able to comment on mentoring for other programmes or their future intentions only.

	<b>Total participants:</b>
<b>Awarding Body programmes</b>	
City & Guilds 7302	15
Certificate in FE Teaching Stages 1, 2 & 3 (Final cohorts of the outgoing FENTO endorsed programme)	237
Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector	346
Certificate in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector	197
Diploma in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector	392
Literacy for Subject Specialists	26
Numeracy for Subject Specialists	28
<b>HEI accredited programmes</b>	
PGCE / Certificate in Education (SVUK endorsed) Part time in service	340
PGCE / Certificate in Education (SVUK endorsed) Full time pre-service	30
<b>CPD programmes</b>	
Assessor and verifier awards	42
Awareness in Literacy, Numeracy and ICT	6
Learning and Development awards at levels 3 and 4	51
Short half-day non-accredited CPD courses	300
V&C graduate and post-graduate programmes	20
Mentoring training	20
Adult Numeracy/Literacy Subject Support L3	20
NVQ L2/3 Teaching Assistants	20

#### 4.1.2 The extent of mentorship arrangements for ITT and CPD

Respondents were asked to indicate whether mentoring was required or encouraged on their ITT and CPD courses. In addition they were asked to identify who was responsible for providing mentoring for trainees from both their own and external organisations whose employees attended their courses.

Where course cohorts are composed of both staff employed by the organisation delivering the programme and those employed by external organisations, mentors are provided as follows:

Total returns given in brackets	In house mentoring provided for own staff	Mentoring provided for staff of external organisations	External organisations responsible for providing mentors for own staff
<b>ITT where required</b>			
FE Colleges (11)	9	1	5
HEIs (2)			3
ACL (3)	2	1	
WBL (1)	1		
VC (1)		1	
<b>Total (18)</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>ITT where encouraged</b>			
FE Colleges (11)	2	2	2
HEIs (2)			
ACL (3)		1	
WBL (1)	2	2	1
VC (1)			
<b>Total (18)</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>CPD programmes</b>			
FE Colleges (4)	1	4	2
HEIs (0)			
ACL (2)	1		
WBL (3)	1		1
VC (2)	2	1	1
<b>Total (11)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>

**The findings indicate that, in the main, provider organisations arrange mentors for those course participants who are their own employees and ask external organisations to provide mentors for their own staff.** One respondent reported that they provide mentors for other organisations' trainees 'as a last resort'.

**It is evident that mentoring is either required or encouraged on all ITT programmes. Where providers are delivering HEI accredited programmes, they follow the requirements of the HEI concerned.** One HEI reported that the scheme they have in place 'attempts to ensure that every trainee teacher receives some kind of mentoring support'. **However, in the case of Awarding Body courses there is evidence of more variation in practice.** One respondent pointed out that mentor support is mandatory for those undertaking the new initial teaching award (Preparing to Teach in the Lifelong Learning Sector), although according to the regulations this is not the case for the Certificate or Diploma in Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector awards.

One FE college reported that with awarding body courses, 'mentoring requirements are much weaker and vary between programmes'. Nonetheless, some organisations reported that they



have a policy of providing mentors for their own staff and strongly advising external candidates to find themselves an appropriate Mentor. This trend was strongest among the FE colleges, though other types of organisation reported that they try to provide support as far as possible.

We were interested to identify the range of people who were involved in providing mentor support across the range of providers. The range is shown below:

Total returns given in brackets	Course tutors	Subject specific mentors	Supervisors / line managers	Peers
<b>ITT courses:</b>				
FE Colleges (11)	7	9	8	5
HEIs (2)	1	2	2	2
ACL (3)	2	2	2	1
WBL (1)	2	3	3	3
VC (1)	1			
<b>Total (18)</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>CPD courses:</b>				
FE Colleges (4)	2	3	3	4
HEIs (0)				
ACL (2)	1	2	2	
WBL (3)		1	2	2
VC (2)	1	1	2	2
<b>Total (11)</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>

**Analysis of the responses indicates that, in order to meet individual needs, mentoring support is provided by a range of people within organisations. There is a fairly even spread across course tutors, subject specific mentors, supervisors/line managers and peers.** Comments from respondents indicate that most take a pragmatic approach and that, while there is a general desire to provide subject specific mentors, these may be drawn from line managers, experienced peers, course tutors (particularly for the subject specialist awards) or those holding Advanced Practitioner or equivalent/similar posts. In some organisations line managers are expected to provide mentor support as part of their job role, although two respondents stated that they avoided using line managers unless absolutely necessary. One HEI noted that, as subject specific mentors will not always be available, some will be line managers or peers, though they would never use course tutors as mentors.

