



---

## **Identifying Effective Practices: Survey Results of Mentors**

---

**National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers (NCIEC)  
Mentoring Team  
December, 2007**

## **Identifying Effective Practices: Survey Results of Mentors**

The survey, “Identifying Effective Practices: Mentor,” consisted of 78 questions and was carefully written to accurately assess the needs of interpreting mentors nationally. People were encouraged through press releases, emails, and announcements to complete the survey, which was posted online for more than 30 days at [www.zoomerang.com/mentor](http://www.zoomerang.com/mentor). A complementary survey targeting mentees/proteges was in progress at the same time. Results from the mentee survey are documented, as well.

### **Part I: About You (Demographics)**

A total of 241 people from across the United States responded to the survey. The largest number of respondents was female, hearing, Euro-American/white and listed English as their first language. In contrast, only a small percentage was male, deaf; hard of hearing, and listed American Sign Language as their first language. A small scattering of individuals identified themselves as African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino(a), and other.

The ages of respondents were spread out fairly evenly, with the highest percentage (23%) in the age group 46-50, the next highest in the group 41-45 (18%), followed by 36-40 and 50-55 at 16% and 15% respectively.

Respondents came from all over the United States and broke down by the National Consortium of Interpreter Education Center Regions as follows:

| <b>The CATIE Center at the College of St. Catherine</b> |    |
|---|----|
| Illinois  | 5  |
| Indiana   | 6  |
| Iowa  | 3  |
| Kansas  | 7  |
| Minnesota   | 16 |
| Missouri  | 2  |
| Ohio  | 6  |
| Wisconsin   | 6  |

| <b>Gallaudet University Regional Interpreter Education Center</b> |   |
|---|---|
| Alabama   | 3 |
| District of Columbia  | 6 |
| Florida   | 4 |
| Georgia   | 4 |
| Kentucky  | 2 |
| Maryland  | 7 |
| North Carolina  | 5 |
| Pennsylvania  | 1 |
| South Carolina  | 2 |
| Tennessee   | 5 |
| Virginia  | 4 |

| <b>Northeastern University Regional Interpreter Education Center</b> |    |
|--|----|
| Maine  | 1  |
| Massachusetts  | 10 |
| New Hampshire  | 1  |
| New Jersey   | 8  |
| New York   | 12 |
| Puerto Rico  | 1  |
| Vermont  | 2  |

| <b>Mid-America Regional Interpreter Education Center</b> |   |
|--|---|
| Arkansas   | 2 |
| Louisiana  | 2 |
| Montana  | 3 |
| New Mexico   | 6 |
| Oklahoma   | 4 |
| Texas  | 9 |
| Utah   | 1 |
| Wyoming  | 1 |

| <b>Western Region Interpreter Education Center</b> |    |
|--|----|
| Alaska   | 2  |
| Arizona  | 4  |
| California   | 16 |
| Hawaii   | 1  |
| Oregon   | 2  |
| Washington   | 3  |

There was also one response from Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

Like the mentee survey results, the largest group of respondents (36%) listed BA/BS as their highest educational degree awarded. But while results of the mentee survey showed AA/AS degrees as the second highest response to this question, the second highest response from the mentors was an MA/MS degree at 28%, followed by an AA/AS degree at 18%. Those with high school diplomas (8%), those currently in college (5%), and those with a doctorate (4%) had a much closer distribution.

Thirty five percent of respondents earned degrees in some form of interpreting, i.e., English/ASL Interpreting, Educational Interpreter Certificate program, Interpreting and Linguistics, and Interpreter Training. Other respondents earned degrees in educational disciplines that ranged dramatically from areas such as psychology, speech pathology and audiology, to business, law, and music.

When asked about interpreter education, 54% of the respondents participated in face-to-face workshops and trainings, 44% received on-the-job training, 32% were graduates of AA/AS degree programs in interpreting, 20% graduated from vocational or short-term programs, and 15% graduated with a BS/BA degree in interpreting. Fourteen percent enrolled in online courses and 9% identified themselves as CODAs.

Seventy five percent of respondents reported holding RID certification, 16% hold NAD certification, and 14% indicated that they currently were not certified. When asked about other diagnostic or quality assessments, 35% listed EIPA, 8% saying they hold no other

credential, with the remainder holding credentials through a variety of state screening/assessment tools.

The top two responses to the question on primary employment were very close with 32% of respondents working in post-secondary institutions and 31% being self-employed. Sixteen percent work in elementary/secondary educational settings. The third highest group on this question at 20% was “other.” Thirty seven percent of the “other” responses listed VRS as their primary employment. Additional examples under the category of “other” were legal settings, schools for the Deaf, and managing interpreter referral services.

Mentors were asked to indicate what percentage of their interpreting time is currently spent in the following roles: practitioner, educator, mentor, supervisor/employer, tutor, or other. Thirty nine percent of the respondents spend 76-100% of their time as practitioners. Thirty nine percent also spend 1-10% of their time as an educator. Over half of the respondents (54%) reported that they spend 1-10% of their time in the role of mentor. Only 1% reported spending 76-100% of their time mentoring. See the table below for more details.

| <b>Use the scale below to indicate what percentage of your current interpreting time is spent in each role:</b> |     |       |        |        |        |         |
|---|-----|-------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
|   | 0%  | 1-10% | 11-25% | 26-50% | 51-75% | 76-100% |
| Practitioner  | 3%  | 10%   | 11%    | 15%    | 23%    | 39%     |
| Educator  | 19% | 39%   | 17%    | 13%    | 7%     | 6%      |
| Mentor  | 4%  | 54%   | 28%    | 10%    | 3%     | 1%      |
| Supervisor/<br>Employer   | 50% | 15%   | 14%    | 6%     | 7%     | 7%      |
| Tutor   | 53% | 29%   | 10%    | 6%     | 1%     | 2%      |
| Other   | 48% | 26%   | 15%    | 5%     | 4%     | 1%      |

A strong majority (90%) of respondents are members of RID, 38% are members of NAD, 32% are CIT members, 18% are members of ASLTA, and 39% noted membership in “other” interpreting-related membership organizations, most of those being RID state affiliate chapters. Eight people listed membership in NAOBI.