**For CPD programmes line managers and peers tend to be more likely to act as mentors than subject specific mentors or course tutors.** One V&C organisation employs Regional Tutors who provide the mentoring support required for students undertaking their graduate and post-graduate courses.

#### 4.1.3 Analysis of mentorship approaches across all providers

We asked respondents to indicate which particular mentoring functions they promoted.

The results are shown on the table below, by type of organisation. **The most frequently cited functions were "supporting the development of teaching skills in general" and "supporting the development of classroom management skills"; the least cited were "acting as a role model", "coaching" and "helping with assignments".** The variation between the most and least cited was not great.

Analysis of the additional comments offered indicates that many respondents would ideally like their mentors to provide support for mentees in all the categories listed. However, some organisations stated that there were differences in the approach depending on individual need and in the interests of making the best possible subject match from the resources available. It was pointed out by one respondent that many or all of the categories of support were provided by course tutors as well as mentors.

Total returns given in brackets	FE Colleges (11)	HEIs (2)	ACL (3)	WBL (4)	VC (3)	Total (23)
Supporting the development of subject pedagogy	10	2	2	3	2	19
Supporting the development of teaching skills in general	10	2	3	4	2	21
Supporting the development of classroom management skills	10	2	3	3	2	20
Being a role model for new teachers	8	2	1	3	2	16
Supporting new teachers in understanding their overall role and responsibilities	9	2	2	4	2	19
Acting as a critical friend	10	2	1	3	2	18
Coaching	9	2	1	2	2	16
Helping with assignment preparation	8	2	2	2	2	16
Developing the teacher as a Reflective Practitioner	10	2	2	3	2	19

#### 4.1.4 Availability of written guidelines for mentors

**Of 23 organisations that responded to this part of the survey, 10 reported that they have written guidelines for their mentors and 13 reported that they did not.** Where organisations have written guidelines, in particular FE colleges, these are chiefly those provided by their HEI partners. The totals are shown below, broken down by organisation type.

Total returns given in brackets	YES	NO
FE Colleges (11)	5	6
HEIs (2)	2	
ACL (3)	1	2
WBL (4)	1	3
VC (3)	1	2
<b>Total (23)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>13</b>

## 4.2 The role of the designated Mentor – analysis by type of organisation and qualification

As identified earlier in this report, mentoring support is provided by a range of different people within employing organisations. In this section of the survey, however, we concentrated on the role of designated Mentors - ie. where there were persons acting as Mentors to whom this title was given, as opposed to individuals in a variety of roles providing mentorship support. All 23 organisations that are currently providing mentorship for either ITT or CPD programmes made a return under this heading. **The use of designated Mentors is standard practice in all ITT and CPD provision across SWitch.**

### 4.2.1 Recruitment of mentors and selection criteria

We asked respondents to identify how mentors are selected and the criteria they use in the selection process. Their responses are shown below:

Total returns given in brackets	Individual mentee requests colleague to be Mentor	Line manager or Curriculum leader selects Mentor	ITTE staff approach individuals	Individuals invited to apply for the role	Individuals volunteer for the role
<b>ITT</b>					
FE Colleges (11)	8	6	5	5	5
HEIs (2)	2	3	2	2	2
ACL (3)		1	1	1	
WBL (1)	1	1			
VC (1)					
<b>Total (18)</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>CPD</b>					
FE Colleges (4)	1	3	2	4	2
HEIs (0)					
ACL (2)		1		1	
WBL (3)		1			
VC (2)	1	1		1	1
<b>Total (11)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>

**For ITT programmes, in the largest number of cases either individual mentees request a particular colleague to be their Mentor or the mentee's line manager selects the Mentor.** However, there are indications that in some instances ITT tutors will make contact with potential mentors and also that in some organisations individuals are invited to apply for or volunteer for a mentoring role.

**In the case of CPD courses it appears that the two most frequently used methods are selection by the line manager or individual applications to be a Mentor.** One WBL provider reported that the course tutors act as mentors.

In terms of the qualifications and experience expected of mentors, the pattern is similar across ITT and CPD provision. **The three most important factors across all organisation types were that mentors should be experienced practitioners in a specific teaching context, should possess full teaching qualifications and have appropriate personal skills and attributes.**

The full range of qualifications and experience they expected of those acting as mentors is shown in the table below:

Total returns given in brackets	Experienced practitioner in specific teaching context	Holder of advanced practitioner post	Possession of appropriate personal skills and attributes	Trained as or in training as SLC	Designated Teaching & Learning Coach	Full teaching qualifications	Mentoring/coaching awards or qualifications
<b>ITT</b>							
FE Colleges (11)	9	3	8		1	9	1
HEIs (2)	2		2			2	
ACL (3)	2	1	1			1	
WBL (1)	2		2			1	
VC (1)	1	1				1	
<b>Total (18)</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>13</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CPD</b>							
FE Colleges (4)	3	2	4	1	1	2	
HEIs (0)							
ACL (2)	2	1	3	1		1	
WBL (3)	1					1	
VC (2)	2	2	2			1	
<b>Total (11)</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	

**There are indications that there are differences between mentoring practice on HEI and awarding body courses, as HEIs make more specific requirements of their partner organisations.** One FE college reported that 'we cannot afford to be choosy yet'.

One HEI added that proven good practice was also a criterion, as evidenced through observation grades. This organisation further stated that they will, exceptionally, allow mentors to practice who do not meet all the stated criteria. In some organisations there are Advanced Practitioner or similar posts and these postholders will frequently take on the role of Mentor because they match all or most of the criteria.

**For CPD courses the two factors identified as being most significant are that mentors should possess appropriate personal skills and attributes and be experienced practitioners in a particular subject area.**

#### 4.2.2 Contractual arrangements and funding

In this part of the survey, we wanted to identify the nature and extent of contractual arrangements for mentoring services. In particular, we were interested to know whether formal contracts and job descriptions were used, whether mentoring was regarded as a timetabled activity and whether the keeping of standardised formal records was common practice.

**Analysis of the returns indicates that few mentors are given a contract for their role, though in some cases they are given a job description.** The findings for ITT indicate a mixed pattern across organisations. One HEI highlights the differences in the amounts of time given to mentoring in its partner colleges. **In many cases those acting as mentors are asked to take on the role in addition to existing teaching and other duties and receive no remission.** At the other end of the scale, there is one FE college where mentors, known as

Learning Team Leaders, are given 150 hours a year remission to support an ITT trainee and contribute to CPD.

The full results are set out below:

Total returns given in brackets	Given a contract for the role	Given a job description	Asked to agree details of the relationship with the mentee	Given remission from their timetable	Paid for extra time spent on mentoring	Asked to take on the role in addition to existing duties	Required to keep standardised formal records
<b>ITT</b>							
FE Colleges (11)	3	4	7	4		6	9
HEIs (2)		2	2	1		2	2
ACL (3)	1	1			1	1	2
WBL (1)			1			2	
VC (1)							
<b>Total (18)</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>CPD</b>							
FE Colleges (4)	2	2	2	2		1	2
HEIs (0)							
ACL (2)	1	1			2		1
WBL (3)						1	
VC (2)			1			1	1
<b>Total (11)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>

Some specific posts include mentoring in their duties, such as curriculum support tutors in one ACL provider, and Advanced Practitioners may be able to gain remission for mentoring. There are indications that some mentors undertake formal record keeping, but we do not have specific information as to whether this differs between HEI and awarding body programmes.

**For CPD programmes no particular contractual factor stands out in the findings. However, it seems that line managers may have a greater role in this context than in ITT.**

We were also interested to gain an overview of how mentoring support is funded over the range of organisations in the survey. **Comments offered by respondents indicate clearly that there have been difficulties in resourcing mentoring support, as until now there has been no national funding allocated to support mentoring.** Until the recent allocation of £30 million nationally to support the development of mentoring for ITT programmes, provider organisations report various ways in which they have worked.

Comments indicate that funding has been sourced from college funds, LSC core funding and external sources such as Crystal Chandelier and charitable funds. Some HEI funding is passed to partner colleges to support mentoring and some colleges have added funding of their own to supplement this. This is a further indicator of the differences between provision for trainee teachers following HEI and awarding body courses.

### 4.2.3 Mentor time commitments and modes of contact with mentees

In this section of the survey we asked respondents to indicate the time commitments they expected of mentors, including the number of mentees allocated to individuals, the time allocated to mentoring activity and specific time spent per learner per week. The results are shown below:

Total returns given in brackets	Mentoring of one learner	Mentoring of more than one learner	Specific time designated for mentoring	No specific time designated	Attendance at mentor training, briefings, meetings	Less than 1 hour p.w.	1 – 2 hours p.w.	More than 2 hrs p.w.
<b>ITT</b>								
FE Colleges (11)	6	7	4	8	9	5	3	3
HEIs (2)	2		2		2	2		
ACL (3)		1	2	1	1	1		
WBL (1)	2					1		
VC (1)		1	1					1
<b>Total (18)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>CPD</b>								
FE Colleges (4)	1	4	1	3	3	1		2
HEIs (0)								
ACL (2)		1	1	1	2	1		
WBL (3)		1				1		
VC (2)	1	1		2	1		1	1
<b>Total (11)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>

**For ITT programmes mentors may work with one learner or, as commonly, more than one.** One FE college reported that a Mentor might be allocated a caseload of up to five mentees. The returns indicate an even spread between those who are asked to devote a specific time to mentoring activity and those where no specific time is designated.