## **Part II: About Training to Become a Mentor**

The leading question in part 2 was “Have you received formal mentor training?” The response was almost divided down the middle, with 48% saying “yes,” and 52% saying “no.”

The next set of questions dealt with the specifics regarding training received, such as, when, where, how long, and with whom training was received. The questions for each of these was open ended, so the stage was set to receive a variety of responses, and this is exactly what happened. For example, in response to when mentors received their training, they listed approximate years or a listing of several years in which training happened, i.e., 1999, 2000, 2002. Several mentors listed “ongoing,” “over many years,”

or “mid to late 1990’s.” Some mentors were specific about the leader or site of the training, but only some had specific years attached.

The responses for where mentors received their training were just as diverse. Mentors listed various sites, including the Master Mentor Program, EICP/DOIT Center, Project T.I.E.M., Conference Interpreters Mentorship Project, Southeast Mentorship Project, Online, and Workshops. Many mentorship projects provided in specific states from around the nation were listed, as well as CIT convention workshops and various RID and local RID Chapter events.

In response to the question, “With whom did you receive your training,” mentors listed individual names of instructors (see Appendix for full listing of names), or programs. Programs included Project TIEM, Master Mentor Program, Region IX Mentorship Training Team, UoC Master Mentor Program, DO IT Center, ISLR, NYS Educational Grant through RIT/NTID, MCDHH, MASSRID, Signs of Development, NM Mentoring Program, RITC, Sign Language Associates, Charting the Way Pilot Mentoring Program and Communication Services for the Deaf Pilot Mentoring Program. Various workshops, such as Peer Mentoring Workshop (2005), RID Conference Workshops on Mentoring were listed, as well. A few people indicated confusion over what was being asked of them and if they were to list names of people or programs, and several stated they could not remember.

Generally, more than one response was given on the length of training mentors received. However, the level of intensity of the training was not listed. Seventy eight percent of respondents listed they received one week, or less, of training. Specifically, this included two, eight, and 12 hours; two, three, and four days; weekend; and one week. Twenty three percent of respondents stated they received one to six months of training; ten percent of respondents stated they received nine to 18 months of training; ten percent of respondents stated they received two years of training; and six percent stated they received 50 hours to two weeks of training.

| <b>What was the composition of your mentor educators?</b> |     |
|---|-----|
| deaf only   | 1%  |
| hearing only  | 43% |
| combination of deaf and hearing                           | 56% |

Fifty six percent of respondents stated that the composition of their mentor educators were a combination of deaf and hearing; 43% stated they were hearing only, and one percent stated they were deaf only.

When asked with what approaches/philosophies they were trained, the majority (71%) said it was mentee/protégé-centered. The second highest group of respondents (15%) wrote in comments that typically included a combination of two or all types of approaches and philosophies. Only eight percent of respondents stated that the approaches/philosophies of their training were peer-directed and only seven percent said it was mentor-directed.

| <b>What, if any, prerequisites did you need to satisfy in order to participate in your mentor training(s)?</b> |     |
|--|-----|
| certification  | 65% |
| certain number of years in the field (please specify number of years in <i>other</i> box, below)               | 38% |
| referred by another individual   | 27% |
| letters of reference   | 26% |
| academic degree  | 9%  |
| teaching experience  | 8%  |

Regarding prerequisites needed in order to participate in mentor training, 65% of the respondents listed certification. Others (38%) stated that a certain number of years in the field was necessary, and listed various comments specifying the requirement, including that they must be a working interpreter; that they needed a letter of interest and application; that they needed to be a working interpreter for a minimum of 10 hours per week; that they needed to have five years of experience; that they needed to be in the ITP; that they didn't remember; that they needed to submit a videotape of their skills; or that they needed to attend an orientation workshop. Twenty seven percent of respondents said they needed to be referred by another individual and 26% said they needed to submit letters of reference. Only nine percent listed academic degree and eight percent listed teaching experience as prerequisites.

When asked if they were trained to provide language-specific or interpreting-specific mentoring services, 67% responded "both." Thirty two percent of the mentors listed interpretation, and only one percent listed language.

| <b>Did the training(s) prepare you adequately to provide mentorship services?</b>   |     |
|---|-----|
| left the training well prepared and confident                                       | 37% |
| left the training with a good number of skills but not as confident as I would like | 36% |
| left the training with adequate skills  | 24% |
| left the training ill prepared to conduct an effective mentorship                   | 3%  |

Most respondents (37%), when asked if the training prepared them adequately to provide mentorship services, stated that they left the training well prepared and confident. In close proximity to this, 36% of respondents stated they left the training with a good number of skills, but they were not as confident as they would like. Twenty four percent said they left the training with adequate skills, and only three percent said they left the training ill prepared to conduct an effective mentorship.

| <b>What would have enhanced or improved the mentor training(s) you received?</b> |     |
|--|-----|
| provision of wider range of mentoring tools                                      | 50% |
| longer training period   | 41% |
| better skilled trainers  | 6%  |
| Other  | 38% |

A majority of mentors (50%) felt provision of a wider range of mentoring tools would have enhanced or improved the mentor training(s) they received. Some mentors (41%) said that a longer training period would have. Better skilled trainers were listed by only 6% of the respondents. Other comments included things such as, supervision and onsite

training, follow-up or refresher courses, more Deaf instructors, more role plays or additional practice, and more dialogue. Fewer comments included things such as updated models and materials, funding available, preview tools before training, intense focus on language, clearer expectations of goals, programs resulting in permits or certificates for mentors, Hispanic and Latino trainers, and learning chronology and progression.

When asked if respondents have trained others to serve as mentors, 72% stated no, and 28% stated yes. Additional comments expanded on the types of training programs that were subsequently designed or the types of programs respondents participated in as mentors.

| <b>If you have <i>not</i> received formal mentor training, how did you obtain your skills as a mentor?<br/>(please check all that apply)</b> |     |
|--|-----|
| learned informally from other mentors  | 63% |
| previous experience as a mentee/protégé  | 39% |
| conducted personal research and literature review  | 33% |
| N/A  | 27% |
| Other  | 23% |

Mentors that did not receive formal training stated that they obtained their skills by learning informally from other mentors (63%), or through previous experience as a mentee/protégé (39%), or by conducting personal research and literature review (33%). Twenty seven percent of the mentors said the question did not apply to them, but 23% listed additional comments, including things such as workshops or courses (42%), self taught through reading materials or on the job training (28%), previous training as teachers (20%), and through mentoring relationships (18%).