**Mentors in the majority of organisations spend less than 1 hour per week on the role. It is not that uncommon, however, for Mentors to spend between one and two hours or more than two hours.**

Attendance at mentor briefing meetings is common in FE colleges and HEIs, but this is not the case in other provider types. One respondent indicated that, for awarding body courses, there is no requirement for Mentors to attend mentor training or meetings.

**For CPD courses mentoring of more than one learner with no specific time allocation is the most common arrangement and there is no clear pattern of hours spent.** In one FE college, mentoring for CPD is included as part of the agenda for monthly team meetings.

We also asked which were the most commonly used modes of contact between Mentors and mentees:

Total returns given in brackets	Face to face with individuals	Telephone	E-mail	Telephone/video conferencing	Group meetings	Written communication
<b>ITT</b>						
FE Colleges (11)	11	6	10	3	3	6
HEIs (2)	2	1	1	1	1	1
ACL (3)	2	2	2	2	2	1
WBL (1)	2	1	2			1
VC (1)	1			1	1	1
<b>Total (18)</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>CPD</b>						
FE Colleges (4)	4	2	3	1	2	1
HEIs (0)						
ACL (2)	2	2	2	1	2	1
WBL (3)	1		1			1
VC (2)	1	1	1		2	1
<b>Total (11)</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>

**For both ITT and CPD the most frequently used modes of contact are face to face and email, with telephone and written communication being less frequently used alternatives.** Comments by respondents indicate that the modes of contact used in specific cases depend on the circumstances, e.g. where the two parties work, etc.

#### 4.2.4 Roles and responsibilities of Mentors

We wanted to identify if there is a common view of the roles and responsibilities of a Mentor in the context of ITT and CPD. As a follow up question, we asked respondents to indicate which of the roles they considered to be the key or primary roles. A summary of the responses is shown overleaf.

**By far the most important roles of the Mentor identified by respondents from a list of nine are observing mentees and supporting the development of their subject specialism.** The next most important role identified is supporting the mentee in their professional role.

Additional comments from FE colleges suggest that support for embedding Skills for Life in subject delivery and for the delivery of e-learning and blended learning are also important. One respondent declined to select one role as the primary role, as they saw this as being different for each individual learner.

Total returns given in brackets	Support for subject specialism	Support for embedding of SfL into programmes	Support for those working with SLD students	Support to mentees delivering e-learning	Support to mentees delivering blended learning	Observing mentees	Support for mentees in the professional role	Support for assignment writing for ITT/CPD	Moderating assessments made by mentees on their learners' coursework
<b>ITT</b>									
FE Colleges (11)	9	7	4	7	7	6	7	2	3
HEIs (2)	2					2	2	1	
ACL (3)	1	1		1			1	1	
WBL (1)	2					1			
VC (1)	1					1	1		
<b>Total (18)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>CPD</b>									
FE Colleges (4)	3	4	2	3	3	3	2	1	2
HEIs (0)									
ACL (2)	1	1		1	1		1	1	
WBL (3)						1			
VC (2)	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1
<b>Total (11)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>

The table below illustrates the overwhelming dominance of observation of teaching practice and support for subject specialism as the key roles identified by respondents.

<b>Primary roles for Mentors</b>	
a. Support for subject specialism	<b>13</b>
b. Support for embedding of SfL in programmes	<b>2</b>
c. Support for those working with SLD students	<b>4</b>
d. Support for mentees delivering e-learning	<b>3</b>
e. Support for mentees delivering blended learning	<b>4</b>
f. Observing mentees	<b>16</b>
g. Support for mentees in the professional role	<b>7</b>
h. Support for assignment writing for ITT or CPD programmes	<b>2</b>
i. Moderating assessments made by mentees of their learners' coursework	<b>1</b>

#### 4.2.5 Training, support and monitoring of Mentors

This section of the survey is concerned with the way in which Mentors are trained, supported and monitored. The responses show that **some formal training is provided for Mentors in all FE Colleges and HEIs but less so in other types of provider. There is growing use of online training materials.** Comments show, however, that there are differences in the provision and take-up of mentor training opportunities between HEI and awarding body courses. **There is very little accreditation for mentor training in place.**

The responses to our question on the training arrangements are shown overleaf:



Total returns given in brackets	My organisation provides formal training sessions for all Mentors	My organisation provides formal training only for Mentors of our own employees	Training for Mentors from other organisations is provided by those organisations	Training materials are available online	Training for Mentors is accredited
<b>ITTE</b>					
FE Colleges (11)	8	2	2	6	2
HEIs (2)	2		1	1	
ACL (3)					
WBL (1)					
VC (1)					
<b>Total (18)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>CPD</b>					
FE Colleges (4)	2	1	1	2	
HEIs (0)					
ACL (2)					
WBL (3)					
VC (2)					
<b>Total (11)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>2</b>	

In FE colleges training is provided in a variety of ways. In one case an OCN course is available, though only for college Mentors and not for those from external organisations. In another case the HEI partner delivers training and in a third the HEI has written a training pack which is used by the college to train its Mentors, who may also attend training sessions at the university. This college reported that they intend to use the same pack to train Mentors supporting mentees on awarding body courses but that, as the awarding body does not stipulate that training is necessary, they will not be able to 'compel' these Mentors to attend.

In addition to the training available for those acting as Mentors, we wanted to know how Mentors are supported:

Total returns given in brackets	Support/review meetings with other Mentors	Mentors are given written guidance	A named individual acts as Mentor co-ordinator	Named individual/s provide support, advice and guidance	Online support is provided via a VLE
<b>ITTE</b>					
FE Colleges (11)	5	8	8	5	6
HEIs (2)	2	2	1	1	
ACL (3)	2	1	1		
WBL (1)	3		1		
VC (1)					
<b>Total (18)</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>CPD</b>					
FE Colleges (4)	2	3	3	3	1
HEIs (0)					
ACL (2)	1	1			
WBL (3)			1		
VC (2)	2	2		2	
<b>Total (11)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

**Mentors are supported in approximately equal measure via mentor support/review meetings, written guidance and an in-house mentor co-ordinator.** Mentor support meetings are less common in FE colleges, however. There are some comments from FE colleges that VLE support is either planned or already in place. Teacher training tutors also liaise with their tutees' Mentors and, on some courses, moderate a sample of mentor observations. For one national V&C provider, line managers or the national manager act as support agencies for Mentors. **For CPD, mentor group meetings, used also to some extent in ITT, are the most significant means of monitoring.**

The final part of this section of the survey concerns the monitoring of mentoring activity. The pattern across the respondents is as follows:

Total returns given in brackets	Through mentor group meetings	Course tutors/mentor co-ordinators liaise and meet regularly with Mentors	Review of reports from Mentors	Feedback from mentees	Feedback from others, e.g. mentees' line managers	Observation of Mentor performance
<b>ITT</b>						
FE Colleges (11)	3	8	6	10	5	3
HEIs (2)		2	2	2	1	1
ACL (3)	2	1	1	1		
WBL (1)			1			1
VC (1)						
<b>Total (18)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>CPD</b>						
FE Colleges (4)	4	4	4	3	2	2
HEIs (0)						
ACL (2)	1				1	
WBL (3)						1
VC (2)	1	1	1	1		
<b>Total (11)</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>

**Monitoring of mentoring provision seems to be relatively under-developed at present. For ITT courses, feedback from mentees, liaison with course tutors and review of formal mentor reports are the most commonly used means of monitoring mentor activity.**

One FE college reported that their HEI partner has appointed a person to monitor mentoring on their programmes, but that for awarding body courses the only means of monitoring is mentee feedback.

## 4.3 Evaluating and improving mentorship arrangements

### 4.3.1 Summary of methods of evaluating mentorship arrangements

We were interested to know how providers measure the effectiveness of their mentoring arrangements. Respondents were asked to identify which measures they used from a list of four:

	FE Colleges (11)	HEIs (2)	ACL (3)	WBL (4)	VC (3)	Total (23)
a) Mentees successfully complete the programme, obtain the qualification	7	1			2	<b>9</b>
b) Mentees' professional skills and knowledge match accepted models of good practice	5	1	1	1	3	<b>8</b>
c) Mentees are able to identify the extent to which mentoring support has developed them personally and professionally	8	2			2	<b>10</b>
d) Feedback from Mentors indicates that they have derived personal and professional development from carrying out the role	9	2			2	<b>11</b>

**Feedback from mentees in conjunction with data on successful completion of the award are marginally the most commonly used measures of the effectiveness of mentor support.** However, as one FE respondent pointed out, it is hard to judge whether the performance of the trainee teacher is attributable to mentor support. Trainee Personal Development Journals were also suggested as a means of judging the effectiveness of mentoring.

### 4.3.2 Plans of existing ITT/CPD providers to develop mentorship arrangements

Responses to this section of the survey indicate that **there is a general awareness of the need to review and/or develop mentorship arrangements; respondents frequently refer to current arrangements as being "informal" or "under-developed"**. One FE college stated that the survey questionnaire had served to highlight areas where their provision was lacking formality and regulation, as mentorship is 'extremely informal' at present. The exercise will inform development over the coming year. One ACL provider reported that their organisation is 'in the very early stages of responding to the needs of formal mentorship'.