Eighty nine percent of the respondents felt that mentor training was essential, where only 11% did not feel that it was essential. In support of this, 85% of the respondents said that they would participate in mentor training at this time in their career, whereas only 15% said they would not.

### **Part III: About Experiences as a Mentor**

A majority of respondents (60%) said they first began mentoring more than 5 years ago. At a distant second, 23% of respondents said they first began mentoring 1-3 years ago. Twelve percent said they first began mentoring 4-5 years ago and only six percent said they began less than one year ago.

When asked about how often they mentored 42% of the respondents said regularly, 31% said occasionally, 18% said sporadically, and 8% said rarely. Most respondents (41%) answered the question “How many individuals have you mentored throughout your career?” with more than ten individuals, but 24% said five to ten individuals, 20% said four to five individuals, 13% said two to three individuals, and three percent said one.

| <b>Use the scale below to estimate the percentage of the individuals you've mentored who have been:</b> |           |              |               |               |               |                |
|---|-----------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
|   | <b>0%</b> | <b>1-10%</b> | <b>11-25%</b> | <b>26-50%</b> | <b>51-75%</b> | <b>76-100%</b> |
| pre-certified   | 4%        | 7%           | 5%            | 11%           | 26%           | 47%            |
| certified   | 31%       | 29%          | 21%           | 12%           | 3%            | 3%             |
| Deaf  | 64%       | 26%          | 5%            | 3%            | 1%            | 1%             |
| hearing   | 1%        | 4%           | 1%            | 2%            | 10%           | 82%            |
| trilingual  | 66%       | 26%          | 5%            | 2%            | 1%            | 1%             |
| recent ITP graduate   | 7%        | 23%          | 13%           | 23%           | 19%           | 16%            |
| working interpreter   | 9%        | 16%          | 14%           | 19%           | 20%           | 23%            |
| other   | 57%       | 16%          | 10%           | 4%            | 1%            | 11%            |

The people conducting the survey really wanted to get a good idea of who has been served by this group of respondents, so asked them to estimate the percentage of the individuals they mentored who had been pre-certified, certified, Deaf, hearing, trilingual, recent ITP graduate, working interpreter, or other. Responses were across the board, but 47% of the respondents said 76-100% of the individuals they mentored were pre-certified, while 26% of the respondents said 51-75% of the individuals they mentored were pre-certified, 11% said that 26-50% of the individuals they mentored were pre-certified, seven percent said that 1-10% of the individuals they mentored were pre-certified, five percent said 11-25% of the individuals they mentored were pre-certified, and four percent said none of the individuals they mentored were pre-certified.

The next category dealt with certified interpreters to which 31% of respondents said they had not mentored any of these individuals, while 29% mentored only 1-10% of these individuals. Twenty one percent said they mentored 11-25% of these individuals, and 12% said they mentored 26-50% of these individuals. Only three percent of respondents said they mentored 51-75% certified interpreters and again, only three percent of respondents said they mentored 76-100% certified interpreters.

An overwhelming 64% of respondents replied that they had not mentored any Deaf people, and 26% said they mentored only 1-10% Deaf individuals. Five percent of the respondents said they mentored 11-25% Deaf people, three percent mentored 26-50% Deaf people, and only one percent said they mentored 51-75% and 76-100% of Deaf individuals, respectively.

In exact contrast to responses regarding mentoring Deaf people, 82% of respondents said they mentored 76-100% hearing people. Ten percent said they mentored 51-75% hearing people, four percent said they mentored 1-10% hearing people, and only two percent said they mentored 26-50% hearing people. One percent of the respondents mentored 11-25% hearing people, and only one percent stated they mentored no hearing people.

It may not be surprising that at this point in our history, not many of the mentors surveyed reported mentoring a trilingual interpreter. Sixty six percent of the respondents said they had never mentored a trilingual individual, and 26% said they had mentored



only 1-10%. Five percent of the respondents stated they mentored 11-25% trilingual individuals, two percent said they mentored 26-50% trilingual individuals, and only one percent said they mentored 51-75% and 76-100% of trilingual individuals, respectively.

Recent ITP graduates got the most evenly dispersed number of responses. Twenty three percent of the respondents said they had mentored 1-10%, and 26-50% recent ITP graduates, respectively. Nineteen percent mentored 51-75% in this category, 16% mentored 76-100% in this category, and 13% mentored 11-25% in this category. Only seven percent of the respondents said they did not mentor anyone in this category.

Responses were fairly evenly distributed in each area for working interpreters. Leading the group, 23% of respondents said they mentored 76-100% of working interpreters. Closely following this, twenty percent said they mentored 51-75% of working interpreters, 19% said they mentored 26-50%, 16% replied they had worked with 1-10% of them, 14% responded they worked with 11-25% of working interpreters, and nine percent said they worked with nobody from this group.

The “other” category is undefined. However, the largest number of respondents (57%) said they had mentored nobody in this category. Next, at 16%, respondents stated they mentored 1-10% of “other” individuals, 11% said they worked with 76-100% of “other” individuals, and 10% listed that they worked with 11-25% in this category. Four percent of respondents said they worked with 26-50% of other” individuals and only one percent worked with 51-75% of them.

| <b>Generally, do you mentor people individually or in groups?</b> |     |
|---|-----|
| individually  | 64% |
| small groups  | 1%  |
| both  | 35% |

The survey question, “Generally, do you mentor people individually or in groups?” resulted in the following: Sixty four percent of respondents said they mentored people individually; thirty five percent mentored people both individually and in small groups. Only one percent of the respondents said they mentored people in small groups alone.