**Those organisations that are already embarked on a development programme - largely, but not exclusively, HEIs - intend to develop these further.** Another college reported that development of mentorship arrangements is an ongoing process and is reviewed annually, especially in light of the new ITT qualifications. **Those organisations that do not currently have mentoring arrangements in place, declare their intention to develop them in the near future.** One respondent from an FE college felt that, as the new ITT programmes became established, this would happen as a matter of course.

**Support for Mentors is an area that appears to be recognised as a priority development area across a range of organisations.** Several organisations reported that they now intend to improve these areas of mentor support as a result of feedback from previous ITT courses. Developments reported include a new mentor support network, web based support and workshops. One ACL provider intends to provide support through team meetings and training.

**Monitoring and evaluation are key areas of development as reported by HEIs, FE colleges and ACL providers.** Plans reported include: the holding of termly mentor meetings; more systematic joint observation/moderation of teaching observations; evaluation by the quality team; modular evaluation forms for ITT course participants and evaluation forms completed by Mentors following training (FE); evaluation of questionnaires sent to Mentors and mentees (HEI) and the normal course review process and the SAR (ACL).

Finally, a respondent from one WBL organisation would welcome the opportunity to develop or pilot mentor training as it is a role at present undervalued and under-recognised in that context.

## **4.4 Plans of organisations not currently delivering ITT/CPD**

### **4.4.1 The range of providers in this category**

We asked those organisations who do not currently have a mentorship arrangement in place to tell us about any plans they have for developing specific aspects of mentoring. Only three organisations fell into this category: one ACL provider, one WBL provider and one FE college.

### **4.4.2 Summary of the plans**

**All three respondents indicated that they would be introducing mentoring arrangements, linked to the new ITT initiatives and would be developing and issuing written guidelines for the Mentors.** Two of the respondents explained their approach to the new developments:

In the ACL provider a pilot scheme will be run from November 2007 to March 2008. Mentorship arrangements will be developed using the outcomes of the pilot scheme.

The WBL organisation intends to introduce C&G 7304 this year. The role of Mentors will be established via dialogue with the students on the programme and their employers. Course tutors will have a caseload of four students and will brief them about mentoring arrangements, probably on an informal basis. In this pilot year no formal training will be provided and Mentors will not be expected to undertake observations, though support will be offered informally by the visiting course tutors. Monitoring will be undertaken on an informal basis by means of the visiting course tutors and feedback from the students. Evaluation of the effectiveness of mentoring will form part of the end of course evaluation, taking into account responses from course tutors, students and the Mentors themselves. This provider will also be running a CPD programme for qualified teachers and, in the long term, employer mentors are likely to be a feature of this programme.

## 4.5 Mentorship arrangements for programmes other than ITT/CPD

### 4.5.1 Summary of the arrangements

As good mentorship practice is not the exclusive preserve of ITT and CPD programmes, we were interested to learn of any examples outside this context that respondents felt to be models of good practice.

**In FE colleges there are examples of mentor support for staff new to the college and for staff who need additional support for their teaching practice.** There are indications that, in these cases, the mentoring support is managed, monitored and evaluated using feedback from all parties concerned. In one college, where new staff are mentored, the Quality Department reviews probationary reports to evaluate the effectiveness of the mentoring. Another college reported that specific faculties had mentorship programmes in place for all staff, led by specific departments whose work had been identified by Ofsted as modelling best practice.

**Two examples of the use of ILT to support mentoring were cited.** One HEI is currently working with the University of Huddersfield (also a CETT) to develop on-line mentoring using Moodle. An ACL provider highlighted the work done as part of the Moles project. Here, ILT was used to support tutors and approaches to teaching in ALDD, Arts & Crafts, Family Learning and Languages. ILT champions were identified and supported their peer tutors in skills for life. Subject specialist coaches were identified and supported tutors in language and SfL curriculum areas. Team leaders are curriculum specialists and support tutors in subject content, context and delivery.

**One WBL organisation described** how they have developed best practice in mentoring via a **cross fertilisation of practice used in the mentoring for ITT and CPD, in the mentoring of the staff of employers to whom they deliver work based learning, and mentoring for their own staff.**

One Voluntary and Community organisation described how professional mentoring is used by a national Physiotherapy Support Service organised by a manager based in the South West who leads a team based at the University of East London. The Service supports people who are thinking of applying for a physiotherapy course in a mainstream college, physiotherapy students and qualified physiotherapists undertaking in-service and postgraduate education. The Service also offers support to qualified physiotherapists in the employment setting.

## **5. Conclusions**

### **5.1. Summary of principal findings**

#### **5.1.1. Organisational approaches to Mentorship for ITT and CPD programmes**

- The findings indicate that, in the main, provider organisations arrange Mentors for those course participants who are their own employees and ask external organisations to provide Mentors for their own staff.
- It is evident that mentoring is either required or encouraged on all ITT programmes. Where providers are delivering HEI accredited programmes, they follow the requirements of the HEI concerned. However, in the case of Awarding Body courses there is evidence of more variation in practice.
- Analysis of the responses indicates that, in order to meet individual needs, mentoring support is provided by a range of people within organisations. There is a fairly even spread across course tutors, subject specific mentors, supervisors / line managers and peers.
- The most frequently cited functions of mentoring support were “supporting the development of teaching skills in general” and “supporting the development of classroom management skills”; the least cited were “acting as a role model”, “coaching” and “helping with assignments”.

#### **5.1.2. The role of the designated Mentor - analysis by type of organisation and qualification**

##### Recruitment and selection

- For ITT programmes, in the largest number of cases either individual mentees request a particular colleague to be their Mentor or the mentee’s line manager selects the Mentor.
- In the case of CPD courses it appears that the two most frequently used methods are selection by the line manager or individual applications to be a Mentor.
- The three most important factors across all organisation types were that Mentors should be experienced practitioners in a specific teaching context, should possess full teaching qualifications and have appropriate personal skills and attributes.
- Of 23 organisations that responded to this part of the survey, 10 reported that they have written guidelines for their Mentors and 13 reported that they did not.
- There are indications that there are differences between mentoring practice on HEI and awarding body courses, as HEIs make more specific requirements of their partner organisations.
- For CPD courses the two factors identified as being most significant are that Mentors should possess appropriate personal skills and attributes and be experienced practitioners in a particular subject area.

## Contracts and funding

- Analysis of the returns indicates that few Mentors are given a contract for their role, though in some cases they are given a job description.
- In many cases those acting as Mentors are asked to take on the role in addition to existing teaching and other duties and receive no remission.
- For CPD programmes no particular contractual factor stands out in the findings. However, it seems that line managers may have a greater role in this context than in ITT.
- Comments offered by respondents indicate clearly that there have been difficulties in resourcing mentoring support, as until now there has been no national funding allocated to support mentoring.

## Contact with mentees

- For ITT programmes Mentors may work with one learner or, as commonly, more than one.
- Mentors in the majority of organisations spend less than one hour per week on the role. It is not that uncommon, however, for Mentors to spend between one and two hours or more than two hours.
- For CPD courses mentoring of more than one learner with no specific time allocation is the most common arrangement and there is no clear pattern of hours spent.
- For both ITT and CPD the most frequently used modes of contact are face to face and email, with telephone and written communication being less frequently used alternatives.

## Roles and responsibilities

- The use of designated Mentors is standard practice in all ITT and CPD provision across SWitch.
- By far the most important roles of the Mentor identified by respondents from a list of nine are observing mentees and supporting the development of their subject specialism.

## Training, support and monitoring

- Some formal training is provided for Mentors in all FE Colleges and HEIs but less so in other types of provider.
- There is growing use of online training materials.
- There is very little accreditation for mentor training in place.
- Mentors are supported in approximately equal measure via mentor support/review meetings, written guidance and an in-house mentor co-ordinator.
- For CPD, mentor group meetings, used also to some extent in ITT, are the most significant means of monitoring.
- Monitoring of mentoring provision seems to be relatively under-developed at present.



- For ITT courses, feedback from mentees, liaison with course tutors and review of formal mentor reports are the most commonly used means of monitoring mentor activity.

### **5.1.3. Evaluating and improving mentorship arrangements**

- Feedback from mentees, in conjunction with data on successful completion of the award, are marginally the most commonly used measures of the effectiveness of mentor support.
- There is a general awareness of the need to review and/or develop mentorship arrangements; respondents frequently refer to current arrangements as being “informal” or “under-developed”.
- Those organisations that are already embarked on a development programme - largely, but not exclusively, HEIs - intend to develop these further.
- Those organisations that do not currently have mentoring arrangements in place declare their intention to develop them in the near future.
- Support for Mentors is an area that appears to be recognised as a priority development area across a range of organisations.
- Monitoring and evaluation are key areas of development as reported by HEIs, FE colleges and ACL providers.

### **5.1.4. Plans of organisations not currently delivering ITT/CPD**

- All three respondents indicated that they would be introducing mentoring arrangements, linked to the new ITT initiatives and would be developing and issuing written guidelines for the Mentors.

### **5.1.5. Mentorship arrangements for programmes other than ITT/CPD**

- In FE colleges there are examples of mentor support for staff new to the college and for staff who need additional support for their teaching practice.
- Two examples of the use of ILT to support mentoring were cited.
- One WBL organisation described a cross fertilisation of practice used in the mentoring for ITT and CPD, in the mentoring of the staff of employers to whom they deliver work based learning, and mentoring for their own staff.