When asked how many participants were mentored at one time, if they mentored in small groups, 55% of the respondents said this did not apply. Twenty four percent said they mentored 2-3 participants; 13% said they mentored 4-6 participants, and eight percent said they mentored 7 or more participants.

| <b>What do you feel is an optimum number of participants for a small group mentorship?</b> |     |
|--|-----|
| 2-3 participants   | 67% |
| 4-6 participants   | 29% |
| 7+ participants  | 4%  |

Respondents were then asked what they felt was the optimum number of participants for a small group mentorship? Sixty seven percent (67%) of the mentors preferred 2-3

participants per small group, while 29% preferred 4-6 participants. Only four percent (4%) stated that they found seven or more participants to be the optimum number for small group mentorship.

| <b>Use the scale below to approximate what percentage of your time involves mentoring in the following settings</b> |           |              |               |               |               |                |
|---|-----------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
|   | <b>0%</b> | <b>1-10%</b> | <b>11-25%</b> | <b>26-50%</b> | <b>51-75%</b> | <b>76-100%</b> |
| medical settings  | 52%       | 29%          | 9%            | 5%            | 4%            | 1%             |
| K-12  | 41%       | 15%          | 7%            | 6%            | 12%           | 20%            |
| post-secondary education  | 22%       | 25%          | 15%           | 11%           | 10%           | 17%            |
| technical/vocational training   | 51%       | 29%          | 12%           | 3%            | 3%            | 2%             |
| business  | 47%       | 22%          | 18%           | 8%            | 5%            | 1%             |
| social service  | 45%       | 25%          | 16%           | 9%            | 4%            | 1%             |
| legal settings  | 77%       | 9%           | 10%           | 3%            | 0%            | 1%             |
| mental health settings  | 60%       | 25%          | 9%            | 4%            | 1%            | 1%             |
| religious settings  | 53%       | 24%          | 9%            | 8%            | 4%            | 3%             |
| Vocational Rehabilitation   | 64%       | 21%          | 8%            | 5%            | 2%            | 0%             |
| VRS/VRI   | 70%       | 12%          | 7%            | 6%            | %             | 1%             |

Fifty two percent of respondents said they spent no time mentoring in medical settings, where 29% said they spent 1-10% of their time there, while nine percent spent 11-25% of their time in medical settings, five percent spent 26-50% of their time in medical settings, four percent spent 51-75% of their time in medical settings, and only one percent spent 76-100% of their time in medical settings.

Forty one percent of the respondents said they spent no time mentoring in K-12 settings, where 20% said they spent 76-100% of their time there. Fifteen percent spent 1-10% of their time in K-12 settings, 12% spent 51-75% of their time in K-12 settings, seven percent spent 11-25% of their time there, and only six percent spent 26-50% of their time in K-12 settings.

Twenty five percent of the respondents said they spent 1-10% of their time mentoring in post-secondary education settings, where 22% said they spent no time there. Seventeen percent spent 76-100% of their time in post-secondary education settings, 15% spent 11-25% of their time there, 11% percent spent 26-50% of their time there, and only 10% spent 51-75% of their time in post-secondary education settings.

Fifty one percent of respondents said they spent no time mentoring in technical/vocational training, where 29% said they spent 1-10% of their time there. Twelve percent spent 11-25% of their time in technical/vocational training, three percent spent 26-50% and 51-75% of their time there, and only two percent spent 76-100% of their time in technical/vocational training settings.

Forty seven percent of respondents said they spent no time mentoring in business settings, where 22% said they spent 1-10% of their time there. Eighteen percent spent

11-25% of their time in business settings, eight percent spent 26-50% and five percent spent 51-75% of their time there. Only one percent spent 76-100% of their time mentoring in business settings.

Forty five percent of respondents said they spent no time mentoring in social service settings, where 25% said they spent 1-10% of their time there. Sixteen percent spent 11-25% of their time in social service settings, nine percent spent 26-50% and four percent spent 51-75% of their time there. Only one percent spent 76-100% of their time mentoring in social service settings.

Seventy seven percent of respondents said they spent no time mentoring in legal settings. Ten percent said they spent 11-25% of their time there, nine percent spent 1-10% of their time in legal settings, three percent spent 26-50% and only one percent spent 76-100% of their time there. Nobody (0%) spent 76-100% of their time mentoring in legal settings.

Sixty percent of respondents said they spent no time mentoring in mental health settings, where 25% said they spent 1-10% of their time there. Nine percent spent 11-25% of their time in mental health settings, and four percent spent 26-50% of their time there. Only one percent spent 51-75% or 76-100% of their time mentoring in mental health settings.

Fifty three percent of respondents said they spent no time mentoring in religious settings. Twenty four percent said they spent 1-10% of their time there, nine percent spent 11-25% of their time in religious settings, eight percent spent 26-50% and four percent spent 51-75% of their time there. Three percent of the mentors spent 76-100% of their time mentoring in religious settings.

Sixty four percent of respondents said they spent no time mentoring in Vocational Rehabilitation settings. Twenty one percent said they spent 1-10% of their time there, eight percent spent 11-25% of their time in Vocational Rehabilitation settings, five percent spent 26-50% and only two percent spent 51-75% of their time there. Nobody spent 76-100% of their time mentoring in Vocational Rehabilitation settings.

Seventy percent of respondents said they spent no time mentoring in VRS/VRI settings. Twelve percent said they spent 1-10% of their time there, seven percent spent 11-25% of their time in VRS/VRI settings, six percent spent 26-50% and four percent spent 51-75% of their time there. Only one percent spent 76-100% of their time mentoring in VRS/VRI settings.

| <b>How have individuals been referred to you for mentoring services? (please check all that apply)</b> |     |
|--|-----|
| personal contact   | 75% |
| by another interpreter   | 56% |
| by a Deaf person   | 26% |
| by an employer   | 41% |
| by a regional interpreter education center or other professional organization                          | 41% |
| I contacted the individual.  | 9%  |
| Other  | 18% |

The largest number of respondents (75%) said that individuals were referred to them for mentoring services by personal contact. The next leading group (56%) said it was by another interpreter. Individuals were referred, “by an employer,” and “by a regional interpreter education center or other professional organization” equally according to 41% of the respondents. But a lesser number of respondents (26%) said the individuals were referred to them by a Deaf person, and even fewer (9%) said that they contacted the individual. Other responses included such things as through Interpreter Education Programs, through special advertisements on websites, at workshops and presentations, and through newsletters or course catalogs. Several people said individuals were referred to them as part of a mentoring program.

| <b>In most cases, are you paid for your services?</b> |     |
|---|-----|
| Yes (please specify amount below)                     | 9%  |
| No  | 54% |
| Please specify amount if you answered Yes.            | 38% |

Most mentors (54%) said they were not paid for their services, and only nine percent said they were paid. However, according to the comments made by respondents, it seems a majority of the mentors (71%) were paid as part of their regular salary rather than separately or directly for mentorship services. Specific amounts varied greatly, and many people responded that it depended on the situation, or the financial ability of the mentee, or on the specific services provided. Others said they would barter or negotiate, or were given gifts in lieu of their services. Some charged the same rate as their freelance interpreting fee; some were paid by the semester (\$500 - \$1,000). Some charged flat rates, such as \$300 - \$600 per day, or \$200 per 10 hours of mentoring, or \$75 for two hours of mentoring. Some stated they worked on a sliding scale, charging \$50 and up, depending on the service provided.

| <b>Please use the scale below to approximate what percentage of your service was paid for by each group.</b> |     |       |        |        |        |         |
|--|-----|-------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
|  | 0%  | 1-10% | 11-25% | 26-50% | 51-75% | 76-100% |
| the individual   | 61% | 9%    | 8%     | 6%     | 6%     | 9%      |
| an interpreter education program   | 57% | 10%   | 6%     | 5%     | 4%     | 19%     |
| an employer  | 32% | 3%    | 5%     | 8%     | 9%     | 42%     |
| an RSA stipend   | 82% | 5%    | 5%     | 1%     | 1%     | 4%      |
| a mentorship program   | 56% | 10%   | 5%     | 9%     | 6%     | 15%     |
| other  | 83% | 4%    | 24%    | 4%     | 4%     | 2%      |

Sixty one percent of respondents said none of their service was paid for by the individual. Nine percent said 1-10% and 76-100% were paid for by the individual. Eight percent

said 11-25% of their service was paid for by the individual; while six percent said 26-50% and 51-75% were paid for by the individual.

Fifteen percent of respondents said none of their service was paid for by an interpreter education program. Nineteen percent said 76-100% was paid for by an interpreter education program. Ten percent said 1-10% of their service was paid for by an interpreter education program; while six percent said 11-25% was, five percent said 26-50% was, and four percent said 51-57% was paid for by an interpreter education program.

Forty two percent of respondents said 76-100% of their service was paid for by an employer, while thirty two percent said none of their service was. Nine percent said 51-75% was, and eight percent said 26-50% was paid for by an employer. Eight percent said 26-50% of their service was paid for by an employer; while five percent said 11-25% was and three percent said 1-10% was paid for by an employer.

Eighty two percent of respondents said none of their service was paid for by an RSA stipend. Equal at five percent, respondents said 1-10%, 11-25% was paid for by an RSA stipend while four percent said 76-100% was. Only one percent said 26-50% and 51-75% was paid for by an RSA stipend.

Fifty six percent of respondents said none of their service was paid for by a mentorship program. Fifteen percent said 76-100% was paid for by a mentorship program and ten percent said 1-10% of it was. Nine percent said 26-50% of their service was paid for by a mentorship program; while six percent said 51-75% was and five percent said 11-25% was paid for by a mentorship program.

| <b>Do you receive compensation in a timely manner?</b> |     |
|--|-----|
| regularly  | 84% |
| occasionally   | 9%  |
| sporadically   | 3%  |
| rarely   | 4%  |

Mentors regularly received compensation in a timely manner in 84% of the cases. Nine percent occasionally received compensation in a timely manner, whereas only four percent rarely did, and three percent sporadically did.

| <b>How do others know that you are a mentor? (please check all that apply)</b> |     |
|--|-----|
| self-promotion   | 18% |
| listed on mentoring directories  | 12% |
| word-of-mouth  | 66% |
| people just seek me out  | 49% |
| mentorship program   | 41% |
| Other  | 20% |

Word of mouth seemed to be the main way others knew that 66% of the respondents were mentors. For 49% of the mentors, people just sought them out, and 41% of the mentors

were known through a mentorship program. Eighteen percent did self-promotion, and 12% were listed on mentoring directories. Other comments indicated others knew mentors through working relationships, local Interpreter Education Programs, assignment through a mentorship program, and through email announcements.

| <b>What type of structure is provided in your mentoring services? (please check all that apply)</b> |     |
|---|-----|
| a structured program adhering to set goals and objectives   | 28% |
| a structured program with flexible goals and objectives   | 61% |
| unstructured program with no specific goals and objectives  | 12% |
| whatever the individual asked of me   | 44% |
| Other   | 15% |

Respondents were asked to check all types of structures provided in their mentoring services. Most types (61%) were structured programs with flexible goals and objectives, but 44% said it was whatever the individual asked of the mentor. The structure provided in 28% of the services were structured programs adhering to set goals and objectives, while 12% were unstructured programs with no specific goals and objectives. Other comments indicated that they combined various types of structures, or that the company or state set the structure and requirements of the mentorship. Some stated that their structure was based on what was needed to prepare the mentee for a certification exam or in response to diagnostic assessments that had been done.

| <b>Which type of program do you feel is most effective?</b>                             |     |
|---|-----|
| a structured program adhering to set goals and objectives                               | 9%  |
| a structured program with flexible goals and objectives                                 | 39% |
| unstructured program with no specific goals and objectives                              | 0%  |
| whatever the individual asked of me   | 3%  |
| all programmatic strategies have a place and function depending upon the mentee/protégé | 48% |
| Other   | 2%  |

Most mentors (48%) felt that there was not one type of program that was most effective, but that all programmatic strategies have a place and function depending upon the mentee/protégé while 39% percent felt that a structured program with flexible goals and objectives was most effective. Only nine percent felt that a structured program adhering to set goals and objectives was most effective, and three percent stated the most effective program was “whatever the individual asked of me.” Nobody (0%) thought an unstructured program with no specific goals and objectives was most effective. Other comments stated that mentee/protégé centered programs, and those that were informal, and conducted over time were not effective.

| <b>What formats do you employ when conducting a mentorship activity? (please check all that apply)</b> |     |
|--|-----|
| mentor observation of mentee/protégé in real life setting  | 86% |
| mentor observation of mentee/protégé in mock settings  | 63% |
| mentee/protégé observation of mentor in real life settings   | 75% |
| mentee/protégé observation of mentor in mock settings  | 36% |
| face-to-face discussion  | 93% |
| review of video/DVD interpretations of individual  | 76% |
| online   | 14% |
| Other  | 13% |