## 5.2. Some recommendations for further research

From the findings summarised above we have identified the following aspects of mentoring that in our view deserve further research by the SWitch partnership. Many of these arise from suggestions made by individual respondents. The remainder are our own suppositions, based on consideration of the principal findings. Readers of this report will no doubt identify other areas for research – this list is not intended to be definitive. In each case, we have posed one or more “research questions” that we feel might usefully be addressed.

In many cases, descriptions of practice contained in the completed questionnaires will provide the starting point for the examination and evaluation of best practice. For this reason, the completed questionnaires will be made available to the two SWitch research groups tasked with disseminating models of good practice in mentor training.

In other cases, the topics for research that we recommend do not currently form part of SWitch’s research programme but are offered here for consideration as the focus of future research projects.

Partnerships	What good practice exists in structures for managing partnerships? Can the existing models for partnership, mainly between HEIs and FE Colleges, be extended to partnerships with other types of provider? Are there examples where partnerships have successfully addressed the current and future need for CPD?
Policies	What good practice exists in the development of organisation or partnership policies? What understandings of the purpose and practice of mentoring underpins the policies? How do policies link mentoring for ITT, CPD and support for qualified teachers new to the organisation? What links exist with Quality Improvement Plans, Self-assessment Reports etc.?
Organisational Structures	What structures exist to support mentoring arrangements – ITT course teams, professional development teams, line management, departments/divisions? What good practice exists for co-ordinating mentoring support between different individuals – mentors, course tutors, line managers etc? Are there examples of good practice in co-ordinating mentors engaged by the trainee’s employer, where this is different from the ITT provider?
Roles	Are there examples good practice in mentoring support being tailored to the needs of the trainee? If so, how is the effectiveness of mentoring support measured? What examples of good practice exist in enabling Mentors to support mentees embedding Skills for Life? What examples of good practice exist in enabling Mentors to support mentees who deliver e-learning or blended learning? What examples of good practice exist in enabling Mentors to support mentees who work with SLD learners? Are there examples of successful use of Mentors to assess trainees’ coursework? What critical differences are there, if any, between mentor support for ITT trainees and mentor support for qualified staff undertaking CPD?

Recruitment	<p>What examples of good practice in job description and guidance materials exist?          What evidence is there that particular skills and experience predict the future capability of Mentors?          What examples of good practice in recruitment and selection processes exist?          Where Mentors cannot be required, what examples of good practice in encouraging potential Mentors to come forward?          What incentives other than financial have been shown to be successful?</p>
Contact	<p>What time allowance per mentee and what caseloads work best?          What are the best modes of contact for Mentors in particular contexts?          What examples of good practice in on-line and other forms of distance mentor support exist, where specialist support is not available locally?</p>
Resources	<p>What sources of funding are there or will there be in the near future to support mentoring arrangements?          What pragmatic solutions have organisations discovered to overcome lack of resources?</p>
Support and Training	<p>What forms of support do Mentors value?          What examples of good practice in inducting Mentors exist?          What examples of good practice in in-service training for Mentors exist?          What accreditation for Mentors exists?          What examples of the effective dissemination of good practice in mentoring are there?</p>
Monitoring and evaluation	<p>What good practice exists in monitoring Mentors?          What good practice exists in records of mentoring activity in particular contexts?          What performance standards exist to measure performance of Mentors?          Are there examples where Ofsted performance criteria have been successfully employed for this purpose?          What evaluation tools have been tested and found to be effective?          What evidence is there of the effectiveness of particular mentoring functions in particular contexts, eg observations by subject specialist mentors as opposed to pedagogic mentors?          Is there any evidence of the effectiveness of informal mentoring arrangements?</p>
Awarding Bodies	<p>What guidance and support do different awarding bodies give on mentor support?</p>

# Appendix 1: List of respondents

## Higher Education<sup>1</sup>

Bath Spa University  
University of the West of England  
University College of Plymouth St Mark and St John (Marjon)<sup>2</sup>

## FE Colleges

City of Bristol College  
Exeter College  
Filton College  
Gloucestershire College  
Kingston Maurward College  
Norton Radstock College  
Royal Forest of Dean College  
Strode College  
Stroud College  
Weston College  
Weymouth College  
Yeovil College

## Work based learning

Accountancy Plus Training Ltd  
Devon and Cornwall Training Provider Network  
Enable Assessment  
Royal Artillery Centre for Personal Development

## Adult Education

Adult Education in Gloucestershire, Glos CC  
Cornwall Adult Education Service  
Devon Adult and Community Learning  
Dorset Adult Education

## Voluntary and Community sector

Exeter Council for Voluntary Service  
The Learning Curve  
Royal National Institute for the Blind

---

<sup>1</sup> University of Exeter did not make a separate return but its mentor support programme is represented through its partner colleges

<sup>2</sup> Return based on training for primary and secondary education; quantitative data not included in the findings