A combination of formats were generally used when conducting mentorship activities, but at least 93% utilized face-to-face discussion, and 86% of the mentors observed the mentee/protégé in real life settings. Seventy six percent of the mentors reviewed video/DVD interpretations of the individual, and 75% had the mentee/protégé observe the mentor in real life settings. Sixty three percent of the mentors observed the mentee/protégé in mock settings, while 36% of the mentors had the mentees/protégés observe the mentor in mock settings. Fourteen percent of the mentors conducted the mentorship activity online. Other formats included transcript analysis, journaling, and attendance at Deaf community events, assessments, reading specific mentoring guidebooks, small and large group discussions, and self-observations.

| <b>Of the formats used, which do you employ most often?</b> |     |
|---|-----|
| observation in real life setting                            | 40% |
| face-to-face discussion                                     | 34% |
| live interpretations in mock setting                        | 6%  |
| review of video/DVD interpretation of individual            | 12% |
| online  | 2%  |
| diagnostics   | 2%  |
| Other   | 3%  |

The formats employed most often were observation in real life setting (40%) and face-to-face discussion (34%). Twelve percent of the formats most employed were review of video/DVD interpretation of the individual, and six percent employed live interpretations in mock settings. Only two percent of the respondents employed online formats or diagnostics. Other formats used included remote video, real life interpretation with follow-up discussion, and review of taped interpretation of the mentee/protégé. Several people indicated that the format would vary depending on the situation and the mentee/protégé.

| <b>As part of your mentoring services, which of the following do you, or the mentorship program you work for, require? (please check all that apply)</b> |     |
|--|-----|
| signed contract of agreement on work to be done during mentoring sessions  | 43% |
| a minimum number of hours to be completed  | 58% |
| specific attendance requirements   | 53% |
| homework assignments   | 42% |
| end-of-mentorship evaluation   | 60% |
| Other  | 19% |

The majority (60%) of mentors, or mentorship programs mentors worked for, required end-of-mentorship evaluations. Closely following that, 58% required a minimum number of hours to be completed, and 53% had specific attendance requirements. Forty three percent required a signed contract of agreement on work to be done during mentoring sessions, and 42% required homework assignments. Other requirements included mid-point evaluations, portfolios, reports, journaling, logs, or note taking. Some mentors required regular meetings or discussions, oral contracts, pre-work and post-work samples, and sitting for a certification exam.

| <b>What percentage of the time is a mentorship successfully completed?</b> |     |
|--|-----|
| 0-20%  | 4%  |
| 21-40%   | 4%  |
| 41-60%   | 15% |
| 61-80%   | 28% |
| 81-100%  | 49% |

Forty nine of the mentors indicated that 81-100% of the mentorships are completed successfully. Twenty eight percent said 61-80% of the time mentorships were completed successfully and 15% said 41-60% of them were. Only four percent said either 0-20% or 21-40% of the mentorships was completed successfully.

| <b>What top three factors contributed to the success of the mentorships you provided?</b> |     |
|---|-----|
| motivation of mentor  | 36% |
| motivation of mentee/protégé  | 90% |
| compatibility between mentor and mentee/protégé   | 51% |
| objectives and expectations clearly understood  | 53% |
| financial support provided  | 7%  |
| compatible schedules  | 34% |
| geography   | 8%  |
| professional or personal priorities remained consistent                                   | 29% |
| Other   | 8%  |

The top three factors contributing to the success of the mentorships provided were motivation of mentee/protégé (90%), objectives and expectations clearly understood (53%), and compatibility between mentor and mentee/protégé (51%). Thirty six percent listed motivation of the mentor as one of the top three factors, while 34% listed compatible schedules, and 29% listed professional or personal priorities remained consistent. Only eight percent listed geography as a factor, and only seven percent listed financial support provided as a factor. Other factors included supportive environment, variety of assignments, trust, having multiple mentors, effective mentoring skills, and journaling.



| <b>What top three factors contributed to the failure of the mentorships you provided?</b> |     |
|---|-----|
| time constraints/scheduling   | 62% |
| lack of motivation of mentor  | 11% |
| lack of motivation of mentee/protégé  | 64% |
| geography   | 18% |
| financial restrictions  | 14% |
| change in professional or personal priorities   | 39% |
| incompatibility between mentor and mentee/protégé   | 26% |
| lack of understanding of expectations   | 36% |
| Other   | 8%  |

The top three factors that contributed to the failure of the mentorship provided were listed as lack of motivation of mentee/protégé (64%), time constraints/scheduling (62%), and change in professional or personal priorities (39%). Thirty six percent listed lack of understanding of expectations as a factor, and 26% listed incompatibility between mentor and mentee/protégé. Only 18% listed geography, 14% listed financial restrictions and only 11% listed lack of motivation of the mentor as factors. Other factors included no trust, the mentee/protégé was not ready to interpret, or was overcommitted to other priorities, the mentee/protégé quit prematurely, or was unwilling to accept any feedback. One person stated the mentor lacked skills and strategies, and another said there were not enough real life opportunities available.

| <b>Do you find serving as a mentor to be rewarding?</b> |     |
|---|-----|
| Yes   | 98% |
| No  | 2%  |

Ninety eight percent of the respondents found serving as a mentor to be rewarding, and only two percent did not.

| <b>Would you like to serve as a mentor full time?</b> |     |
|---|-----|
| Yes   | 26% |
| No  | 74% |

In response to the question, asking if they would like to serve as a mentor full time the majority of respondents (74%) stated that they would not. Many of them qualified their response with statements such as, “it’s a lot of work!” “It is too labor-intensive for the pay,” and “It is too stressful.” Other statements indicated the mentor enjoyed the work, but wanted a balance between mentoring and teaching, interpreting, etc. Likewise, some respondents felt their work as mentors was enhanced because of their work as practitioners. The two following statements seemed to sum up the sentiments of many others, “being a practitioner makes me a more credible mentor,” and “part of what makes me an effective mentor is that I am still very much a practitioner.” Twenty six percent of respondents said they would like to serve as a mentor full time, and several people indicated that they already do. Positive statements regarding mentoring full time included “I love mentoring!” “It is a rewarding and constantly learning experience,” and “I find it exciting to see the growth in the mentee that I can tag as something I helped them develop.” Some people stated they would like to mentor full time, but only if

certain conditions were met, like being able to determine the format and approach to the mentorship.

| <b>Do you think you would be able to earn a living as a full time mentor?</b> |     |
|---|-----|
| Yes   | 21% |
| No  | 79% |

At 79%, the overwhelming response to the question, “Do you think you would be able to earn a living as a full time mentor?” was no. Only 21% of the respondents said yes. Individual comments generally reflected the general consensus rejecting the idea that a person could earn a living full time as a mentor, and included sentiments that many interpreters don’t think they need mentorship, it is not financially viable, no funding resources are available, people want mentoring for free, and there is enough need for mentorship, but not enough need to make a living. Some people felt it was possible to make a living as a full time mentor, some were not sure, and some said they would not want to do it full time.

| <b>In addition to mentoring interpreting, do you mentor any of the following individuals?</b> |     |
|---|-----|
| interpreting educators  | 37% |
| other interpreting mentors  | 56% |
| Other   | 39% |

Fifty six percent of the respondents stated they mentored other interpreting mentors, and 37% said they mentored interpreting educators. Other individuals mentored included peers, interpreting managers, ASL teachers or individuals that wanted to improve ASL fluency. New faculty, staff, and consumers were also listed. One respondent mentored “at risk teens.”

#### **Part IV: Your Thoughts Regarding Effective Practices in Mentoring**

Sixty two percent of mentors refer to the individual being mentored as a mentee. Eleven percent use the term protégé, and 27% selected “other” and wrote in the terms they use which included team interpreter, interpreter, colleague, apprentice, intern, pre-certified interpreter, novice, rookie, trainee, and student. When asked if there’s a term other than mentee/protégé that’s better suited to the individual receiving mentoring services, 70% of the respondents felt that there is no term that’s better suited. Of the 30% feeling there is a better term, the most common suggestions were interpreter, colleague, and intern. Another repeated suggestion was that the term being used should depend on the situation (i.e. sometimes use intern, sometimes student, sometimes colleague). Many expressed dissatisfaction with the terms mentee and protégé but were unable to come up with other suggestions.

| <b>What top three factors do you feel contribute to an individual's reluctance to utilize mentor services?</b> |     |
|--|-----|
| personal insecurity about one's interpreting ability   | 64% |
| not enough trained mentors in the area   | 38% |
| interpreter's perception that skills are fully developed and not necessary of improvement                      | 30% |
| lack of understanding of the mentorship process by the mentee/protégé  | 31% |
| lack of understanding of the mentorship process by the IEP educators   | 7%  |
| lack of self-perception of the need to enhance skills  | 38% |
| negative past experience as a mentee/protégé   | 28% |
| lack of understanding on how to obtain a mentor  | 22% |
| lack of financial resources  | 34% |
| inadequate/insufficient advertising of mentorship services   | 15% |
| Other  | 9%  |

The top three factors respondents felt contribute to an individual's reluctance to utilize mentor services were personal insecurity about one's interpreting ability (64%), a lack of self-perception of the need to enhance skills (38%), and not enough trained mentors in the area (also at 38%). The next highest responses, with a fairly close distribution, were lack of financial resources (34%), lack of understanding of the mentorship process by the mentee/protégé (31%), and the interpreter's perception that skills are fully developed and not necessary of improvement (30%), and a negative past experience as a mentee/protégé (28%).

| <b>What do you feel the minimum qualifications should be for a mentor? (please check all that apply)</b> |     |
|--|-----|
| educator   | 24% |
| certification  | 68% |
| mentor training  | 73% |
| a minimum number of years working the field  | 75% |
| academic credentials (please see following question)   | 37% |
| Other  | 17% |

There was a fairly close distribution of the top three responses to the question on minimum qualifications for a mentor, including a minimum number of years working in the field (75%), mentor training (73%) and certification (68%). The next highest response rates to this question were academic credentials (37%) and experience as an interpreter educator (24%). Seventeen percent added to their responses with write-in answers, many of which could come under the personality/communication style category (i.e. an excitement in seeing others improve, interpersonal skills, attitude, ability to be positive) and others mentioned experience as a mentee as a minimum qualification for a mentor. Of those who selected academic credentials as a mentor's minimum qualification, 61% felt that should be a BA/BS degree. Twenty-nine percent suggested an AA/AS degree, with only 10% feeling that a master's degree should be a minimum qualification for a mentor.

When asked about the minimum number of training/credit hours required for an individual to obtain the knowledge and skills needed to conduct effective mentorships, the highest response, at 41%, was "while an academic quarter or semester course would

be desirable, 20-30 hours of intensive training is adequate.” Twenty four percent of the respondents decided to write in open-ended responses that mainly fell into two groups. Many indicated that they really didn’t know how many hours were required. Others suggested that “it depends...” on for example, the needs of the mentee, the level of involvement, prior experience, other training, on the individual, etc.

| <b>In which formats do you feel training of mentors is most effectively offered?</b> |     |
|--|-----|
| face-to-face training only   | 27% |
| online only  | 0%  |
| blended training   | 27% |
| any and all formats can be effective   | 46% |

Interestingly, when asked about the format of the trainings, 46% felt that any and all formats can be effective, but zero percent of respondents selected online training only. Face-to-face training only and blended training both came in at 27%.

Sixty four percent felt that mentors do not need to go through a certification process similar to interpreter certification, with the remaining 36% preferring that there be an additional certification required of mentors.

Over half the respondents (57%) felt that diagnostic information would be helpful as the mentor and mentee/protégé design a mentorship. Twenty nine percent indicated that mentorships should have the latitude to be structured between the mentor and mentee/protégé without outside influence.

| <b>If someone were to ask you, what the state of the mentorship experience is today, how would you answer? (please check all that apply)</b> |     |
|--|-----|
| unknown to most interpreters in the field  | 10% |
| recognized as “existing” but misunderstood by most   | 54% |
| perceived by many as an excellent way to improve skill but most would not seek it out  | 40% |
| an activity more and more interpreters seek out on a regular basis   | 18% |

When asked about the state of mentorship today, 54% selected “recognized as existing but misunderstood by most,” with 40% choosing “perceived by many as an excellent way to improve skill but most would not seek it out.”

Using a liker scale, survey participants were asked “Do you agree with this statement? Mentorship is considered one of the best methods or tools for enhancing skills of working interpreters and closing the readiness gap for recent graduates.” Sixty percent strongly agreed, 37% agreed, only 3% disagreed, and 0% strongly disagreed.

| <b>What do you believe are the trends in the supply and demand for mentors?</b>                                     |     |
|---|-----|
| Mentoring is an activity that has seen its time and the supply is greater than the demand.                          | 3%  |
| Today's mentors are able to meet tomorrow's demand for mentorships.   | 7%  |
| Mentoring services will grow at a slow and steady pace and therefore an additional cadre of mentors will be needed. | 52% |
| Mentorship requests far outpace the supply of trained mentors and will only continue to grow at a rapid pace.       | 43% |

When asked about beliefs regarding the trends in the supply and demand for mentors, just over half (52%) indicated that they believe “mentoring services will grow at a slow and steady pace and therefore an additional cadre of mentors will be needed,” with 43% believing that “mentorship requests far outpace the supply of trained mentors and will only continue to grow at a rapid pace.” Only a small number of respondents (7%) felt that “today’s mentors are able to meet tomorrow’s demand for mentorships” with three percent suggesting that “mentoring is an activity that has seen its time and the supply is greater than the demand.”

When the mentors were asked to list what they considered to be key elements in successful practices in mentoring, several responses appeared repeatedly including: mentee/protégé driven, clear goals/roles/expectations/timelines, trained mentors, measurable goals, mutual respect and trust, matching schedules (mentor and mentee), motivation, learner centered, and mentor’s listening ability.

Respondents were asked what additional philosophies they bring to mentorship. The most common responses were the Vygotskian, mentee centered approach, that the mentor and mentee both contribute, both teach and learn, both have strengths and weaknesses, that there be an attitude of lifelong learning, and several mentioned the importance of involving Deaf consumers in the mentoring process.

### **Part V: About Your Experiences as a Mentee/Protégé**

People were asked to skip to the end of the survey if they did not also have experience as a mentee/protégé. Of the 241 people who began taking this survey, 198 completed at least part of this section.

Forty four percent of the respondents indicated they were a mentee/protégé two to three times. There was a close distribution in the remaining responses to this question with 20% being a mentee one time, 19% more than five times, and 17% four to five times.

When asked when their first mentorship experience occurred, 77% percent indicated that it was more than five years ago. The percentages went down from there with 13% indicating their first mentorship relationship was two to five years ago, four percent reported that it took place more than one year ago, but less than two years ago, again four percent in the past twelve months, with only two percent currently receiving mentorship services.

| Why did you seek out a mentorship?   |     |
|--|-----|
| Improve my interpretation skills   | 68% |
| Become more aware of my interpreting and/or language weaknesses and strength | 60% |
| Receive direct feedback on my weaknesses and strengths                       | 54% |
| Receive direction on how to improve my weaknesses                            | 47% |
| Improve my language skills   | 43% |
| Prepare to take a certification exam   | 36% |
| Improve my ability to make ethical decisions                                 | 30% |
| Did not have any expectations before being mentored                          | 10% |

The most common reason people sought out mentorship was to improve their interpretation skills (68%) but they often sought mentorship for more than one reason. See the table below for the full picture for complete responses to the question, “Why did you seek out a mentorship?”

Half of the people surveyed reported that when they were mentees, the mentors they worked with were “more than qualified.” Forty percent indicated that the mentors were “adequately qualified” while eight percent indicated only “marginally qualified.” Only one percent reported that their mentors were “not qualified.”

An overwhelming majority (90%) were generally satisfied with their experiences as a mentee. Eighty three percent even report that they are interested in participating in another mentorship as a mentee/protégé.

The final question on the survey asked “Do you have any additional comments you would like to share with us regarding mentorship?” Many of these comments fell into three main categories, 1. concerns, 2. suggestions, and 3. overall feelings about mentorship in general.

Examples of some of the concerns expressed:

- I appreciate the mentee lead approach, but some take it to a level where nothing ever comes of the mentorship.
- I think one of the main issues is money. There are many interpreters in my community who want mentoring, but don't want to pay for it. I can't give my time away, but to charge what my time is worth seems cost prohibitive for some educational interpreters making less than \$19,000/year.
- The "weekend workshop preparation for mentors" should be outlawed.

Some suggestions given are as follows:

- One thing that might help is to have a structured internship program upon graduation from an ITP. Mentorship programs often are elective and too unstructured, but an internship could be a more formal, and required, way to be mentored in the important first year after graduation.
- I believe mentorship should be a requirement for certification/licensure.
- Include the new RID code of conduct and have discussions around why ethics are integral within our work.

- Create opportunities for Deaf people to be trained as Deaf mentors for Deaf interpreters!

Many interpreters had positive comments about mentorship in general:

- Mentoring is one of the best tools to help you reach your full potential.
- Mentorship is a must if we want our field to grow and be perceived as a profession and not as paraprofessionals
- I believe that a mentoring experience can be beneficial and productive for both the mentor and mentee.
- To truly gain the skills necessary to be effective, a mentor is essential.

The survey results as shown in the preceding pages identify many of the positive and negative experiences of mentors. These results can be used to light the way for future mentorship programs and help to guide and improve their development. The more effectively trained mentors are, the more effectively mentees are served.

© *National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers*

CATIE Center at St. Catherine University

Gallaudet University Regional Interpreter Education Center

Mid-America Regional Interpreter Education Center at University of Arkansas at Little Rock

National Interpreter Education Center at Northeastern University

Regional Interpreter Education Center at Northeastern University

Western Region Interpreter Education Center at Western Oregon University

The National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers is funded from 2005 – 2010 by the U.S. Department of Education RSA CFDA #84.160A and B, Training of Interpreters for Individuals Who Are Deaf and Individuals Who Are Deaf-Blind.

Permission is granted to copy and disseminate these documents and video materials for educational purposes, provided that National Consortium of Interpreter Education Centers is credited as the source and referenced appropriately on any such copies.